

Evaluation of Risks for School Directors in Education in Developed / Developing Countries

Behcet Öznacar¹ and Gökmen Dagli²

Near East University, Faculty of Education, Northern Cyprus, Via Mersin 10, Turkey
E-mail: ¹<oznacar.behcet@gmail.com>, ²<gokmendagli@kibrisonline.com>

KEYWORDS Analysis of Risk. Education. Risk Management. School Administrators. Teachers

ABSTRACT In this study, it is aimed to get some ideas about risk analysis on school directors, fix the idea of risk analysis and to determine the kinds of risks in schools in France, Turkey and Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus which work under the control of the Ministry of Education. The study is done through qualitative search patterns of 'phenomenology'. As a qualitative search, samples related to this study are taken from 37 school principals in England, France, TRNC and Turkey in the 2013-2014 academic year. The school principals in TRNC have done less risk analyse/analysis than the school principals in Turkey. However, it is found that the risk analysed is not part of the strategical plan in both countries. On the other hand, it is found out that the risk analysis is randomly done and it is part of a strategical plan in England and France.

INTRODUCTION

Risk can be explained as a disadvantage of institution and institutional politics, for reaching the effects of the whole possibilities and cases (Bageci 2010). This case shows the importance of risk in our daily life and the necessity of risk management. However, if there is no risk of a possible case or if it has not happened, the result is clear or there is no possibility of loss which could be reached as a result. The basic combinations of risk, possible forms and the results are profits. Risk is not a concept which has negative returns; risk can be seen as possibility of getting a benefit and turning it to an advantage (Fikirkoca 2003).

Risk management, is a control mechanism whose importance increases day by day; the institutions are worrying more about risk related points. Risk can be formed during some strategic steps, reasons of obscurity of these steps or sometimes with the activities. For the institution to get a positive benefit from the risk, the risk management of the institution must be carefully examined from every perspective. Risks associated with identification are identified in the order of severity of a diagram and description of all the critical analysis of institutions to manage risk, is very important. When managing risk, it is very important to identify the related topic in the order of severity, by presenting it on a diagram and to define all the critical analysis of the institution. A good adaptation process and ensuring the trust and quality of decision-making occurs

as a result of a successful risk management. These results contribute to the increasing of the institution's productivity and efficiency and to the development of its strategy (Airmic 2010).

According to Ludvík Eger (2015), a study was done in Czech Republic schools about Risk Managements in the educational organizations context. In 118 educational subjects, a survey took place in nine different regions of the Czech Republic. In the end of the survey it was seen that there was a problem in managing the risks of educational projects. In general, the headteacher had some difficulties managing them. High risks were 8 percent and 27 percent were middle risk. Being able to manage risk in education must be a priority while preparing headteachers for their roles.

Risk management has a very important task and authorizes institutions to manage risk and to reach success in its aims (AGB 2004). According to the international studies in educational institutions, the emerging of risk management could be applied. Jenkins (2003) in his research showed that there are number/numbers of common risks and set/setting up the risk management strategy could be seen as fuse. In other studies done by Goode (2001), Erick (2003) and Boone (2004), they found that risk management may also be applied in higher education.

According to Maya (2008), the field of education, risk management, could be evaluated with two different factors. The first one is the organization of the training institutions where the di-

rector is at the top. The second factor is the educational institutions, students, faculty, and academic staff and parents benefitting from this. Managers contributing to risks that they cannot determine or cannot find a solution; will form a risk management system where risks in education will be less.

According to educational institutions in general (Huber 2011), especially in the universities, the main risk elements of education research risks are summarized as organizational risks, financial risks, and external risks. Reductions of risk factors in different fields at different periods are placed in application regulations which come into force. Löfsted et al. (2011) made a research to change the regulations which were altered and updated in Europe and the United States. As a result of it, risk management plan and different designs were determined, different designs were determined and current conditions were put in mind.

