



Journal name	International e-Journal of Educational Studies
Abbreviation	IEJES
e-ISSN	2602-4241
Founded	2017
Article link	http://doi.org/10.31458/iejjes.1214553
Article type	Research Article
Received date	04.12.2022
Accepted date	11.02.2023
Publication date	21.03.2023
Volume	7
Issue	13
pp-pp	13-30
Section Editor	Assoc.Prof.Dr. Mustafa İLHAN
Chief-in-Editor	Prof.Dr. Tamer KUTLUCA
Abstracting & Indexing	EBSCO Education Full Text Database Coverage List H.W. Wilson Index Copernicus DRJI Harvard Library WorldCat SOBIAD
Article Name	Experiences and Demands about Supervision Practices of Teachers and School Administrators

Author Contribution Statement

¹Elif Gamze ÖZCAN 

Assist.Prof.Dr.
Dokuz Eylül University,
İzmir, Turkey

Conceptualization, literature review, methodology, implementation, data analysis, translation, and writing

Abstract


Carried out by education inspectors and administrative superiors in Türkiye, school supervisions are done in line with national guidelines. How supervision processes are conducted in schools is necessary to be specified so as to ensure continuity and evaluation of improvement in education and training processes. Both teacher supervision and administrative supervision of school administrators were examined in this study. Designed as a descriptive survey, a questionnaire was created and multiple-choice questions were used to collect data for the present study. Teachers and school administrators working in secondary and high schools at Urla district of İzmir, Türkiye in the 2019/20 academic year were investigated in this study under the headings of the purpose of supervision; results of supervision; frequency of supervision; data sources used for supervision; the teachers and school administrators' perceptions of the current supervision processes; their views on what kind of supervision was to be demanded; along with the comparisons made on the existing situation of supervision practices and demands concerning such practices. The results indicated that teacher supervision aimed to identify teachers' weaknesses and strengths; resulted in making verbal reminding and guidance; had no routine, and was carried out in the form of a document review. Some other results regarding the supervision of school administrations pointed to either administrative sanctions or improvement through guidance, as well as to the fact that supervision practices are to be carried out every few years, taking place in the form of a document review. Some of the demands identified through this study are that the supervision of both groups should be carried out to identify both weaknesses and strengths, to result in improvement through guidance, to be continued throughout the education and training processes, to be practiced in such a way as to monitor the process and detect satisfactions of those who benefit from the service.

To cite this article:

Özcan, E.G. (2023). Experiences and demands about supervision practices of teachers and school administrators. *International e-Journal of Educational Studies*, 7 (13), 13-30. <https://doi.org/10.31458/iejjes.1214553>

Copyright © IEJES

IEJES's Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement are based, in large part, on the guidelines and standards developed by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). This article is available under Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Research Article**Experiences and Demands about Supervision Practices of Teachers and School Administrators***Elif Gamze ÖZCAN¹ **Abstract**

Carried out by education inspectors and administrative superiors in Türkiye, school supervisions are done in line with national guidelines. How supervision processes are conducted in schools is necessary to be specified so as to ensure continuity and evaluation of improvement in education and training processes. Both teacher supervision and administrative supervision of school administrators were examined in this study. Designed as a descriptive survey, a questionnaire was created and multiple-choice questions were used to collect data for the present study. Teachers and school administrators working in secondary and high schools at Urla district of Izmir, Türkiye in the 2019/20 academic year were investigated in this study under the headings of the purpose of supervision; results of supervision; frequency of supervision; data sources used for supervision; the teachers and school administrators' perceptions of the current supervision processes; their views on what kind of supervision was to be demanded; along with the comparisons made on the existing situation of supervision practices and demands concerning such practices. The results indicated that teacher supervision aimed to identify teachers' weaknesses and strengths; resulted in making verbal reminding and guidance; had no routine, and was carried out in the form of a document review. Some other results regarding the supervision of school administrations pointed to either administrative sanctions or improvement through guidance, as well as to the fact that supervision practices are to be carried out every few years, taking place in the form of a document review. Some of the demands identified through this study are that the supervision of both groups should be carried out to identify both weaknesses and strengths, to result in improvement through guidance, to be continued throughout the education and training processes, to be practiced in such a way as to monitor the process and detect satisfactions of those who benefit from the service.

Keywords: Supervision of teachers, supervision of school administrators, purpose and results of supervision, frequency of supervision, data sources used in the supervision

1. INTRODUCTION

Teachers are often subject to supervision related to their activities in the classroom, whereas school administrators are subject to them concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of their administrative actions so that the education and training processes can be fulfilled properly. Carried out by inspectors and administrative superiors in Türkiye, school supervision is practiced in line with national guidelines (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2021a). According to the Regulation on Education Inspectors of the Ministry of National Education published in 2022, education inspectors are responsible for the inspection of teachers and school administrations to fulfill the duties of Guidance and Supervision, Monitoring and Evaluation, Examination, Investigation Activities and Reporting. This regulation states that it is essential to contribute to schools through supervision activities prevent corruption and irregularities, determine the level of achievement in the curriculum, as well as enabling them to improve themselves (MoNE, 2022). In this regard, it is necessary to describe how supervision processes are applied in schools to ensure continuity and evaluation of improvement in education and training processes.

Received Date: 04/12/2022**Accepted Date:** 11/02/2023**Publication Date:** 21/03/2023

*To cite this article: Özcan, E.G. (2023). Experiences and demands about supervision practices of teachers and school administrators. *International e-Journal of Educational Studies*, 7 (13), 13-30. <https://doi.org/10.31458/iej.1214553>

¹ Assist.Prof.Dr. Dokuz Eylül University, Buca Faculty of Education, İzmir, Turkey, egamzeozcan@gmail.com

* Corresponding Author e-mail address: egamzeozcan@gmail.com

It appears that some systems assuming that managerial processes based on classical views continue with clear control and direction have been replaced by chaos management based on the uncertainty that takes place under the influence of many unpredictable variables (Dikmen, 2017). However, many administrations are still under the influence of classical thought and ignore the influence of many factors that have an impact on the organization to keep their organizations in orderly, linear and predictable systems. This might cause the organization to be alienated from its internal and external environment, hinder the creativity of its stakeholders and weaken the functions of the organization. It should, therefore, be known that their tendency towards linearity is not a redemptive solution and carries with it the risks of destroying organizations.

Supervision, which is the main focus of this study, is regarded as an evaluation step in management processes; and is practiced to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of an organization (Ozcan, 2018). An observation of the intellectual progress of control along with the theories of leadership and the way it is handled in organizations in practice reveals that the gap between theory and practice is great. Theories covered in the relevant literature often emphasize that the classical understanding is left behind, and instead, that participatory, flexible and instructional leadership prevails, without sacrificing quality and efficiency, in addition to caring about human values (Aydin, 2020; Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2017), whereas administrative practices in the field show that the efficiency of organizations in supervision processes is mostly determined by the generalizable results of standard assessment tools for internal stakeholders (MoNE, 2021b).

