A Study On Fulfillment Levels Of Supervisory Duties Of School Principals In Primary Schools

İlköğretim Kurumlarında Görev Yapan Müdürlerin Denetim Görevlerini Yerine Getirme Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi

Yüksel GÜNDÜZ

Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Samsun, Türkiye

Abstract

The goal of this study is to find out teacher perceptions regarding fulfillment levels of supervisory duties of school principals in primary schools. A descriptive survey model has been used in this study. Population of this study consists of 3719 teachers working at 70 primary schools and 19 secondary schools in Maltepe district of Istanbul in 2014-2015. 422 teachers working at 20 primary schools and 10 secondary schools constitute the sampling based on homogenous scheme. In this study, an inventory of fulfillment levels of supervisory duties of school principals has been used. Alpha value of the inventory was found as (.97) . Frequencies, percentages, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, t test and one- way analysis of variance have been used for the data analysis. Based on results of the study, it was found that fulfillment level of supervisory duties of school principals was 'medium' according to teacher perceptions. For the sub-dimensions, it was found that school principals fulfill the duties of 'supervising teachers' and 'supervising education and instruction' at the medium level whereas fulfillment level of 'supervising physical environment' was found 'high'. Significant differences were found based on the variables of gender and age. Results of the study suggest that school principals be engaged with more active supervisory activities and regular and systematic in-service training programs should be implemented.

Keywords: Primary education; school principal; teacher; supervision

Özet

Bu araştırmanın amacı, ilköğretim okullarında görev yapan okul müdürlerinin denetim rollerini ne düzeyde yerine getirdiklerini ortaya koymaktır. Araştırmada, genel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini 2014-2015 öğretim yılında İstanbul ili Maltepe ilçesindeki 70 ilk ve 19 ortaöğretim okulunda çalışan 3719 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Örneklemi ise, benzeşik örnekleme yöntemi ile belirlenen 20 ilk ve 10 ortaöğretim okulunda görev yapan öğretmenlerden uygun örnekleme yöntemi ile seçilen 422 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada, Müdürlerin Denetim Görevlerini Yerine Getirme Düzeylerini Belirleme Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Ölçeğin Cronbach Alfa değeri (.97) bulunmuştur. Verilerin çözümlenmesinde, frekans, yüzdelik, aritmetik ortalama, standart sapma, "t" testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizi işlemleri yapılmıştır. Araştırmada, öğretmenler müdürlerin denetim görevlerini genel olarak "orta" düzeyde yerine getirdiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Alt boyutlar bazında bakıldığında ise,

müdürler *"öğretmeni denetleme"* ve *"eğitim-öğretimi denetleme"* görevini *"orta"* düzeyde yerine getirirken, *"fiziki mekânı denetleme"* görevini ise *"çok"* düzeyinde yerine getirmişlerdir. Cinsiyet ve yaş değişkenine göre, öğretmen görüşleri arasında anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Okul müdürlerinin genel olarak daha aktif bir denetim etkinliğinde bulunmaları sağlanmalı ve bunun için de düzenli ve sistemli olarak hizmet içi eğitim programları düzenlenmelidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *İlköğretim, müdür, öğretmen, denetim*

1. Introduction

In each school there is a principal representing the school and responsible for managing it. Resting on legal rules and scientific data, a principal is entitled to execute, regulate and supervise all works in a school. It is seen that this supervision is a last and supplementary process requiring examination of not only the result but also all processes to attain organizational goals.

Rue and Byars (1990) define supervision as encouraging staff for their positive contribution to attaining organizational goals; Sullivan and Glanz (2000) as a process of incorporating teachers in education to enhance teaching and promoting student's success; Taymaz (1997) as monitoring the staff's style of performing their duties, presenting mistakes and inadequacies, taking measures for their correction, introducing innovations and enabling them to develop methods for problem solving. In this context, it is possible to define supervision in education as controlling and improving the process. "Supervision, as a universal value, a sub-system in all systems and a constituent in management processes" (Başaran, 1993, p.73) performs such functions as defining the area dominated by the teacher, providing professional guiding, analyzing their studies and assessing the success of the teacher considering teaching process (Hedges,1989). Here, the goal of supervision is to improve teaching and learning, enhance school and student achievement (Lee, 1998; Blase & Blase 2002). Therefore, supervision is a necessary activity.

Organizations without supervision cause disorder, stagnation and loss of power (Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990). "In this sense, supervision in education is important for transforming school into a more effective learning environment" (Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1993, p.38) and essential for vitality of institutions.