Huber (2011) made a study about major risks in education sector groups which are mentioned as institution's prestige status, research, education and training, transfer of knowledge, the strategic partnership, the human resources, educational institution, financial issues, training and infrastructure facilities. Besides mentioning these risks, for risk management to be applied in a productive way, the sources that form the risk, the mitigants, and early precaution mechanisms should be evaluated as a whole. Huber (2011) gives an example as a difference and he mentioned that at the University of Cambridge there are 16 different risk groups. He also mentioned that in England an average of 50 other risk groups took part in these universities. For Bath University, prestige continuity is seen as a risk, but for Cambridge University due to the academic success their risk of prestige is seen at a lower level.

The risks which are encountered in educational institutions are differentiated with respect to the speciality of the institution, the level, type, and environmental conditions (Abraham 1999). Also in a research by Query (2001), in higher education institutions there are certain risks which are faced like, at a fire, theft, technological function, workers' responsibilities sexual harassment, discrimination, health care; students' alcohol and drug use and related risks have been introduced.

In educational institutions administrators are responsible for managing risks and for the institution's work, the administrators should handle

all risks. Especially in and around the continuous increase in risk factors, risk managers' role increases; however, in order to ensure the safety and security of workers at school, compensation programs for management, including school buildings, equipment, and any possible events should be followed in order to avoid the risks, and to reduce their role to finance and meet their responsibilities as it is (Ahmed 2005).

This research is done in order to share ideas in the developing countries of TRNC and Turkey, and advanced countries of France and England connected to the Ministry of National Education at a state school for administrators on risk analysis. In schools, it was determined that they did not have to take those kinds of risks. Besides this, the survey is done in the developing countries (TRNC and Turkey) and developed countries (France and the England) on what risks are in education, how risks are determined and the comparison on subjects like what kind of methods are used for the management of these risks were aimed in this study.

METHODOLOGY

For this study qualitative scanning pattern is used. Qualitative research has seven main features: awareness to natural environment, researcher participant role, totalitarian approach, flexibility in the pattern of work, induction pattern analysis, and qualitative data, which is defined as a research where data collecting techniques like observation, interview, and document analysis is used (Yildirim and Simsek 2008).

The aim of this study is to get an idea about school administrators' thoughts about risk analysis, whether the administrator had done the analysis in schools or not, and will be able to determine what type of risks it is intended for. This is why qualitative research study found that "phenomenon science (phenomenology) pattern" is used (Yildirim and Simsek 2008). It is shown that we are aware of phenomenon science pattern, and that we have a detailed and in-depth thinking structure case. Factual science is not foreign to us, but it is a research method that helps us research the facts which we cannot understand the meaning of.

Working Group

In case studies, there are samples of research and data sources which are used for expressing and reflecting individual or groups. For this type

of research taking out the most convenient sample is important (Yildirim and Simsek 2008).

In this study in order to determine the working groups, individuals were selected from TRNC, Turkey, England, and France to conduct the research. Trainings were provided by the Ministry of Education in educational institutions and the school administrators created a working group.

As part of the study, interviews between 37 schools, administrators were made in England, France, Turkey, and TRNC. Between the administrators that participated in the research, 21 percent of the participants were men and 16 percent were women. The interviews were conducted on 10 (27%) participants from TRNC, 9 (25%) from Turkey, 10 (27%) from England, and 8 (23%) from France. The average ages of the participants were 23.51 percent. The participants gave feedback and a coding system was used. This coding system K; Female; E; male, M: Director, SB: Branch Manager, MY: Deputy Manager was expressed. For example (KMY4) code would be interpreted as participant number 4, woman and the deputy manager.

Data Collection Techniques

Interview is the primary data collection tool in factual science research. The main purpose of interviews is, investigating and determining individual's communication, emotion, and thoughts about an issue. In addition, interviews are a good way to be a foundation of a person's senses on the truth, meanings and definitions (Noble 2011), and it is also one of the most powerful methods for having empathy (Punch 2005).