According to many studies in the literature, even though supervision finds affirmative responses such as leadership, motivation, being an opportunity for professional advancement, etc. (Sullivan & Glanz, 2013) it is observed that supervision operates in schools both for the students, who are the focal beneficiaries of the process, and for the teachers and the administrative staff who are their supervisors, in a controlling manner rather than personal-professional development provider, where errors are highlighted, oriented to the continuity of order and based on paperwork (Altınok, Tezel & Gungor, 2020; Can, 2004; Şeren & Özcan, 2022). Research on the supervision of education and school institutions in primary education in Türkiye reveals that the supervision subsystem cannot fulfill its duties in the modern sense, cannot respond to the needs, and that there are many weaknesses in this field accompanied by the presence of numerous problems (MONE, 2010).

The phenomenon of performance evaluation according to predetermined general indicators is the main practice of today's supervision practices, yet filling out of standard forms and transmission of standard forms to superiors are practices inherited from the bureaucratic management approach. Naturally, the basis of these practices is the legal regulations established by the Ministry of National Education. The most current legislation on the subject is the regulation on supervision activities and responsible training inspectors in 2022. With this regulation, duties of providing supervision and guidance services to inspectors have been defined. It is stated that preventive and corrective and improving guidance services will be provided and reported to educational institutions. In this framework, supervision of educational institutions are to be conducted according to processes, results, performance, systems, finance, appropriateness, themes, personnel, appropriateness, and course supervision types. According to this regulation, inspectors are also responsible for the supervision of the annual self-evaluations that educational institutions are obliged to carry out.

1.1. Context of the Study

Besides its function within school administration processes, supervision has been defined in the given statement as follows: “*Because the elements incorporated in it are initiating action, taking leadership, ordering, guiding and motivating the personnel, it is not a function of evaluation or correcting deviations*” (UNESCO, 1984). Nevertheless, supervision is also defined as a function of a control stage of the administration process, and as inspection activities required to make evaluation-

related decisions (Agih, 2015). Understanding the purpose of supervision depends on knowing its elements. The purpose of the supervision consists of a relationship of 3 elements, which are assessment, evaluation and correction-development. The assessment phase of the supervision is the situation description stage, which includes data collection, examination, and comparison of the purpose-result appropriateness. The evaluation phase is a stage where decisions are made about what to do with the collected data to control or improve those supervised. Correction and improvement activities are the implementations of those that turn into decisions from the options that will arise as a result of the evaluation (Basar, 2000).

Supervision can be carried out in the public sector with a focus on control and investigation, in order to take the necessary legal actions against the personnel by detecting their negligence, abuse or carelessness, or it can be carried out for the purpose of vocational guidance and assistance, which can be applied at all levels of the training provided at the desired and needed place and time with a focus on guidance and professional assistance activities (Taymaz, 2005). In general, supervision is carried out to ensure the survival and development of organizations by using their resources in the most efficient and beneficial way. In educational institutions, supervision can be carried out to determine the weaknesses of the supervised staff in a control-oriented manner, or it can be carried out to determine the strengths of the supervised with a developmental focus. The supervision may have the purpose of both controlling and improving the supervised, in which the option of ‘identifying the weaknesses’ and ‘identifying the strengths’ as well as ‘identifying both the weaknesses and strengths’ were directed to the participants in the questions addressing the purpose of the supervision and what it should be. A school is an organization of complex activities which are carried out by people (Agih, 2015) to ensure that educational processes evolve towards development with the contribution of supervision factors, and the purpose of the supervision should also be aimed at development. According to complexity management theory, precise dependence on the foundation point for organizational processes and characteristics of variables that can be recognized in a system are related to the way the supervision is carried out, but how it is carried out depends on what is intended by it, and these choices determine how it will yield results. For example, supervisors may use process supervision to improve school and classroom management processes, or they may turn to the supervision of results to reveal the benefit or impact of the work being done. In this study, participants stated their opinions through the options about the results of the supervision, which are; “administrative sanctions”, “both administrative sanctions and development with guidance” and “development with guidance”.

How often the supervision is carried out in educational processes varies depending on the intensity of the task that the supervisors are responsible for. The intensity of the supervision program and the low inter-tour times (Taymaz, 2005) and the excess workload caused by the supervision (Basar, 2000) cause the supervision approach to rely on outcome evaluation instead of process evaluation. Process evaluation aims to improve personnel with guidance, and therefore, requires frequent monitoring of the supervised individuals in the process (Aydin, 2020). Taking into consideration the intensity of findings from the literature signifying that short-term supervision practices based on standard forms and document examination are dominant in schools (Altinok et al., 2020), it may be suggested that the outcome evaluation approach, which deems sufficient to visit schools on average once a year to check whether the people supervised fulfill their responsibilities (Glickman et al., 2017), is the preferred approach in the supervision of educational institutions in Türkiye. In this study, participants expressed their opinions on the questions about the frequency of supervision through the options of “never”, “once a few years”, “once a year”, “once a term”, and “during the process”.

For the purposes of supervision, the available data obtained about those supervised are utilized so as to make decisions about them during the evaluation phase (Basar, 2000). It is possible

for supervisors to collect data from various sources as well as their own impressions in order to determine the attitudes and behaviors that the supervised persons should show in accordance with their job descriptions in the legislation. If the aim is to reveal the status of those being supervised by supervision processes and to give feedback to people in line with the results, then supervision processes should be conducted in this direction and data should be collected from sources to feed the need.

In supervision, while making decisions about those supervised during the evaluation phase, data obtained about them are utilized (Basar, 2000). When supervision is conducted in a process evaluation approach, care is taken to access all possible performance data on both weaknesses and competencies for their superiority when monitoring supervisees. According to Glickman et al. (2017), in process supervision, in-class observation data such as students' participation in class, movements in the classroom, and questioning techniques, as well as assignments, experiments, practice studies, projects, and measurement tools are also subject to review. If the supervision process is to be operated in the outcome evaluation approach, it is suggested that the stakeholders affected by the services of the person inspected should participate in the decision process and their representation in the evaluation decision, but it is also said that administrators and teachers resist such participation (Aydin, 2020). Since the currently more prevalent supervision approach is the outcome evaluation approach for evaluating the situation in a short time, it is important to reveal the judgments of school administrators and teachers. For this reason, school administrators and teachers were asked about their thoughts on the sources from which supervisors collect data and from which they should collect it when conducting their own supervision.