Educational systems are gaining more and more complex qualifications, changes and complicates teachers' role. At this point, teachers need guidance and assistance both physically and morally. Hence, teachers' skills must be updated for their success in class (Rosenholtz, 1985). Here, supervision aims at improving the staff in many ways, making them sufficient and making up their shortages.

Supervision, which is one of the education management processes, is among principal's duties (Başar, 2006). The most important reason for this is that principals as instructional leaders are held responsible for all works and practices at school. The necessity of principals' supervision of education is strongly emphasized in literature (Aslanargun and Göksoy, 2013; Guarnay, 1971; Kaya, 1984; Başaran, 1992; Başar, 1995; Taymaz, 2000; Bursalıoğlu, 2002; Dönmez, 2002; Kowalski, 2003; Balcı, 2005; Yılmaz, 2009). It is possible to base principals' instructional supervision on a

number of grounds. Among them, they have instructional leadership roles, existence of the continuity principle of supervision, principals are held responsible for all the activities in school, and close supervision is necessary.

Principals have instructional leadership roles. "They should take an effective educational leadership to be able to establish a positive learning and teaching environment" (Özden, 1999, p.146). They are also acquainted with the teachers' sufficient and insufficient aspects, as part of their instructional leadership and because they work together. By this means, it is possible to think that assessment can be made more realistically. As Knoll (1987) pointed out, supervision is a leadership role as well. School manager is to monitor teaching in class constantly as an instructional leader (Balcı, 2005). It is difficult to define the successful and unsuccessful sides of activities without manager's supervision in a school (Taymaz, 2000). While performing their supervision roles, they diagnose teacher performance needs, guide, direct and help them.

Continuity in supervision is important for the effectiveness of supervision. As one of the most important items of contemporary supervision concept, it is carried out via applying process-oriented management concept. "Given the fact that aptitude and ability are obtained by means of consecutive stages" (Aydın, 1993, p. 17). Principal should conduct supervision regularly to find solutions to problems teacher faces in class such as teaching, behavior patterns and class discipline and things like that. A continuous supervision may be helpful for corrective, supplementary and promoting administrative actions. If there is no continuity in supervision, it would be late for some arrangements and changes. "Continuous supervision enables interaction between past and future dimensions" (Başar, 1995, p.5). Preventing long interspaces between audits and supervision that principals perform is regarded important for monitoring the audit results. Those supervision duties conducted by external auditors are made in long intervals and the insufficiency of constructive studies is not compatible with the continuity principle accordingly.

Principals are responsible for all the activities in school. "They are authorized people at the highest level and are responsible for the arrangement, application and evaluation of the events, the execution of general activities in school and the provision and supervision of order" (Uluğ, 1985, p.169). Holding Principals responsible for all activities in school excluding supervision is not a correct approach. Because the sooner principals learn that activities aren't executed as planned, the quicker can they take actions to correct them (Knootz & Weihrich, 1980). Thus, principals are in charge of executing, regulating and supervising all works in school, principals affect teaching directly via evaluation and supervision as well (Halverson & Kelley, 2004). Principals must also closely monitor the staff to enhance their performance.

Close supervision is necessary for an effective supervision. Audit functions of administrators require close supervision. And in close supervision, personal and business relations between supervisor and the person supervisee should be provided. "Here as supervisor and the person supervised won't change, they can make more use of each other's knowledge and experience and help each other a longer period" (Taymaz 1997, p. 25). Thus, communication between principal and teacher is strengthened, common areas on education are created and the level of cooperation is

improved. "Teacher's demand for self-improvement increases and a climate of trust occurs" (Zepeda, 2003, p.35). "Yet, in remote audit, neither personal nor business relationship is formed between supervisor and the person supervised" (Bursalıoğlu 1975, p.118). In remote audit there are recommendations for development based on the fact-finding; but their monitoring the developments and facilities to work together is either too limited or doesn't exist at all. Thus, it is possible to say that principals have an important duty such as supervising education and teaching in their schools.