For this study qualitative research methods were used and the research was covered by the structure which is appropriate for a call technique with standardized open-ended questions. Before preparing data collection tool with this technique, ideas from experts were received and they decided if these ideas were appropriate for this technique (Yildirim and Simsek 2008).

In the study researchers decided to ask open-ended questions to school administrators in order to get their views on risk analysis and develop it like, "Risk Management Skills Form in a call to School Administrators". For developing this form other similar studies that have been made in areas were investigated and in this study, the questions were designed according to the im-

portance and purpose. For the improvement and validity of the form, it was reviewed by three faculty members. Some questions had to be removed or developed after being reviewed due to fact they were expressing the same content. Besides this, the form of complexity and power phrases were detected.

As it is mentioned by Yildirim and Simsek (2008), it is very important to create an effective environment based on empathy and trust among the participants. In such an environment, even if the individuals did not notice it before or did not remember earlier will give more on meanings and talk more comfortably. Therefore, participants were informed that personal and professional information during a conversation would be kept as a secret, and their recommendations will be carried out by specified bar-codes. The interviews were done in quiet and suitable physical conditions. As a more comfortable and secure environment was formed, the participants expressed their views and emotions freely to the researchers.

The data source of the study was made up with the written records that the participants provided. The interview times were set according to the suitability of the participants. The interviews of participants from France and England were done via skype, and the interviews of participants from Turkey and TRNC were conducted face-to-face. Each participant's interview took between 45-90 minutes.

Data Analysis

As it is mentioned by Gokce (2006), the data is collected from administrators by data collecting tools, and is subjected to 'data content analysis'. The content analysis is designed by meaningful concepts in relation to the sense of describing data according to this theme afar the word concepts (Yildirim and Simsek 2008); identification of data, coding and categorising is a process (Patton 1990; Bell 1999).

Three school managers and the two Ministry of National Education managers were selected for piloting in the conversation. It was shown whether the answers were open and easy to understand, or the responses to answers to common questions did or did not reflect the responses. For this purpose, the conversations recorded at the computing environment was done with computers and turned into a written form. Then,

the two other experts' documents were examined and checked if the data is easy-to-understand, if it contained the required information or the given information was possible to gather. It is understood from the percentage which is 90 percent, from the two experts that they have similar concepts.

In the research 'categorised analysis' is used as a type of content analysis research. This analysis, in general is about a specific message with a division of units and these units are in categorised groups' form which are based on the criteria (Tavsancil and Aslan 2001).

In this research NVIVO 9.0 qualitative data analysis program is used for obtaining data in categories for grouping and coding. Quantifying qualitative data is numbering the data by processing it in certain ways. These processes, which are in written form, are evaluated through observation or documentation. Next they are numbered. Qualitative research has data types in certain level of reduced numbers (Yildirim and Simsek 2008).

In the study, frequency analysis is used for accessing data for coding simple percentage calculations. Frequency analysis puts forward the units to be able to be seen quantitatively. Frequency analysis is done which is based on classification through items and for making comment severity and impact ratings are used (Tavsancil and Aslan 2001). By using the coding method, the trust for qualitative data reduction is increased, and the data becomes more reliable (Yildirim and Simsek 2008). This study found that for coding qualitative data, NVIVO 9.0 qualitative data analysis software is used which provides statistical calculations.

It is suggested to use and follow specific orders of the orientations for content (Kishore et al. 2005). The research was done according to the data order which should be followed. These are: transferring the data into computer environment, ordering the transferred data, coding the transferred data, identifying the coded themes, putting them in order, determining the relation between the themes, changing the themes into vision according to the data, interpretation, giving place to quotation and giving samples and patterns.

Data is defined from the light of codes and established general categories and written records, which were analysed as codes and categories. Then, the research paper was typed for assessing the results and explaining the literature.

Reliability is formed by putting events in to the same category by different observers or by having a relation to making observations at different times by the same observer (Altunisik et al. 2005). Internal reliability, that is consistency, collecting the data in a similar way, being consistent with the results incoding data, is provided by making relation with the data results. External reliability which means maintaining availability is provided from an external expert in the judicial experts study for comments and suggestions to raw data by comparing and confirming them.