1.2. Problem of the Study

The problem statement is based on determining the study sample's perceptions of current supervision practices under the headings of the purpose of supervision, consequences of supervision, frequency of supervision and data sources used in supervision and on what kind of supervision is demanded; comparing the existing and demanding circumstances. This study aimed to investigate and determine the opinions of those being supervised about the current situation of the supervision practices and of the favorable supervision practices. Unlike the other current studies in this area this study focused not only on teacher supervision, but also on the supervision of principals and vice-principals. To this end, it is aimed that the questions did not remain superficial, that they could show the details of the operation of the supervision, and that the experience of the participants about the practice was obtained rather than focusing on the morale/motivation dimension of supervision practices. For this reason, the teachers and school administrators were asked multiple-choice questions in the form of questions such as what, which, how, how often and in what ways, in order to be able to obtain clear diagnostic answers about the objectives, results, frequency and data sources of classroom supervision and school administrative supervision.

Main problem: What are the perceptions of teachers and administrators about current and demanded supervision practices?

Four sub-problems were created and analysed.

Sub-problem 1: What are the participant views on what the purpose of the supervision is and how it is desired to be?

Sub-problem 2: What are the participant views on the consequences of existing and desired states of supervision?

Sub-problem 3: What are the participant views on the current state of the supervision frequency and the desired frequency?

Sub-problem 4: What are the views of the participants on the sources of data used in the supervision and which data would they like to be used as a source of data during their supervision?

In the scale prepared to examine these sub-problems in depth, participants were asked the following questions:

1.2.1. Purpose of the supervision (Sub-problem 1)

- Which status of the supervised person does the supervision aim to identify, according to school administrators and teachers?
- Which status of the supervised person should the supervision aim to identify, according to school administrators and teachers?
- Are there any differences between perceptions of teachers and school administrators about which state of the supervised person the supervision aims to identify and which state of the supervised person should the supervision aim to identify?

1.2.2. Consequences of the supervision (Sub-problem 2)

- How is the supervision concluded, according to school administrators and teachers?
- How should the supervision be concluded, according to school administrators and teachers?
- Is there a difference between the views on how the supervision ends and on how those being supervised demand it to end for their own sake?

1.2.3. Supervision frequency (Sub problem 3)

- How often are school principals supervised, according to school administrators and teachers?
- How often should school principals be supervised, according to school administrators and teachers?
- Are there any differences between the opinions of the participants about how often school principals are supervised and how often the participants want them to be supervised?
- How often are teachers supervised, according to school administrators and teachers?
- How often should teachers be supervised, according to school administrators and teachers?
- Is there a difference between opinions of the participants about how often teachers are supervised and how often the participants want them to be?

1.2.4. Data sources used in supervision (Sub-problem 4)

- From what sources was data collected during the supervision?
- From what sources should data be collected for supervision in schools?

2. METHOD

2.1. Research Design

This research was conducted using a descriptive survey model in a qualitative research design. In this study, the researcher investigated teachers' and administrators' perceptions on current supervision practices under the headings of purpose of supervision, results of supervision, frequency of supervision and methods used in supervision and on what kind of supervision is demanded; and compared current situations and demands in this direction. A semi-structured, multiple-choice questionnaire was prepared and applied to participants to determine their situational perceptions of supervision practice and their views on how to demand it. This measurement tool took into account the possibility of unpredictable responses; therefore, in addition to the options provided as possible for each question item, "other: ..." was included as a final option for each question to be answered if required. The answers that reached the same significance for the expression "other" and that were at least as high as the frequency of choosing the other options were grouped and included in the calculations related to the question by being treated like other options.

2.2. Participants

This research was carried out with 40 teachers, 17 vice principals and 24 school principals working in secondary and high schools in Urla district of Izmir, Türkiye during the 2019/20 academic

year. Kindergartens and primary schools were not included in the study population since education and training processes were carried out with classroom teachers. In order to make reliable generalizations about the population, this study was designed in a way to be conducted in schools where only the core subjects were taught.

Sampling was not used in this study. Entire population of school administrators (N=55) were aimed to be reached, though only 14 of them could be reached (n=41). Since views of teachers and administrators were to be compared for the purposes of the present study, utmost attention was paid to reach as many teachers as the number of administrators in order to make parametric distribution calculations reliable. In this case, school administrators whose data were evaluated corresponded to 74.5% of the population, while teachers corresponded to 11% (n=40) of the whole population (N=363). Relevant tables demonstrate the distribution of the study sample according to their tasks (Table 1), school types (Table 2) and professional seniority (Table 3).

Table 1. Participants' professional positions in schools

Status	<i>f</i>	%
Teachers	40	49.4
Vice Principals	17	21.0
Principals	24	29.6
Total	81	100.0

Table 2. School types and participants by position

School Type	<i>Teachers</i>	<i>School Administrators</i>	<i>Total</i>
Secondary school	4	21	25
High school	36	20	56
Total	40	41	81

Table 3. Distribution of participants by professional seniority

Seniority	<i>f</i>	%
10 years and less	19	23.5
11-19 years	21	25.9
20-24 years	20	24.7
25 years and above	21	25.9
Total	81	100

2.3. Measurement tool

The measurement tool was designed with the aim of creating the simplest and clearest questions possible in order to establish clearly what teachers and school administrators, who were subject to supervision as part of their job descriptions, thought about supervision in relation to the research questions. For this purpose, volunteer school administrators and a field expert were consulted on the items and options of the questionnaire prepared by the researcher prior to the actual administration, and then the participants' opinions on content validity and suggestions for improvement were taken. It was concluded that items asked about the demanded questions and options largely met answers that could be given. Due to the well-known advantages such as quick sharing, simultaneous feedback and only volunteers taking the time to fill in, questions were prepared in an online form. The responses of volunteer participants working as teachers and school administrators in the study population were collected online.

2.3.1. Reliability and Validity of Measurement

The reliability of the measurement was determined by the Cronbach's alpha calculation for items with more than three options in the scale. The Cronbach's alpha is the correlation coefficient

between the total scores of the answers and is suitable for this analysis since the number of options of the 4 items written for the sub-problem about the frequency of supervision from the research questions is greater than 3 (with 5 options). The result of the reliability analysis was found as $\alpha = 0.707$, and according to Kilic (2016), the measurement reliability for these substances is at a good level since this value is higher than 0.7.

Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's analyses were applied for the validity of the measurements, and these values were magnitudes related to the appropriateness of the correlation between the sample and the scale items. The analyses were made by considering the answers given to 4 items written to find perceptions about the frequency of the supervision, which had 5 options as in reliability measurements. The measurement value of the KMO sample size was determined to be $KMO = 0.589$, $p = 0.000$. According to Field (2000), the fact that the KMO value is greater than 0.50 and the value p in Bartlett's hypothesis "The correlation matrix is the unit matrix" is less than 0.05 is an indication of a correlation between substances.