In today's educational settings where school and its environment change rapidly, principals have to influence nonlinear, complex and dynamic periods of change and manage them successfully (Fullan, 1999; Crow, Hausman & Scribner, 2002). Principals, in such a process, must have supervision competence for performing all types of audit activities in their schools. Supervision undertaken by unqualified principals cannot move beyond being a bureaucratic necessity and a determination of the situation. However, the purpose of the supervision is to enhance the person being supervised. To enhance, the qualification in the area is required. It is important that principals should supervise only after they get the required qualification. Kaya (1984) claims that the competencies that principals must have are planning education and teaching activities, monitoring and evaluating the works done at school. Bursalıoğlu (2002) emphasized that principals must go through an academic education to be sufficient. Yet, most principals haven't undergone an academic training. Despite this, Kurt (2009) found 80% of principals do not want to supervise, and Aslanargun and Göksoy (2013) found that most teachers state that the supervision should be undertaken by principals. In the study teachers approve principal supervision because they believe that principals know them better for they work in the same organization for a long time, but they also disapprove it in the case of a principal having bias and no qualification for supervision. Despite these drawbacks, it makes sense that teachers prefer principal supervision. Inefficacy and inefficiency of the supervision of inspectors may be an underlying reason of it. Because the supervision undertaken by inspectors is not seen as purposeful and adequately useful (Aslanargun ve Tarku, 2014; Özbek, 1997; Kavas, 2005; Renklier, 2005; Dündar, 2005; Doğanay, 2006; İnal, 2008; Çiçek-Sağlam ve Demir, 2009).

Development and training of teachers because of the inefficacy and inefficiency of the supervision of inspectors is discussed intensively in Turkey as well as in the world. The necessity of the supervision by principals. It can be asserted that this situation is based on the instructional leadership roles of principals, the necessity of the continuity of supervision, principals' responsibilities in all the activities in school, and the necessity of close inspection. Principals' tasks and responsibilities are numerous and educational management isn't accepted as a profession. This resulted in some problems in their supervision roles of principals. They cannot perform their supervisory roles sufficiently (Kaykanacı, 2003; Akçay ve Başer, 2004). However, changes in principals' roles in recent years reveal that principals must give more importance to supervision activities. It is hoped that after school principals are made proficient in administration and participate in supervisory activities more actively, teachers' deficiencies could be eliminated; they would be professionally developed, more competent and efficient in their area. As a result, the gaps left by supervisors are expected to be filled. The important point here is the level at which principles fulfill the necessities of such an important responsibility.

Purpose of the Study

The aim of the study is to present at what degree primary school principals perform their roles as instructional leaders. In this respect, the answers for the following questions are sought.

1. To what degree do principals perform their supervisory duty for teachers?

2. To what degree do principals perform their supervisory duty for education and teaching?

3. To what degree do principals perform their supervisory duty for physical environment?

4. Are there any significant differences among teacher opinions in terms of gender and age?

2. Method

General surveying model was used in the study. "General surveying model is surveying arrangements conducted on the entire population or a group, model or sample taken from it in order to derive a general judgment" (Karasar, 2004, p.79).

Target population of the study consists of 3719 teachers working in 70 primary and 19 secondary schools in Maltepe district in İstanbul in the 2014-2015 school years. Convenience and stratified sampling methods are used. By stratified sampling method it is emphasized that the deep investigation of a stratified sub group chosen from a population according to a purpose (Patton, 2002). It is aimed to minimize the in-group variance by working with stratified sub groups (Büyüköztürk, 2011). Researchers generally use the convenience sampling method when it is hard to use either random or systematic sampling methods. The participants chosen via the convenience sampling method are the ones who can be reached conveniently by researchers (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). Sample size was defined pursuant to sample distribution theory. First, 20 primary schools and 10 secondary schools are determined using stratified sampling method. In the second phase, the convenience sampling method was used to select 422 teachers working in the chosen schools. Here, sample was given as 382 for a population of 100.000 people (5%) (Balcı, 2009). Therefore it was assumed that a sample consisting of 422 teachers would be appropriate.

In order to collect data, Determining Principals' Discharge Degrees of Supervision Roles Scale designed by the researcher was used in the study. It is based on five-point Likert- type (never (1), rarely (2), sometimes (3), most of the time (4), always (5)) evaluation system. Before designation of the scale, the literature was reviewed, a group of principals were interviewed and in this context, principals' supervision duties were defined under main headings. As a result of literature review process and principals' opinions a pool was created. Then they were transformed into items by the researcher and these items were sent to 10 academicians and expert to give their feedback about the items. With these feedbacks, the scale was revised and finalized.

To ensure the validity of the scale, factor analysis was done by Varimax rotation

method. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value, calculated based on data is ,95. Then, according to Bartlett test (13365,56) result, three sub-scales were found. For the 'Supervising Teachers (1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10.) subscale eigenvalue is 6,30 which explains 25,21 % of total variance; for 'Supervising Education and Teaching' (11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20.) subscale eigenvalue is 8,24 which explains 32,98 % of total variance itself ; for 'Supervising Physical Environment" (21,22,23,24,25.) subscale eigenvalue is 5,00 which explains 20,03% of total variance. The value of total variance of the three subscales together is 78, 21. According to this, scale consisted of 25 items.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to verify the factorial structure of Determining Principals' Discharge Degrees of Supervision Roles Scale. Employed to find out the level of consistency between the factors that are created based on a theory and real data, CFA is regarded as a quite functional analysis (Kline, 2005). In the present study, CFA was employed so as to verify the construct of the three factor model. Within this scope, modification indices which are consistent with the theoretical structure were examined. In this study, we reported results for several fit indices such as CFI (Comparative Fit Indices), IFI (Incremental Fit Index), NFI (Normed Fit Index), NNFI (Non-Normed Fit Index), SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Square Residual), and RFI (Relative Fit Index) to evaluate the level of consistency of the model. General agreements in the related literature about fit indexes are that CFI, IFI, NFI, RFI and NNFI values of .90 or greater indicate satisfactory fit; SRMR values of .05 or lower show excellent fit (Kline, 2005). Results of CFA indicated that the model was sufficient fit to the data: CFI = .90; IFI = .90; NFI = .89; NNFI = .89, SRMR = .05; RFI = .87. 'Supervising Teacher' gave the highest correlation between total point of the scale (,93) (p<,001). The lowest correlation was found between 'Supervising Physical Environment' (,83) (p<,001). As it is noticed, all factors showed significant and high correlations with total point. The highest correlation is between 'Supervising Teacher' and 'Supervising Education and Teaching' (,78) and this result is significant at ,001 level. The lowest correlation was found between 'Supervising Education and Teaching' and 'Supervising Physical Environment' as ,66 (p<,001). The relations between subscales used within the study are appropriate for psychometric rules. Here subscales showed neither too high nor too low correlation in itself. These are findings which indicate scale's validity. Test-retest was applied to a study group of 44 people twice in two week intervals for reliability of the test. Here correlation coefficients are determined as test's test-retest reliability. Accordingly continuity coefficient of total test is calculated ,73. In subscale, continuity coefficients are, 'Supervising Teacher' ,72; 'Supervising Education and Teaching' ,71; 'Supervising Physical Place',72. Cronbach's alpha for total test is ,97; for 'Supervising Teacher' ,94; for 'Supervising Education and Teaching' ,97; for 'Supervising Physical Environment' ,95. For test's reliability once again, standard error of scaling (SES) was calculated. Values of standard error of scaling changed between ,27 (supervising teachers) and ,147 (scale total). These results show high reliability of the test. The last procedure for scale's validity and reliability is item analysis process for total test and subscales. Thus, it is understood that all items are highly valid and reliable.

In this study, frequency and percentage distributions of independent variables of the scale were found. Then, arithmetic mean and standard deviation of scale's total

subscales were calculated. Parametric statistical techniques were used as data showed normal distribution according to Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. In situations where independent variables consisted of two categories 't' test and when there were more than two one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were performed to determine the differences in scale's total and subscale points. On the presence of a significant difference in F test, complementary calculations for analysis of variance (post-hoc) were administered. When a significant difference wasn't obtained as a result of Levenes test Scheffe test, and when there was a significant difference Tamhane test were performed. Error level in the study is assumed to be 0.05. All the statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS for Windows 15.0.

3. Findings

This study aimed to determine the level at which primary school principals fulfill their responsibilities of supervision from teachers' point of view. For this purpose, results of the questionnaire and scale filled by the sample were evaluated and interpreted in this section.

Table 1 displays the frequency and percentile distributions regarding demographic information of the teachers who form the sample.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentile Distributions Regarding Demographic Information of the Sample

Variable	Category	f	%
Gender	Female	299	70,9
	Male	123	29,1
Age	25-30	70	16,6
	31-35	117	27,7
	36-40	74	17,5
	41-45	91	21,6
	46 and over	68	16,1
Total f= 422 %= 100			

As presented in Table 1, 70,9 % of teachers forming the study group are female and 29,1 are male. According to age variable, 27,7 % of the teachers are 31-35; 21,6 % are 41-45 and 16,1 % are 46 and over. Descriptive statistical values of total scale and subscale scores applied to the sample are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistical Values of Total Scale and Subscale Scores

Subscales	N	$\overline{x}$	Ss
Supervising Teacher	422	3,07	,96
Supervising Education and Teaching	422	2,70	1,14
Supervising Physical Places	422	3,42	1,16
Total	422	3,06	,98

As shown in Table 2, arithmetic mean of total points of scale is $\overline{x}$=3,06. Hereby, teachers state that principals generally perform supervision activities at ''moderate''' level. The highest mean in scale's subscales is obtained from ''Supervising Physical Environment'' subscale with $\overline{x}$=3,42. According to this result, principals performed the duty supervising physical environment at "most of the time". Principals perform supervisory duty in ''Supervising Teacher'' ($\overline{x}$=3,07) and ''Supervising Education and Teaching'' ($\overline{x}$=2,70) subscales at "moderate" level.