After the interview's documents were made, the data obtained by the participants were examined, divided into meaningful sections, and then these sections were named and coded. A list of codes was given to all the data, and the data had a key task in the preparation of investigating data. The code keys and conversation documents were read by the researchers. 'Opinion differences' and 'agreements' were discussed and arrangements were made by having arguments on the topics.

The calculation of reliable research was done by Miles and Huberman (1994) who proposed the calculating formula. According to this, data is used by a different section of a researcher in order to create themes. The researchers created themes which were based on the data and these themes were compared with the main themes. As a result of the comparison between two themes unit, it was found that the two themes were 89 percent similar. Because this percentage is above the average 70 percent that is envisaged in literature, it can be accepted as reliable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research findings were found by having done investigation in the education sector, and shown in the available findings section. The dimensions according to findings are provided below.

First Dimension: Identification of Risks for School

In Table 1, it is shown that the common definition of risk is used by the participants. From the the word patterns, it is seen that the risk is a possibility of having a negative event.

In Table 1, the percentage of distribution from the school directors' position was understood. The high rate of school administrators in Turkey and TRNC is 20 percent (n= 4) and it is shown that not reaching educational goals for schools states is a risk.

In England the percentage of the risk rate is 10 percent (n= 1) in France the risk of not reaching educational goals at schools is 0 percent (n= 0) as it can be seen from the percentage. In France and England, the high rate of 30 percent could be seen from school administrators because of failure in academical success at schools.

Also, as it can be seen in the Table 1, except for academical failures, other risk factors have been observed in TRNC and Turkey. On the other hand, the risk factors for England are physical structure, lack of funds, lack of management and for French the risk factors are not reaching the training goals, lack of funds and being inconsistent with the management.

The participants in Turkey stated their views as the following: *Risk, is not having lessons, not completing the core curriculum, not protecting the teacher and the students in every way, and not having enough sources (EM1). The risk factors for the Schools might be, gas leak from fire, environmental factors like earthquakes, floods, diseases, food poisoning, hazardous substances, transportation service events such as accidents and theft (ESB3).*

The participants in Northern Cyprus stated their views as the following: *Risk is the probability of uncontrollable negative factors that arise in the dimensions of students, parents, staff, administration, and source.*

The participants in England stated their views in the following way: *The first thing that comes in mind for risk evaluation, are factors like disasters, markets and open days. The second risk is not having enough support out-of-schools and not having continuous participation of students (IR23).*

The participants in France stated their views as the following: *The risk is the high level failure at school (EÖ26). Academic and social failure, security, and the incomplete physical structures are the risks (EÖ12).*

Second Dimension: Risks Encountered in the Dimension of Students

In Table 2, the distribution of risk percentages for all identification about the students from the school administrators are given.

There are 11 types of risks that occur which is recognized by the result of participants answers from the research findings. In those risks the first three risks that arise are from external factors, academic failure and family problems.

In Table 2 student-school administrators of risks, faced by percentage distributions are given.

In Turkey, the participants stated their views: *Students catching infectious diseases, bad friends, failing classes, not attending classes and accident and sickness absence, may be counted as risks (EMY5). The absence of individual education programs for those students who need special education, irregular attendance, working children, abused children, the emotional and physical violence parents apply*

Table 1: School administrators for school views on risk identification

Themes	Developing countries				Developed countries			
	North Cyprus		Turkey		England		France	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
Inability to reach educational goals	4	20	4	20	1	10	0	0
Academic failure	0	0	0	0	3	30	3	30
Inability to provide security	3	15	3	15	1	10	1	10
Failure of physical structure	3	15	3	15	0	0	1	10
Indifference of parents and non-communication	3	15	3	15	1	10	1	10
Disasters	2	10	2	10	2	20	2	20
Realization of accidents and other hazards	2	10	2	10	1	10	1	10
Resources failure	1	5	1	5	0	0	0	0
Incompatibility of management and employees	1	5	1	5	0	0	0	0
Be close of hazardous locations	1	5	1	5	1	10	1	10
Total	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100