2.4. Data Analysis

In the first part of the questionnaire, participants were asked about their attitudes towards current supervisory practices in schools, while in the second part they were asked about their expectations of supervisory practices. Frequency, percentage distribution, arithmetic mean and standard deviation data were used for process monitoring and analysis. The normality values of the data distribution were examined in terms of skewness and kurtosis indices. According to Demir, Saatçioğlu and Imrol (2016); if it is close to 0 within the ± 2 limits of the skewness and kurtosis indices, the existence of a normal distribution is taken as evidence. As can be seen in Table 4, the skewness and kurtosis values are within acceptable ranges, so it was decided to use parametric difference tests with the exception of one item (demanded purpose of supervision).

Table 4. Normality indicators scores of items

Items	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
<i>Current purpose of supervision</i>	81	1,32	,496	1,094	-,070
<i>Demanded purpose of supervision</i>	81	1,90	,339	-1,704	4,409
<i>How supervision is currently concluded</i>	81	2,32	,772	-,629	-1,040
<i>How the supervision should be concluded</i>	81	2,64	,508	-,895	-,534
<i>Supervision frequency of school principals in the current situation</i>	81	2,68	1,283	,737	-,560
<i>Demanded supervision frequency of school principals</i>	81	4,16	1,042	-,806	-,773
<i>Supervision frequency of teachers in the current situation</i>	81	2,95	1,413	,226	-1,213
<i>Demanded supervision frequency of teachers</i>	81	4,20	1,005	-,865	-,594

Independent samples t-test analyses were used for parametric distributions to identify teachers' and school administrators' views on their perceptions of school administration and teacher supervision, as well as their demanded supervision practices, and to compare them with the task independent variable. The Mann-Whitney U-test was used for the item "demanded purpose of supervision" as its kurtosis indexes the deviation. Paired samples t-test analyses were used to determine whether there was a difference between situational perceptions of the participants about supervision practices and demanded supervision practices. In this study, the data were analysed by using SPSS 20 program.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Purpose of the Supervision

To interpret the first sub-problem, there are three questions to identify participant views on the current state of supervision, the aim of supervision and how it is demanded to be. In response to the first two questions in the measurement tool, three same options were included. While the results

were being interpreted, generalization was made according to equally spaced score intervals for the options of “Identifying weaknesses” (1.00-1.66), “Identifying both weaknesses and strengths (1.67-2.33), and “Identifying strengths” (2.34-3.00).

To determine whether there is a difference in the opinions between the teacher and administrator groups in the answers given to the question “Which status of the supervised person does the supervision aim to identify, according to school administrators and teachers?”; independent samples t-test analysis was performed.

Table 5. Independent samples t-test results with arithmetic mean and standard deviation values for the current purpose of supervision

Item	Item's options and scores	Groups	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
perceptions of teachers and administrators about purpose of current supervision practices	- identify weaknesses (1)	School administrators	41	1.32	.471	79	.072	.943
	- identify both weaknesses and strengths (2)							
	-identify strengths (3)	Teachers	40	1.33	.526			

[$t_{(79)}=0.072$, $p>.05$].

The opinions of school administrators ($\bar{X}=1.32$, $S=0.471$; $n=41$) and teachers ($\bar{X}=1.33$, $S=0.526$; $n=40$) regarding this research question were in conformity with the view that the supervision was done to “identify weaknesses”. Difference tests for the arithmetic mean scores of the teacher and school administrator groups indicated that there was no significant difference between the groups regarding the current purpose of the supervision [$t_{(79)}=0.072$, $p>.05$] (Table 5). To determine whether there is a difference in the opinions between the teacher and administrator groups in the answers given to the question “Which status of the supervised person should the supervision aim to identify, according to school administrators and teachers?”; Mann Whitney U test analysis was performed.

Table 6. Mann Whitney U test results about what should be aimed with supervision

Item	Item's options and scores	Groups	n	Mean rank	U	p
Demands of teachers and administrators about the purpose of supervision practices	- identify weaknesses (1)	School administrators	41	44,02	944	.040*
	- identify both weaknesses and strengths (2)					
	-identify strengths (3)	Teachers	40	37,90		

*[$U=944$, $p<.05$].

The opinions of school administrators ($\bar{X}=1.98$, $S= 0.156$; $n=41$) and teachers ($\bar{X}=1.83$, $S=0.446$; $n=40$) for this question were found to be indicating that it should be done to “identify both the weaknesses and strengths”; however, this finding was mostly observed in the school administrators group and a statistically significant difference was also found [$U=944$; $p<.05$] (Table 6).

To answer the question “Are there any differences between perceptions of teachers and school administrators about which status of the supervised person the supervision aims to identify, according to school administrators and teachers and which status of the supervised person the supervision should aim to identify, according to school administrators and teachers?”, paired samples t-test was performed.

Table 7. Comparison of the perceptions about purpose of supervision according to participants regarding the current and demanded objectives of supervision

	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
What is the purpose of the supervision?	81	1.32	.496	80	-9.589	.000*
What should be the purpose of the supervision?	81	1.90	.339			

* [$t_{(80)}=9.589$, $p<.05$].

For this question, opinions of the participants regarding the purpose of the supervision and current situation ($\bar{X}=1.32$, $S=496$; $N=81$) and the purpose of the supervision and desired situation ($\bar{X}=1.90$, $S=0,339$; $N=81$), were compared with paired samples t-test. A significant difference was found between current supervision practices and participant views on what should be aimed with the supervision [$t_{(80)}=9,589$, $p<,05$]. Participants stated that in the current situation, it is aimed to find weaknesses of the supervised through the supervision; yet, the aim should be to identify both the weaknesses and successes of the supervised (Table 7).

3.2. Consequence of Supervision

Predicting the second sub-problem, there are three sub-problems in order to determine participant views on the consequences of existing and desired states of supervision. The same three options were included in response to the first two questions in this direction in the measurement tool. While the results were being evaluated, generalization was made according to equally spaced score intervals for the options of “Administrative sanctions” (1.00-1.66), “both administrative sanctions and improvement through guidance” (1.67-2.33), and “Improvement through guidance” (2.34-3.00).

An independent samples t-test analysis was conducted to compare the opinions of the teacher and school administrator groups on the answer data given to the question “How is the supervision concluded, according to school administrators and teachers?”