Table 4 presents the results of independent samples t test results for the total scale and subscale scores regarding the gender variable.

Table 4. T Test Scores Regarding Gender

Subscales	Gender	N	$\overline{x}$	ss	Std. Error	t	SD	P
Supervising Teacher	Female	299	3,00	,96	,05	-2,29	420	,022*
	Male	123	3,24	,94	,08			
Supervising Education and Teaching	Female	299	2,65	1,13	,06	-1,33	420	,182
	Male	123	2,82	1,17	,10			
Supervising Physical Places	Female	299	3,44	1,06	,06	,43	420	,662
	Male	123	3,38	1,39	,12			
Total	Female	299	3,03	,94	,05	-1,03	420	,303
	Male	123	3,14	1,06	,09			

*p<,05   **p<,01   ***p<,001

As can be seen, unrelated group 't' test scores for scale's total and subscales according to gender variable of the study group are displayed in Table 4. There are no significant differences according to gender variable except for ''Supervising Teacher'' subscale. Yet there is a significant difference in ''Supervising Teacher'' subscale at ,05 level. Male teachers ($\overline{x}$= 3,24) find principals' discharge level of supervision duties higher with respect to female teachers ($\overline{x}$=3,00).

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results for the total scale and subscale scores in terms of the age variable are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test Scores Regarding Age

Subscales	Age	N	$\overline{x}$	ss	Variance Reference	SS	SD	MS	F	p
Supervising Teacher	25-30	70	3,33	,86	Between Groups	11,78	4	2,94		
	31-35	117	2,90	,90						
	36-40	74	3,20	,78	Within-group	373,08	415	,89	3,27	,012*
	41-45	91	2,95	1,07						
	46 and over	68	3,18	1,08	Total	384,86	419			
	Total	420	3,08	,95						

Subscales	Age	N	$\bar{x}$	ss	Variance Reference	SS	SD	MS	F	p
Supervising Education and Teaching	25-30	70	2,89	1,11	Between Groups	6,63	4	1,65		
	31-35	117	2,64	1,14						
	36-40	74	2,74	1,11	Within-group	547,59	415	1,31	1,25	,286
	41-45	91	2,54	1,10						
	46 and over	68	2,83	1,28	Total	554,22	419			
	Total	420	2,71	1,15						
Supervising Physical Environment	25-30	70	3,72	,916	Between Groups	15,94	4	3,98		
	31-35	117	3,48	1,09						
	36-40	74	3,16	1,37	Within-group	558,40	415	1,34	2,96	,020*
	41-45	91	3,25	1,12						
	46 and over	68	3,55	1,26	Total	574,35	419			
	Total	420	3,42	1,17						
Total	25-30	70	3,31	,86	Between Groups	8,46	4	2,11		
	31-35	117	3,00	,93						
	36-40	74	3,03	,97	Within-group	397,20	415	,95	2,21	,067
	41-45	91	2,90	1,00						
	46 and over	68	3,19	1,11	Total	405,67	419			
	Total	420	3,07	,98						

*p<,05   **p<,01   ***p<,001*

When one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test scores for scale's total and subscales examined significant differences at ,05 level in "Supervising Teacher" and "Supervising Physical Environment" subscales. As teachers' ages differed, their perception level of principals' "Supervising Teacher" and "Supervising Education and Teaching" features differed too. As a result of eta analysis, it is understood that age variable explains 3,1 % of principals' "Supervising Teacher" subscale variance and 2,8 % of principals' "Supervising Education and Teaching" subscale variance.

In "Supervising Teacher" and "Supervising Physical Environment" subscales where there was a cumulative difference in ANOVA process as for age variable, Tamhane tests were administered in order to find out the difference between groups as there was a significant difference in Levene test. Here, teachers aged 25 to 30 ($\bar{x}$= 3,33), perceive principals' supervision level at more sufficient level than the teachers aged 31 to 35 ($\bar{x}$=2,90) (p<,05). Again, teachers aged 25 to 30 ($\bar{x}$=3,72) find principals' ''Supervising Physical Places" level more sufficient than teachers aged 36 to 40 ($\bar{x}$=3,16) (p<,05).

4. Discussion

According to the results of the study conducted to assess the discharge levels of principals' supervision duties, teachers stated that principals generally performed their supervision, 'supervising teacher' and 'supervising education and teaching' tasks at 'moderate' level, 'supervising physical places' tasks at 'most of the time' level. Male teachers find their principals' supervision discharge levels in 'supervising teacher' subscale higher than female teachers, and teachers aged 25-30 find their principals'

supervision discharge levels in the same subscale higher than teachers aged 31-35.