Table 2: Risks faced by administrators from students opinions

Themes	Developing countries				Developed countries			
	North Cyprus		Turkey		England		France	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
Risks caused by external factors	2	10	3	15	0	0	0	0
Academic failure	2	10	4	20	2	20	2	20
Family problems	3	15	2	10	0	0	0	0
Risks arising from their peers	2	10	2	10	1	10	1	10
Risk of acquiring bad habits	2	10	2	10	2	20	1	10
Risks arising from education	2	10	2	10	1	10	3	30
Risks arising from school	2	10	2	10	1	10	0	0
Absence from school	1	5	1	5	0	0	2	20
Socio-economic situation	1	5	1	5	3	30	1	10
Aimlessness	1	5	1	5	0	0	0	0
Negative self-perception	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other risks	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100

on their children, the lack of care for students and lack of economy are all risk factors (EM35).

Participants in TRNC stated their views as: *Academic failure, lack of communication with families and relationships with negative friends, are all risks. (KMY13). Risk factors are, having a negative attitude to School, academic failure, negative friend relationships, absence, having no goals, cigarette addiction, lack of communication in the family, leaving school unauthorized and late arrival (EO33).*

Participants in England noted their views as: *Not being able to reach high standards due to poor quality education (KÖ21).The risks from the students positions are based on residual risks in social area (EO32).*

Participants in France noted their views as: *Teachers having low expectations, therefore*

causing the formation of low academic standards (EÖ12), academic failure, poor familiarity between students, violence and possibly are all student risk factors (EMY17).

Third Dimension: Risks Encountered in the Dimension of Parents

Seven types of risks have been identified by the answers given by parents; socio-economic status and a low level of education are the main risks. When looking at frequency and proportions the three risk total responses have reach 65 percent.

In Table 3, school administrators of risks faced by parents in size waves are given a percentage. In TRNC and Turkey, the highest percentage of risks in school administrators from

Table 3: School administrators about risks faced by parents in their views

Themes	Developing countries				Developed countries			
	North Cyprus		Turkey		England		France	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
Indifference of parents	4	20	4	20	1	10	2	20
Socio-economic situation	3	15	3	15	1	10	1	10
Language problems	0	0	0	0	3	30	3	30
Low level of parent's education	3	15	3	15	1	10	1	10
Communication problems of parents	2	10	2	10	1	10	2	20
Broken families	2	10	2	10	0	0	0	0
Implementation of child violence	2	10	2	10	0	0	0	0
Negative models of parents	2	10	2	10	2	20	1	10
Other risks	2	10	2	10	1	10	0	0
Total	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100

parents view is (n=4, 20%); France and England, school administrators in their risks, the language problems are at the highest rate (n=3, 30%). In addition, it mentions that in France and England, it is fragmented and the family violence against children on the implementation of risks is not available according to the answers.

Table 3 shows that in England thirty percent and in France thirty percent of the high-risk can be seen in language problems. In TRNC and Turkey, the result is the exact opposite.

Risk of violence against children in Turkey and TRNC is higher than in France and England. In France and England for violence against children, there are serious criminal sanctions.

In Turkey, the participants stated their views: *Family communication is fragmented, the families are broken, the lack of socio-economic status, family education and a low level of violence in the family could be seen as a risk factor (EEY29).*

In TRNC, participants stated their views as followed: *Not being able to attend school, not participating in the school meetings, communication problems and not knowing how to help the students are parents risk factor (IR22).*

Participants in England, stated that their views as: *Due to the language barrier for students, they don't have sufficient information to give support (KMY13). Language problem is the major problem faced by our students' families as a serious risk. A lack of language problems in families effect our school and our student's success (IR28).*

In France, the participants stated their views: *They can't help the students because they do not understand the language used in schools (EO12). Insufficient knowledge of languages*

creates problems between families and students (EO7). Mainly when we look at the answers given from the countries where the research took place, we can see that the most important risk group is the family structure and the administrator's understanding on the dimension of parents (Indifference of parents, socio-economic situation, families having a low level of education, parents' lack of communication).