Table 8. Independent samples t-test results with arithmetic mean and standard deviation values regarding how supervision is currently concluded

Item	Item's options and scores	Groups	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
How is the supervision concluded, according to school administrators and teachers?	- Administrative sanctions (1)	School administrators	41	2.34	.693	79	.240	.811
	- Both administrative sanctions and improvement through guidance (2)							
	- Improvement through guidance (3)	Teachers	40	2.30	.853			

[$t_{(79)}=0.240$, $p>.05$].

\bar{X} points of the groups are close even though the teachers categorically expressed their opinions for this question in the direction of “both administrative sanctions and improvement through guidance” with ($\bar{X}=2.30$, $S=0.853$; $n=40$); and school administrators expressed theirs in the direction of “improvement through guidance” with ($\bar{X}=2.34$, $S=0.693$; $n=41$). When these arithmetic mean scores are compared, the tendency of the views of both groups is that supervision in schools results in “both administrative sanctions and improvement with guidance”. [$t_{(79)}=0.240$, $p>.05$] (Table 8).

An independent samples t-test analysis was conducted to compare the opinions of the teacher and school administrator groups on the answer data given to the question “How should the supervision be concluded according to school administrators and teachers?”

Table 9. Independent samples t-test results with arithmetic mean and standard deviation values about how the supervision should be concluded

Item	Item's options and scores	Groups	n	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
How should the supervision be concluded, according to school administrators and teachers?	- Administrative sanctions (1)	School administrators	41	2.59	.547	79	1.016	.313
	- Both administrative sanctions and improvement through guidance (2)							
	- Improvement through guidance (3)	Teachers	40	2.70	.464			

[$t_{(79)}=1.016$, $p>.05$].

For this question the teachers expressed their opinions in the direction that it should be as “improvement through guidance” with ($\bar{X}=2.70$, $S=0.464$; $n=40$), along with the school administrators being in the same direction ($\bar{X}=2.59$, $S=0.547$; $n=41$). The comparison of the arithmetic mean scores has proven that there is no significant difference between the views of the teacher and administrator groups [$t(79)=1.016$, $p>.05$] (Table 9).

Paired samples t-test analysis was performed to answer the question “Is there a difference between the views on how the supervision comes to a conclusion and on how the supervised demands it to for their own sake?”

Table 10. Comparison of the supervision results in terms of current & demanded statuses (paired samples t-test results)

	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
Result of supervision (current)	81	2.32	.772	80	-3.096	.003*
Result of supervision (demanded)	81	2.64	.508			

* [$t_{(80)}=3.096$, $p<.05$].

For this question, participants’ views of results of the supervision – current situation ($\bar{X}=2.32$, $S=0.772$; $N=81$) and results of the supervision – demanded situation were compared through paired samples t test. A significant difference was found between current supervision practices and participant views on how supervision should be concluded [$t_{(80)}=3.096$, $p<.05$]. The participants stated that supervision often ended up with “both administrative sanctions and improvement through guidance” for the supervised, but should instead be concluded with “improvement through guidance” for the supervised (Table 10).

3.3. Supervision Frequency

For the third sub-problem, there are six questions to determine the participants’ views on the current state of the supervision frequency and the desired frequency. The same five options were included in response to the four questions in this direction in the measurement tool. While evaluating the results, a generalization according to equal score intervals was made for the options of “Never” (1.00-1.80), “Once a few years” (1.81-2.60), “Once a year” (2.61-3.40), “Once a term” (3.41-4.20), “During the process” (4.21-5.00).

An independent samples t-test analysis was conducted to compare the opinions of the teacher and school administrator groups on the answer data given to the question “How often are school principals supervised, according to school administrators and teachers?”

Table 11. Supervision frequency of school principals in the current situation, according to school administrators and teachers

Item	Item’s options and scores	Groups	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
How often are school principals supervised?	- Never(1)	School administrators	41	2.63	1.318	79	.317	.752
	- Once a few years (2)							
	- Once a year (3)	Teachers	40	2.73	1.261			
	- Once a term (4)							
	- During the process (5)							

[$t_{(79)}=.317$, $p>.05$].

Teachers expressed their opinions in the direction of “Once a year” to this question ($\bar{X}=2.73$, $S=1.261$; $n=40$); and school administrators, likewise ($\bar{X}=2.63$, $S=1.1318$; $n=41$). When these arithmetic mean scores are compared, the tendency of the views of both groups is that school principals are currently supervised once a year [$t_{(79)}=.317$, $p>.05$] (Table 11).

An independent samples t-test analysis was conducted in order to compare the opinions of the teachers and school administrators based on the data collected from the responses given to the

following question: “How often should school principals be supervised, according to school administrators and teachers?”

Table 12. Demanded supervision frequency of school principals according to teachers and school administrators

Item	Item's options and scores	Groups	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
How often should school principals be supervised	- Never(1) - Once a few years (2) - Once a year (3) - Once a school term (4) - During the process (5)	School administrators	3,95	1,161	3,95	79	1,857	,066
		Teachers	4,38	,868	4,38			

[$t_{(79)}=1.857, p>.05$].

To this question, teachers expressed their opinions as “during the process” with ($\bar{X}=4.38, S=0.868; n=40$); and school administrators as “once a school term” with ($\bar{X}=3.95, S=1.161; n=41$). Although they differed in terms of categorical nomenclature, when the arithmetic mean scores were compared statistically, there was no significant difference between the tendency of the views of the two groups [$t_{(79)}=1.857, p>.05$]. Accordingly, while interpreting the findings, teachers and administrators stated that school principals should be supervised “during the process” (Table 12).

Paired samples t-test analysis was conducted in order to compare the participants' views and wishes based on the data collected from the responses given to the following question: “Are there any differences between the opinions of the participants about how often school principals are supervised and how often they want them to be supervised?”

Table 13. Current/demanded comparison of school principals' supervision frequency (paired samples t-test findings)

	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
Frequency of school principals –current	81	2.68	1.283	80	-9.363	.000*
Frequency of school principals –demanded	81	4.16	1.042			

* [$t(80)=9.363, p<.05$].

For this question, views of the participants on supervision frequency of school principals – current situation ($\bar{X}=2.68, S=1.283; N=81$) and supervision frequency of school principals – demanded situation ($\bar{X}=4.16, S=1.042; N=81$) were compared through paired samples t-test. A significant difference was found between the current supervision frequency practices of school principals and the participant views on the desired supervision frequency [$t(80)=9.363, p<.05$]. The participants stated that in the current situation, school administrators are supervised once every few years, but they should be supervised throughout the process (Table 13).

An independent samples t-test analysis was conducted in order to compare the opinions of the teachers and school administrators according to the data collected from the responses given to the following question: “How often are teachers supervised, according to school administrators and teachers?”