According to the results of the study, teachers state that principals generally performed their supervision tasks at 'moderate' level. While this conclusion is supported by Tanrıveren's (2000) study, it is partly supported by Bayraktutan's (2011) and Öncel's (2006) studies. In fact, supervision task is an important task which must be fulfilled by principals. It's difficult to define effective and ineffective sides of activities without being supervised. At a point where the majority of teachers state that principals can supervise them best (Topçu & Aslan, 2009; Argon, 2010) it's a must hereafter that principals participate in supervision activities. There are two main purposes of principals' supervision duties. "The first one is to contribute effective teaching by providing professional development of teacher and the other is to make a decision on teacher's professional status by evaluating his/her current performance" (Acheson & Gall, 2003, p.6). However, researches show that principals can't allocate enough time for supervision. Williams (2007), on this subject, righteously, emphasizes that school managers should spare more time for effective supervision. Yılmaz (2009) states that the greatest hindrance for principals to perform their supervision duty is that they haven't received management education. The increase in principals' duties and responsibilities also must be added. Because increase in principal's directorial responsibilities and duties negatively affect principals' performing their supervision duty effectively (Taşdan, 2008; Topçu & Aslan, 2009). Despite all, principals must be involved in regular supervision activities as part of instructional leadership, continuity of supervision, to be in charge of all works and operations in school and close supervision.

That lack of necessary knowledge and skill on supervising of most principals (Özmen & Batmaz, 2006) can be seen as a hindrance to perform supervision activities. Having competence for supervising is one of the most important qualifications of a supervisor. In this context, principals must be provided with competence first to perform supervision practices.

Teachers have stated that principals executed their ''Supervising Teacher'' duty at 'moderate' level. While this result shows conformity with Akçay and Başar's (2004) study results, it doesn't show conformity with the study result of Yıldırım (2013) and Bayraktutan (2011) result. With teaching profession getting more and more complex and hard, teachers' skills must be updated for their success in class (Rosenholtz, 1985). Teachers must be assisted on solving education and teaching problems, on increasing efficiency in education, on conducting education in compliance with goals (Karagözoğlu, 1985). "Thus, teacher's demand for self-improvement increases, as he/she is personally involved and a climate of trust is established" (Zepeda, 2003, p.35). In such an atmosphere, teacher's works are analyzed, areas he/she masters are specified, and his /her success is evaluated. The aim of supervision here is to improve, qualify teacher and satisfy his/her needs.

Teachers stated that principals performed their 'Supervising Education and Teaching' duty at 'sometimes' level. This result tallies with the study of Ural ve Aslim (2013) directly and Başar's (1981) and Özbaş's (2002) study results indirectly, but it doesn't tally with Çalhan's (1999) study result. In general, principals can't perform

their supervision duty of education and teaching sufficiently. Yet, main point to be supervised is to define whether education and teaching is conducted according to its goals.   Without this definition, constructive studies for education and teaching can't be done. Principals must supervise and according to result of supervision take actions on education and teaching. "Here, the aim of supervision is to promote teaching, enhance school and student achievement" (Blase & Blase 2002, p.12). Supervision must be perceived as an action aimed at improving education and learning.

According to teachers' opinion, principals performed 'Supervising Physical Environment' at 'most of the timely' level. This result tallies with Yıldırım's study (2013) but not with Özbaş's (2002) and Aslan's (2000) research results. "Supervision of physical places is important to make school a more effective learning environment" (Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1993, p.38). Because items related to physical places have an important role in carrying out and improving education and learning. So, it's known there won't be a student who can't learn when learning environments are designed according to students.

As for the gender variable in "Supervising Teacher" subscale male teachers found principals' discharge level of supervision duty higher with respect to female teachers. While this result tallies with Göktaş's (2008), it doesn't tally with Yıldırım's (2013), Küçük's (2008), Bayraktutan's (2011) and Öncel's (2006) study results. It can be thought that demand of female teachers that negative and positive parts of activities they performed have influence on it. Whereas, it can be said that male teachers tend to find the things done sufficient because of their attitudes toward supervision.

As for age variable teachers aged 25 to 30 found principals' "Supervising Teacher" level at a more sufficient level than teachers aged 31 to 35 and over. This result is matching with Küçük's (2008) study result. Here, it can be said that there is an effect that teachers aged 31 to 35 have greater demand to benefit from principals for their development.