Fourth Dimension: Risks Encountered in the Dimension of Personnel

The risk ratio encountered by the school administrators staff is specified below in size and proportions as defined in Table 4.

Based on the answers given by the participants, 9 types of risk have been identified. The risks include: the lack of professional personnel, the lack of personnel and adaption problems.

In Table 4, school administrators' personnel size which is compared and distributed in percentages. In Table 4, TRNC and Turkey, the school administrators, the staff at high rate of risks (n=4, 20%) of professional personnel stated out that there are risks. School administrators in England, the staff at high rate of risks (n=3, 30%) stated that there are risks of hierarchy. In France, school administrators, the personnel size risks faced by high proportion ratio (n=3, 30%) stated that there is risk of bureaucracy.

In Turkey, the participants stated their views: *Purpose of the training staff consciously or unconsciously ignored as a lack of moving destination i (ESM2). Due to lack of personnel on duty as a result of division of the personnel*

Table 4: School administrators on staff size risks faced by their views

Themes	Developing countries				Developed countries			
	North Cyprus		Turkey		England		France	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
Failure of staff's professional	4	20	4	20	1	10	1	10
Lack of staff	3	15	3	15	1	10	1	10
Bureaucracy	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	30
Hierarchy	0	0	0	0	3	30	0	0
Adjustment problems	3	15	3	15	1	10	1	10
Health problems	3	15	3	15	2	20	2	20
Exhaustion, lack of motivation	3	15	3	15	1	10	1	10
Absence of the staff	3	15	3	15	0	0	0	0
Other risks	1	5	1	5	1	10	1	10
Total	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100

served their positive work force. This is a risk as a result of distortion health (EM35).

In TRNC, participants stated their views: *There is no sufficient level of teachers and service personnel which can help one at a time if there is no risk factor (KMY8).*

In England participants stated their views: *This could be different because it depends on the students' CV and this could have been different and wide-ranging (IR21).*

In France, the participants stated their views: *Lack of Motivation due to the failure of low management experience (EO12). Problems with students' between their families (EMY19).*

The responses show that lack of professional personnel, having not enough personnel, problems that take place between the staff with organization and the school administrators, could be seen as main risks.

Fifth Dimension: Risks that face with Management

There are 10 types of risks that have been identified by management based on answers given by the participants.

According to the survey results, the data obtained as a result, the visual, and explained the purpose of the preparation as shown in Table 5. In TRNC, Turkey and England there is no problem that observed lack of personnel. In France training systems, that have been observed at the highest risk.

In Turkey, the participants stated their views: *Having no communication with administration and teachers, parents and students may occur*

as the largest risk. With the lack of management understanding communication will make it more difficult to judge (ESB36).

In TRNC, participants stated their views: *Because of teachers' absentism, strikes, and not having enough sensitivity as a trainer are the problems (KMY34).*

In England participants stated their views as: *For foreign families, full details about the students' families should be applied correctly (IR21).*

In France, the participants stated their views: *Motivation due to low management experience is failure (EO12).*

In general, as it can be understood from the answers, it is seen that risks are categorised in two separate categories. These categories are internal risks and external risks.

Sixth Dimension: Source Size Risks Encountered

Risks faced by the source size of school administrators is specified below in size and proportions as defined in Table 6.

As it is understood from the participants' answers, lack of funds has been detected as the highest risk by the managers. According to the directors' responses, lack of funds is one of the most important reasons.

In Table 6, TRNC and Turkey, school administrators' main problem is (n=8, 40%) was lack of property. There isn't any problem about lack of source in France and England, which is faced by the school administrators.