Table 14. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values and independent samples t test results regarding how often the teachers are supervised

Item	Item's options and scores	Groups	n	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
How often are teachers supervised?	- Never(1) - Once a few years (2) - Once a year (3) - Once a term (4) - During the process (5)	School administrators	41	2.80	1.487	79	.939	.351
		Teachers	40	3.10	1.336			

[$t(79)=.939, p>.05$]

To this question, both the teachers ($\bar{X}=3.10$, $S=1.336$; $n=40$) and school administrators ($\bar{X}=2.80$, $S=1.487$; $n=41$) expressed their opinions as teachers need to be supervised “once a year” in the current situation. When these arithmetic mean scores are compared, no significant difference can be found between the tendency of the views of both groups [$t_{(79)}=.939$, $p>.05$] (Table 14).

However, due to the fact that the standard deviation values were higher than the total item loads, it was necessary to see the frequency and percentage distributions for this item. Since the answers given to the supervision frequency of teachers seem too scattered to be considered equal to each other (Never=14, Once every few years=21, Once a year=20, Once a term=7, During the process=19, $N=81$), it may be suggested that there is no clear consensus among the participants in the supervision frequency of teachers, that is, there is no generalizable routine of teachers’ supervision in this study population.

An independent samples t-test analysis was conducted in order to compare the opinions of the teachers and school administrators according to the data collected from the responses given to the following question: “How often teachers should be supervised, according to school administrators and teachers?”

Table 15. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values and independent samples t test results regarding how often teachers should be supervised

Item	Item's options and scores	Groups	n	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
How often should teachers be supervised?	- Never(1)	School administrators	41	4.22	.936	79	.198	.844
	- Once a few years (2)							
	- Once a year (3)	Teachers	40	4.18	1.083			
	- Once a school term (4)							
- During the process (5)								

[$t_{(79)}=.198$, $p>.05$]

As an answer to the question given above, the teachers expressed their opinions indicating that supervision should be conducted “during the process” ($\bar{X}=4.18$, $S=1.083$; $n=40$), and school administrators considered that it should be done “once a school term” ($\bar{X}=4.22$, $S=0.936$; $n=41$). Although they differed in terms of categorical nomenclature, when the arithmetic mean scores were compared statistically, there was no significant difference between the tendency of the views of the two groups [$t_{(79)}=.198$, $p>.05$]. In this connection, when evaluating the findings, teachers and administrators stated that teachers should be supervised “during the process” (Table 15).

Paired samples t-test analysis was conducted in order to compare the participants’ views on the current situation and their preferences about supervision based on the data collected from the responses given to the following question: “Is there a difference between opinions of the participants about how often teachers are supervised and how often they want to be supervised”.

Table 16. Current-demanded comparison of teachers regarding the supervision frequency (paired samples t-test findings)

	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
Frequency of teachers – current	81	2,95	1,413	80	8,574	,000*
Frequency of teachers – demanded	81	4,20	1,005			

* [$t_{(80)}=8.574$, $p<.05$].

For this question, views of the participants on Supervision frequency of teachers – current situation ($\bar{X}=2.95$, $S=1.413$; $N=81$) and supervision frequency of teachers – demanded situation ($\bar{X}=4.20$, $S=1.005$; $N=81$) were compared through paired samples t-test. A significant difference was found between the participants’ views on the current supervision frequency of teachers and their desired supervision frequency [$t_{(80)}=8.574$, $p<.05$]. Participants stated that teachers should be

supervised during the process, rather than the frequency of supervision determined by this research, which differs so much that it cannot be generalized (Table 16).

Additionally, a short summary table (Table 17) has been prepared so that the supervision frequency section findings can be seen simply according to the data of the six sub-questions.

Table 17. Frequency of current and desired supervision of school administrators and teachers

Supervision of whom	Supervision frequency of	Frequency according to teachers	Frequency according to school administrators	Comparison of current and demanded
<i>School administrators</i>	Current	Once a year	Once a year	* [t(80) =9.363, p<.05].
	Demanded	During the process	Once a school term	
<i>Teachers</i>	Current	Once a year	Once a year	* [t(80)=8.574, p<.05].
	Demanded	Once a term	During the process	

It is seen that the participants want more frequent supervisions for both themselves and the other group compared to the current situation.

3.4. Data sources of Supervision

According to fourth sub-problem of the research, the participants were asked what the data sources used in the supervision and which data they would like to be used as a source during their supervision. More than one option could be ticked at the same time.

The participants were asked to answer “From what sources was data collected about you during the supervision?” with separate items for school principals, vice principals and teachers. The answers of the participants are classified and presented in Table 18.

As an answer to the question about how supervisions of the school principals were practiced, most participants pointed to education inspectors and national education directorates, through document review; under the influence of political-union factors, parent-teacher association, parents and students’ opinions.

For the supervisions of the vice principals, this question was answered by referring mostly to school principals, inspectors, and national education directorates; by document review, observation and correction in the process; by taking into account political and union factors, through the opinions of teachers and students.

Table 18. Opinions of participants about current supervision practices

Item	Opinions of school principals	Opinions of vice principals	Opinions of teachers
Who is supervising? (Which units supervised you?)	71.6% by Education inspectors 69.1% by National Education Directorates	79% by school principals, 49.4% by Education inspectors, 38.3% by National Education Directorates	95.1% by school principals, 34.6% by education inspectors, 32.1% by other school administrators, 13.6% by National Education Directorates, 12.3% by students, 8.6% by parents, 4.9% by other teachers at school
Used methods (In what ways have you been supervised?)	72.8% through document review	49.4% by document review, 9.6% by observation and correction in the process	67.8% course observation 58% document review
Other sources affecting supervision (By which sources was data collected during your supervision?)	7.4% under the influence of political-union factors, 3.7% parent-teacher association, 3.7% parents 1.2% students’ opinions.	8.6% under the influence of political and union factors, 1.2%, by getting the opinions of teachers 1.2% by getting the opinions of %students.	by getting the opinions of; 58% other administrators at school, 44.4% students, 25.9% parents, 22.2% other teachers at school, 3.7% parent teacher association 2.5% political-union factors.

The supervision of teachers, on the other hand, was mostly made by school principals, education inspectors, other school administrators, National Education Directorates, by students, parents and other teachers at school. In fact, units such as students, parents and other teachers do not have the authority to supervise teachers legally. The reason why the participants also mentioned these could be that when negative relations are established with them, they may complain about the teacher and the teacher may be decided to be supervised. Answers for the data collection sources during teachers' supervision were rated mostly as course observation and document review by school principal for once a year, by getting the opinions of other administrators at school, also students, and parents, in addition to other teachers at school, parent teacher association and unions. Participant views were taken for another item that answers the question of which stakeholders and to what extent opinions should be sought. Answers to the question of "which sources data should be collected from in the evaluation of a teacher's course efficiency and effectiveness" were given as 72.8% from school administration, 32.1% from inspectors, 24.7% from academicians, 22.2% from students, 18.5% from other teachers at school, and 7.6% from parents. The participants were asked to answer the question "From which sources should data be collected for supervision in schools?" with separate items for school principals (Table 19), vice principals (Table 20) and teachers (Table 21).