According to these results, the following recommendations can be made:

By a legal arrangement made by the Ministry of National Education, principals should be made to perform a more active supervision activity. The Ministry should organize in-service training programs regularly and systematically to increase principals' supervision competencies and efficacies. For an effective in-service training, it should be given at universities or by specialists from universities. In these trainings, principals must be educated about the importance and necessity of supervision and about how it should be done. Principals that are trained must allocate more time for supervising activities of teacher, education and teaching for the development of teachers, education and teaching and to make teachers adapt to changes rapidly.

5. References

Acheson, K. A. & Gall, M. D. (2003). Clinical supervision and teacher development. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Akçay, C. & Başar, M. A. (2004). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin yönetsel görevlere ayırdıKları zaman ve bunları önemli görme dereceleri. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 10 (38), 170–197.

Argon, T. (2010).Akademisyenlerin performans değerlendirme motivasyon ve örgütsel adalet ile ilgili görüşlerine ilişkin nitel bir çalışma. International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2 (1), 133-180.

Aslanargun, E. ve Tarku, E (2014). Teachers' Expectations about Supervision and GuidanceRoles of Supervisors Educational Administration: Theory and Practice 20(3), 281-306.

Aslanargun, E. & Göksoy, S. (2013). Öğretmen Denetimini Kim Yapmalıdır? Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Özel Sayı, 98-121.

Aslan, H. (2000). İlköğretim okullarında yöneticilerin, yönetici teftişine konu olan görevlerinin değerlendirilmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Teszi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Aydın, M. (1993). Çağdaş eğitim denetimi. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Balcı, A. (2005). Eğitim yönetimi terimleri sözlüğü. Ankara: Tek Ağaç Yayıncılık.

Balcı, A. (2009).Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma, yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler. Ankara: Pegem Akdemi.

Başar, H. (1995). Eğitim denetçisi. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Başar, H. (1981). Okul yöneticilerinin denetim görevleri. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Başar, H. (2006) Türkiye'de eğitim denetimi. In M. Hesapçıoğlu & A. Durmuş (Eds.), Türkiye'de Eğitim Bilimleri: Bir Bilanço Denemesi, (pp. 158-165) Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Başaran, İ. E. (1993). Eğitim yönetimi. Ankara: Gül Yayınevi.

Başaran, İ.E. (1992). Yönetimde insan ilişkileri, yönetsel davranış. Ankara: Yargıcı Matbaası.

Bayraktutan, İ. (2011). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin denetim rolleri. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sivas.

Blase, J. & Blase, J. (2002). The micropolitics of instructional supervision. Education Administration Quarterly, 38 (1), 6-44.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1975). Eğitim yöneticilerinin yeterlikleri. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2002). Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış 11. Basım. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2011). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. 13. Baskı. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Crow, G.M., Hausman, C. S. & Scribner, J.P. (2002). Reshaping the role of the school principal. Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 101(1), 189–210.

Çalhan, G. (1999). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Çiçek, Sağlam, A. ve Demir A. (2009). İlköğretim müfettişlerinin rehberlik görevlerini yerine getirme düzeylerine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 38 (183), 130-139.

Doğanay, E. (2006). Taşra birimlerindeki ilk ve orta öğretim kurumlarında yürütülen teftiş hizmetlerinin karşılaştırılması. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Van.

Dönmez, B. (2002). Müfettiş, okul müdürü ve öğretmen algılarına göre ilköğretim okulu müdürlerinin yeterlikleri. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 8 (29), 27–45.

Dündar, A. A. (2005). İlköğretim okullarında yapılan teftişin okul başarısı ve gelişimi üzerine etkisi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Fraenkel, J. R. and Wallen, N. E. (2006). How to design and evaluate research in education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fullan, M. (1999). Change forces: the sequel. London: Falmer Press.

Göktaş, A. (2008). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin ve ilköğretim müfettişlerinin ders denetimine ilişkin yeterliklerinin sınıf öğretmenlerince değerlendirilmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kırıkkale Üniversitesi, Kırıkkale.

Guarnay, B. (1971). Yönetim bilimine giriş. (Çev.:İhsan Kuntbay) Ankara: TODAİE Yayınlan.

Halverson R. & Kelley, C. (2004). How principals make sense of complex artifacts to shape local instructional practice. In W.K. Hoy & c.g. (Eds). Educational administration, policy and reform: Research and measurement research and theory in educational administration, Volume 3, CT: Information Age Press

Hedges, L. E. (1989). Supervising the beginning teacher an affirming approach, The Interstate Printers and Publishers, İnc, Danville, İlliniois.