Table 5: School administrators risk management challenges by their views

Themes	Developing countries				Developed countries			
	North Cyprus		Turkey		England		France	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
Professional incompetence	1	5	4	20	0	0	0	0
Risks from senior management	4	20	1	5	0	0	2	20
Risks from staff	2	10	2	10	0	0	2	20
Lack of communication	2	10	2	10	2	20	0	0
Risks from educational system	2	10	3	15	2	20	1	10
Risks from students	1	5	3	15	3	30	0	0
Risks from parents	1	5	1	5	1	10	0	0
Risks from physical structure	2	10	1	5	0	0	0	0
Risks from environment	2	10	1	5	2	20	1	10
Lack of staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	30
Risks from personality of administrators	3	15	2	10	0	0	1	10
Total	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100

Table 6: School administrators' risks faced by resource size

Themes	Developing countries				Developed countries			
	North Cyprus		Turkey		England		France	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
Lack of financial resources	8	40	8	40	0	0	0	0
Risk of inefficient and proper use of resources	6	30	6	30	0	0	0	0
Lack of tools and equipment's	5	25	5	25	0	0	0	0
Other risks	1	5	1	5	0	0	0	0
Total	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100

Size: How to Perform Risk Analysis at School

Views on the size of risk analysis of school administrators in schools is specified below in size and proportions as defined in Table 7.

As a result of the interviews, the majority of the participants mentioned that risk analysis was overcome by the administration and teachers. This result shows that risk analysis was done by the upper personnel.

In Table 7, Turkey and TRNC school administrators highest risk analysis is (n=4, 20%), it is decided by having meetings with manager and teachers. The highest rates for risk analysis in school administrators in the UK is (n=4, 40%) and it is found by filling out forms about risk analysis. In France, the school administrators high risk analysis (n=4, 40%) was done by training institutions, and the ministry of education in accordance with laws and audit programs.

In Turkey, the participants stated their views: *Guidance teachers, other teachers and the school family units have risk analysis on the evaluation meetings co-operated with the authorities (EÖB36).*

In TRNC, participants stated their views: *It is trifling units working together which have done*

the risk analysis on the task and responsibility points (KÖ31).

Participants in England stated their views: *The risk analysis form is followed-up which was prepared by the ministry of National education and is completed (KÖ28).*

In France, the participants stated their views: *As it described before, the risk analysis is done in different ways. These risks are challenges of reaching families and the participants' problems (EÖ12).*

CONCLUSION

In general, risk analysis is done seriously in advanced countries like France and the United Kingdom. In developed countries risk analysis is being implemented seriously via legislations. In Turkey and TRNC, the institution called, YÖK (Higher Education Institution Legislation of Laws) takes this responsibility. Although it is taken very seriously in legislations with respect to developed countries, it could be said that it is not taken into practice that much serious and necessary procedures have not been structured.

When a comparison is carried out in this scope, administrators in TRNC apply less risk

Table 7: School administrators how to risk analysis on their opinions

Themes	Developing countries				Developed countries			
	North Cyprus		Turkey		England		France	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
Meetings with administration and teachers	4	40	4	40	2	20	2	20
Do not make risk analysis	2	20	2	20	2	20	2	20
Sharing with PTA	2	20	2	20	2	20	1	10
Risk analysis form	0	0	0	0	2	20	1	10
Audit programme	0	0	0	0	2	20	4	40
Other methods	2	20	2	20	0	0	0	0
Total	10	100	10	100	10	100	10	100

analysis than administrators in Turkey. However, it is regularly done in France and England and institutionally it is the part of the strategic planning. Study's findings also claim that risk analysis is checked by managers, and teachers in their meetings. As a result when we look at the school administrators' opinions about risk analysis; school administration and meetings with risk analysis is mainly carried out by the teachers. In England, the highest rate for making risk analysis by administrators is 40 percent and is done mainly in audit programs.