Table 19. Frequency percentage distribution of units which are in demand as supervisors of school principals

School principals' supervisors – demanded	Teachers' views (n=40)		Vice principals' views (n=17)		School principals views' (n=24)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
National Education Directorates	24	60	7	41.17	6	25
Inspectors	26	65	8	47.05	8	33.33
Other administrators at the school	8	20	3	17.64	2	8.33
Teachers	13	32.5	3	17.64	14	58.33
Students	1	2.5			2	8.33
Parents	3	7.5			1	4.16
Academicians	9	22.5	6	35.29	2	8.33
Other stakeholders	1	2.5	1	5.88		
School-parent associations			1	5.88	1	4.16

All groups involved gave a weighted opinion that school principals should be supervised by National Education Directorates and inspectors. However, although teachers do not express themselves mostly in this way, principals prefer teachers to be involved in the supervision of school principals rather than National Education Directorates and inspectors.

Table 20. Frequency percentage distribution of units which are in demand as supervisors of vice principals

Vice principals' supervisors- Demanded	Teachers' views (n=40)		Vice principals' views (n=17)		School principals views' (n=24)	
	f	%	f	%	F	%
National Education Directorates	17	42.5	7	41.17	6	25
School principals	25	62.5	14	82.35	24	100
Inspectors	22	55	3	17.64	5	20.83
Other administrators at the school	10	25	4	23.52	2	8.33
Teachers	19	47.5	3	17.64	5	20.83
Students	6	15	1	5.88	3	12.5
Parents	3	7.5	1	5.88		
Academicians	7	17.5	5	29.41		
Syndicates	1	2.5				
Other stakeholders	1	2.5				
School-parents associations	1	2.5	2	11.76	3	12.5

All groups involved gave a weighted opinion that vice principals should be supervised by the principal. It is interesting to note that teachers and inspectors, which were ranked 5th among the groups that vice principals preferred to be supervised by, were ranked 2nd among teachers and principals. In other words, vice-principals did not seem to consider inspectors or teachers as their primary supervisors. However, teachers and principals seemed to think that both teachers and inspectors should be involved in the supervision of vice principals.

Table 21. Frequency percentage distribution of the units which are demanded as supervisors of teachers

Teachers' Supervisors- demanded	Teachers' views (n=40)		Vice principals' views (n=17)		School principals views' (n=24)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
National Education Directorates	10	25	4	23.52		
School principals	23	57.5	15	88.23	21	87.5
Inspectors	17	42.5	5	29.41	4	16.67
Other teachers	5	12.5	4	23.52	6	25
Students	12	30	2	11.76	4	16.67
Parents	3	7.5	1	5.882	2	8.33
Academics	14	35	6	35.29		
Other stakeholders	1	2.5			1	4.17
School-parents associations	0	0	1	5.88		

All groups involved gave a weighted opinion that teachers should be supervised by the principal (Table 21). Perhaps because of current practice, teachers identified the supervision of inspectors as the second priority. Interestingly, principals indicated that other teachers should be responsible for supervising teachers as a second priority. The vice principals' second priority was for academics to supervise teachers. Another interesting finding is that although teachers almost never agree with the options of having other teachers supervise them, school principals and vice principals have chosen this option as a priority for teacher supervision.

Table 22. Supervision methods considered favourable to be used

Supervision methods – demanded	Teachers (n=40)		Vice principals (n=17)		School principals (n=24)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Supervision should be monitored by academicians.	19	47.5	6	35.29	4	16.66
Supervision should be carried out according to the opinions of the administrative superiors.	10	25	3	17.64	11	45.83
Supervision should be carried out by an inspector.	13	32.5	5	29.41	6	25
Supervision should be carried out by taking the opinions of other stakeholders in the school.	21	52.5	12	70.58	21	87.5
Supervision should be done through written exams.	5	12.5	1	5.88	2	8.33

In terms of the answers of all participants (N=81) to the question of with which methods data should be collected during the supervision; Table 22 demonstrates the detailed distribution of how these findings are represented in each group. As can be seen in table, the answer that “the supervision should be carried out by taking the opinions of other stakeholders in the school” was the most common response given by the participant from each duty. The following results were obtained: “By taking the opinions of other stakeholders in the school” (66.6%), “according to the opinions of administrative chiefs” (28.4%), “by education inspector supervision” (27.2%), “through process monitoring by academics” (34.6%) and “central written exams” (9.6%).

4. CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATION

This study primarily focused on the publications and announcements of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) the education-related national policy-making and implementing institution in Turkey, in order to examine the overlap between the theory and practices regarding supervision; in other words, between “what is demanded” and “what is present” about processes. The Ministry of National Education 2023 Vision Document (2018), Ministry of Education Inspectors’ Duty Standards (2019), and Guidance and Supervision Guidelines and General Principles (2021) emphasize that the primary purpose of supervision is to help the supervised people improve themselves with guidance. However, the “Guidance and Supervision Guidelines”, which were updated and announced in 2021 for the supervision of all kinds of schools and institutions such as primary schools, high schools and equivalent schools, are standard forms that aim to provide bureaucratic convenience to supervisors. Since guidance prevails in theory, whereas compliance with bureaucratic processes in practice due to various limitations encountered in supervision processes (Memduhoglu, et al, 2007); the mission of professional development through guidance seems to be overshadowed by the priority given to the reporting of the process. In other words, when it comes to executing the process and result-oriented supervision together, outcome control seems to become predominant (Aydin, 2020).