İnal, A. (2008). İlköğretim okullarında yapılan denetimlerde müfettişlerin tutum ve davranışlarının öğretmenler tarafından değerlendirilmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Karagözoğlu, G. (1985). Eğitimde teftişin yeniden düzenlenmesi. Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi, 104, 4-8.

Karasar, N. (2004). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kaya, Y. K. (1984). Eğitim yönetimi. Ankara: TODAIE Yayınları.

Kaykanacı, M. (2003). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin yönetim işlerine verdikleri önem ve harcadıkları zaman. Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 11 (1), 137–158.

Kavas, E. (2005). İlköğretim müfettişlerinin denetim davranışlarına ilişkin öğretmen algı ve beklentileri. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli.

Kimbrough, R.B. & Burkett, C.W. (1990). The principalship: Concepts and practices.

Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kline, R.B. (2005). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling. New York: Guilford.

Knoll, M. K. (1987). Supervision for better instruction. New Jersey: Prentice Hail, INÇ, Englewood Cliffs.

Knootz, H. & Weihrich, W. (1980). Management. New York: McGraw Hill.

Kowalski,T. J. (2003). Contemporary school administration. New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Kurt, S. (2009). İlköğretim kurumlarındaki yöneticilerin denetleme faaliyetlerine ilişkin yönetici görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Trakya Üniversitesi, Edirne.

Küçük, E. (2008). İlköğretim okulları öğretmenlerinin okul yöneticilerine yönelik çağdaş denetim algıları ile meslek motivasyon düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Lee, J. (1998). İmproving student learning. İstanbul: Kalder Yayınları.

Öncel, Y. (2006). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin denetimdeki rol ve yeterlikleri. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Harran Üniversitesi, Şanlıurfa.

Özbaş, M. (2002). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin sınıf içi etkinliklerin denetiminde yapmaları gereken ve yapmakta oldukları işler konusunda müdür ve öğretmen görüşleri. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Özbek, O. (1997). Öğretmenlerin ders teftiş etkinliklerinde müfettişlerden beklentileri ve bu beklentilerin müfettişlerce gerçekleştirilme düzeyleri. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Özden, Y.(1999). Eğitimde dönüşüm eğitimde yeni değerler. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.

Özmen, F. & Batmaz, C. (2006). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretmen denetimindeki Etkililikleri. Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2, 102–120.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research & evaluation methods. 3. Baskı. London: Sage Publications.

Renklier, A. (2005). İlköğretim denetmenlerinin ilköğretim okullarında öğrenme öğretme süreçleri ve yönetim görevleriyle ilgili etkililik düzeyleri. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi, Kayseri.

Rosenholts, S. J. (1985). Political myth education reform: Lessons from research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (5), 349-355.

Rue, L. W. & Byars, L. L.(1990). Supervision, key link to productivity. The United States: Irwin Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (1993) Supervision a redefinition. United States: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Sullivan, S. & Glanz, J. (2000). Alternatives approaches to supervision: case from the field. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 15 (3), 212–235.

Tanrıveren, N. (2000). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin denetim görev ve yeterlilikleri. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale.

Taşdan, M. (2008). Çağdaş eğitim denetiminde meslektaş yardımlaşması. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 41 (1), 69-92.

Taymaz, H. (1997). Eğitim sisteminde teftiş. Ankara: Tapu ve Kadastro Vakfı Matbaası.

Taymaz, H. (2000). Okul yönetimi. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Topçu, İ. & Aslan B. (2009). İlköğretim okullarında yöneticilerin öğretimin denetimi görevlerini yerine getirme biçemleri. 1. Uluslararası Türkiye Eğitim Araştırmaları Kongresi. Çanakkale.(2-21).

Ural, A ve Aslim, S. T. (2013). Okul müdürlerinin öğretim programlarını bilme, denetleme ve destekleme düzeyleri: öğretmen değerlendirmelerine ilişkin bir betimleme. Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 32, 26-38.

Uluğ, F. (1985). Açıklamalı Eğitim Yönetimi Sözlüğü: Uygulamadaki Eğitim Yönetimi Terimleri Üzerine Bir Çalışma. Ankara.

Williams, R. (2007). A Case study ın clınical supervısıon: movıng from an evaluatıon to a supervision mode. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania, USA.

Yıldırım, M. K. (2013). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin, müdürlerinin denetim görevlerini gerçekleştirmelerine ilişkin algılarının örgütsel bağlılıklarına etkisi (Elazığ İli Örneği). Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.

Yılmaz, K. (2009). Okul müdürlerinin denetim görevi. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 10 (1), 19-35.

Zepeda, S. J. (2003). Instructional supervision. New York: Eye On Education, Inc.