REFERENCES

- Abraham JM 1999. Identifying and managing risk. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 1999(107): 83–89.
- ACECQA 2013. *Guide to the Education and Care Services National Law and the Education and Care Services National Regulations 2011*. September 2013. Australia. ISBN: 978-0-642-78125-3.
- AGB 2004. *Meeting the Challenges of Enterprise Risk Management in Higher Education*. USA: NACUBO.
- Ahmed H 2005. The Islamic financial system and economic growth: An assessment. In: Iqbal, Munawar, Ahmad Ausaf (Eds.): *Islamic Finance and Economic Development*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 29-48.
- Airmic A 2010. *Kurumsal Risk Yönetimine (KRY) Yapısal Bakış Açısı ve ISO 31000 Yükümlülükleri*. Ankara: The Public Risk Management Association.
- Bagci B 2010. *Bilgisayar Teknolojileri Risk Yönetimi*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilisim Derneği subesi.
- Boone E 2004. *Managing the High Risks of Higher Education*. Indianapolis: Rough Notes.
- Eger L 2015. Project Risk Management in Educational Organizations a Case from the Czech Republic. From <<http://ema.sagepub.com/content/early/2015/07/01/1741143214558573.abstract>> (Retrieved on 10 December 2015).
- Elazig Ili 2013-2014. *Eğitim-Öğretim Yılı Riskli Yaşam şartlarında Koruma Önleme ve Müdahale Hizmetleri Eylem Planı*. Elazig: MEB.
- Erick CM 2003. *Factors that Promote Effective Risk Management at Universities Classified by the Carnegie System as Doctoral/Research Universities Expensive*. EdD. Alabama, SA: Auburn University.
- Erdogan M 2000. *Genel İşletme*. Eskisehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Fikirkoca M 2003. *Bütünsel Risk Yönetimi*. Ankara: Pozitif Matbaacılık.
- Goode HF 2001. *Risk Management in the Arizona Public Universities*. EdD. Arizona, USA: Arizona State University.
- Gokce O 2006. *İçerik Analizi. Kuramsal ve Pratik Bilgiler*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitapevi.
- Huber M 2011. The Risk University: Risk Identification at Higher Education Institutions in England. *Paper No. 69*. London: London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Jenkins HE 2003. *Study of Risk Management Practices in K-12, Kansas School Districts*. EdD. Kansas, USA: University of Kansas.
- Kizilboga R 2012. *Risk Yönetimi ve Ülke Uygulamalarında Risk Yönetim Modelleri*. Türkiye: Akademik Araştırmalar ve Çalışmalar Dergisi.
- Kishore R, Agrawal M, Rao HR 2005. Determinants of sourcing during technology growth and maturity. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 21(3): 47-82.
- Lofsted RE, Vogel D 2001. The changing character of regulation: A comparison of Europe and the United States. *Risk Analysis*, 21(3): 399-405.
- Maya IC 2008. *Eğitim Kurumlarında Risk Yönetimi*. Ankara: Ani Yayıncılık.
- Miles MB, Huberman AM 1994. *An Expanded Sourcebook: Qualitative Data Analysis*. 2nd Edition. USA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Noble HC 2011. The "Life" in Concept 6. Class Students Student Opinions on the Use of Cartoons. 2nd International Conference on New Trends in Education and in Their Implications Statement, Antalya-Turkey, April, 2011, pp. 1445-1456. 27-29
- Patton MQ 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. USA: Sage.
- Punch KF 2005. *Sosyal Araştırmalara Giriş* (Çeviren: D Bayrak, HB Arslan, Z Akyüz). Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Query JT 2001. Managing risk on college campus. *Risk Management*, 48(6): 38.
- Tavsancil E, Aslan E 2001. *Sözel, Yazılı ve Diğer Materyaller İçin İçerik Analizi ve Uygulama Örnekleri*. İstanbul: Epsilon Yayınları.
- Yıldırım A, Şimşek H 2008. *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. 7th Edition. Ankara: Seçkin Yay.