This study aimed to investigate and determine the opinions of those being supervised about the current situation of the supervision practices and of the favorable supervision practices. Previous research in this area has looked at who supervises teachers and how this is done (Mette, et al.2015; Minnear-Peplinski, 2009). For this reason, the scope of the study was kept wide so as not to be limited to the supervision of teachers, but also to find out how administrative supervision of school administrators is and should be. The teachers and school administrators were asked multiple-choice questions in the form of questions such as what, which, how, how often and in what ways, in order to be able to obtain clear diagnostic answers about the objectives, results, frequency and data sources of classroom supervision and school administrative supervision. The results indicated that the teacher supervision aimed to identify not only the teachers’ weaknesses but also their strengths; that it resulted in giving them verbal reminding and guidance; that they did not have a routine, and that they were carried out in the form of document review. Some other results included the following aspects: Supervision aimed to identify weaknesses in administrative supervision of school administrations; they may result in either administrative sanctions or improvement through guidance; supervision is carried out every few years; and it takes place in the form of document review. This is similar to the conclusions of Minnear-Peplinski’s (2009) study that bureaucratic requirements come to the fore rather than improving the performance of the supervisee, and can be done on average once or twice a year. Some of the demands identified through this study are that the supervision of both groups should be carried out to identify both weaknesses and strengths, to result in improvement through guidance, to be continued throughout the education and training processes, to be practiced in such a way as to monitor the process and detect satisfactions of those who benefit from the service. This finding is consistent with other studies that report the importance of guiding teachers through a process of self-reflection, rather than simply seeking to identify areas of deficiency (Mette, et al., 2015).

With this study, it seems clear that the current state of supervision for school staff is far from professional development. It could be asserted that the current supervision in schools does not serve the purpose of the managerial processes, as they are expressed as discontinuous, based on document examination and exploring weaknesses. Based on the results, it could be finally concluded that school staff are faced with the outcome-oriented side of the current supervision, but they accept that the supervision is beneficial for the process and should continue uninterruptedly throughout the process.

Student success, which is the primary goal of schools, can be increased by ensuring professional development through professional supervision of employees (Memduhoğlu, 2012). With regard to the findings of this study, the views of teachers, vice-principals and principals on their own supervision; extending the time and type of data collected about their work was found to be more positive in terms of their professional development. So it is proposed to change the bureaucratic infrastructure of supervision and to spread supervision throughout the education and training process, that is, continuously. This removes the 'current priority of meeting legal requirements' which obscures the purpose of supervision to develop the supervisee, as demonstrated by this and previous research. Another important finding of this research for policy makers is that the majority of research participants approved of those directly affected by their services carrying out their own supervision. In this regard, it was demanded that especially the assistant principals be supervised by the other administrators and teachers in the school, and the principals by the teachers. In addition, there have been prominent demands for academics to be involved as external examiners or monitors for teachers and vice principals.

Acknowledgement

The data used in this study was confirmed by the researcher that it belongs to the years before 2020. This study has been prepared as the continuation of the study titled "Opinions of teachers and school administrators on current and demanded supervision practices", written by Seren and Ozcan (2022), in an effort to reveal the satisfaction of the participants toward supervision with the previous study sample and during the same period; however, it has been prepared by single author thorough preparing and using a different scale to investigate the problem situation in a different conceptual direction. In addition, this study is the extended version of an online oral presentation given by the author at the ICLEL conference in Granada, Italy in 2022.

5. REFERENCES

- Agih, A. A. (2015). Effective school management and supervision: Imperative for quality education service delivery, *African Research Review*, 9(3), 38, 62-74.
- Altınok, V., Tezel, M. & Gungor, S. (2020). Okullarda denetimin gerekliliği üzerine öğretmen görüşleri [Teachers' opinions on the necessity of supervision in schools]. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40(1), 225-253.
- Aydın, İ. (2020). *Öğretimde denetim durum saptama değerlendirme ve geliştirme*. [Instructional supervision status determination evaluation and development]. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Basar, H. (2000). *Eğitim denetçisi*, [Education inspector]. (5 press). Ankara: Pegem A.
- Can, N. (2004). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin denetimi ve sorunları. [Supervision and problems of primary school teachers]. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 161, 112-122.
- Demir, E., Saatçioğlu, O. & Imrol, F. (2006). Uluslararası dergilerde yayımlanan eğitim araştırmalarının normallik varsayımları açısından incelenmesi. [Educational research published in international journals examination in terms of normality assumptions]. *Current Research in Education* 2(3),130-148.
- Dikmen, İ. (2017). *Kuantum paradigmasından okula bakış ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi*. [Developing the scale of view to school from the quantum paradigm]. Unpublished Master Thesis. Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.
- Field, A. (2000). *Discovering statistics using SPSS for windows*. London: Sage Publications.
- Glickman, C., Gordon, S., & Ross-Gordon, J. (2017). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach (10st ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Kilic, S. (2016). Cronbach'ın alpha güvenirlik katsayısı. [Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient]. *Journal of Mood Disorders (JMood)* 1, 47-8.

- Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. (2010). İlköğretim okullarındaki denetim uygulamalarının değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of inspection practices in primary schools]. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Yayınları. Retrieved from: https://www.meb.gov.tr/earged/earged/ilk_ok_denet_uyg_deg.pdf
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE] (2022). Milli eğitim bakanlığı eğitim müfettişleri yönetmeliği. [Ministry of national education regulation on education inspectors]. Resmi Gazete, 01.03.2022, 31765. Retrieved from <https://resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2022/03/20220301-9.htm>
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE] (2021a). Rehberlik ve denetim rehberleri ve genel esaslar. [Guidance and control guides and general principles]. Retrieved from: https://tkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2022_05/30111335_GENEL_ESASLAR.pdf
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE] (2021b). İlköğretim okulları rehberlik ve denetim rehberi. [Primary school guidance and control guide]. Retrieved from: https://tkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2022_05/30132527_YLKOKULLAR_REHBERLYK_VE_DENETYM_REHBERY.pdf
- Memduhoglu, H.B., Aydın,I., Yilmaz,K., Gungor, S, & Oğuz, E. (2007). The process of supervision in the turkish educational system: purpose, structure, operation. *Asia Pacific Education Review*. 8(1), 56-70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03025833>
- Mette, I.M., Range, B.R., Anderson, J., Hvidson, D,J. & Nieuwenhuizen, L. (2015). Teachers' perceptions of teacher supervision and evaluation: A reflection of school improvement practices in the age of reform. *NCPEA Education Leadership Review*, 16(1),16-30.
- Minnear-Peplinski, R. (2009). *Principals' and teachers' perceptions of teacher supervision*, University of Nevada Las Vegas Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones, 69.
- Ozcan, E.G. (2018). Complex relationships of symbiotic organizations. In: Erçetin Ş.Ş.(eds) *Chaos, Complexity and leadership 2016*. Springer Proceedings in Complexity, Springer, Cham
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2013). *Supervision that improves teaching: Strategies and techniques (4st ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.
- Seren, M. & Ozcan, E. G. (2022). Opinions of teachers and school administrators on current and demanded supervision practices, *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 14(1), 196-209. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1331073.pdf>
- Taymaz, H. (2005). *Eğitim sisteminde teftiş: kavramlar, ilkeler ve yöntemler*. [Inspection in the education system: concepts, principles and methods]. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- UNESCO, (1984). *Principles and problems of educational management: Notes, comments*. Digest no IX. UNESCO: Paris.