Research Article

Evaluation of Teachers' Views on School Managers' Classroom Supervision

Müyesser Ceylan[1], Sevcan Can[2]

Abstract

In this study, it is aimed to evaluate teachers' opinions on school principals' classroom supervision task in schools. The study group of this research in which phenomenological model among qualitative research methods was used consists of 8 teachers working in Tepebaşı district in Eskişehir and chosen by means of convenient sampling among purposeful sampling methods. The data obtained using semi-structured interview technique were analyzed using descriptive and content analysis techniques. The results indicate that teachers used metaphors such as "waste, dinosaur, torture, divine comedy, yield meter, Tüvtürk periodical vehicle examination, tea spoon in the glass of someone who does not use any sugar, and detective". Most of the teachers stated that the school principal's role in the course supervision process should be guiding. It was found that none of the teachers thought that school principals could effectively perform their supervisory roles. The results also show that teachers appreciated the application in terms of its effectiveness since it motivated teachers to be prepared for the lessons, to be planned, programmed, to transfer their experience, and to take responsibilities. On the other hand, it was mostly criticized for the unnecessary paperwork, favoritism and discrimination, stress, and reaching wrong judgments due to lack of time. In addition, the majority of the teachers stated that the course supervision should be done by the teachers of the field at issue. In the study, it was concluded that the teachers who do not evaluate the classroom supervision process performed by school administrators as professional do not consider the supervision process as necessary. In general, the study suggests that the supervision should be done by individuals who have a modern understanding of supervision and who are experts in guidance and counseling.

---

[1] Asst. Prof., Anadolu University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, mceylan@anadolu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7830-2584

[2] Teacher, Habip Edip Törehan Mesleki ve Teknik Anadolu lisesi, sevcancanpangal@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7797-4087

Okul Müdürlerinin Ders Denetimine İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi

Öz

Bu çalışmada, okul müdürlerinin okullardaki ders denetim görevine ilişkin öğretmen görüşlerini değerlendirmek amaçlanmıştır. Nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden olgu bilim (fenomenoloji) deseninin kullanıldığı bu araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, amaçlı örnekleme yöntemlerinden kolay ulaşılabilir örnekleme yöntemi ile belirlenen Eskişehir ili Tepebaşı ilçesinde görev yapan 8 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme tekniği kullanılarak elde edilen veriler, betimsel analiz ve içerik analizi tekniği kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, öğretmenlerin ders denetimine ilişkin olarak " fuzuli, dinozor, işkence, ilahi komedya, verim ölçer, Tüvtürk araç muayenesi, şeker kullanmayan birinin bardağındaki çay kaşığı, dedektiflik" gibi metaforlar kullandıkları görülmüştür. Öğretmenlerin çoğu, ders denetim sürecinde okul müdürünün rolünün rehberlik etme yönünde olması gerektiğini belirtmişlerdir. Tüm öğretmenlerin okul müdürlerinin denetim rollerini etkili bir şekilde sergileyemediklerini düşündükleri tespit edilmiştir. Ders denetimlerinin derse hazırlıklı gelme-planlı, programlı olma, tecrübe aktarımı, sorumluluk kazanma açısından kendilerine katkısının olduğu belirlenmiş, gereksiz evraklar, kayırma ve ayrımcılık, stres, zaman yetersizliğinden kaynaklı yanlış yargılara ulaşma gibi olumsuz etkiler de yarattığı öğretmenler tarafından ifade edilmiştir. Ayrıca öğretmenlerin çoğunluğu ders denetimlerinin zümre öğretmenleri tarafından yapılması gerektiğini belirtmişlerdir. Araştırmada okul yöneticilerince gerçekleştirilen sınıf içi denetim sürecini profesyonel olarak değerlendirmeyen öğretmenler denetimi bu haliyle gerekli görmedikleri sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Öğretmenleri sınıf içerisinde denetleyecek kişilerin çağdaş denetim anlayışına sahip, rehberlik ve danışmanlık konularında uzman kişilerin olması bu araştırmanın genel önerisidir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Ders denetimi, okul müdürü, öğretmen.*

Introduction

Countries are trying to achieve their goals by creating well-structured and well-functioning systems and one of the most prominent ones is the education system. In other words, like in any other system, in education systems, aspects such as process operation and sustainability gain importance as well as the structuring processes. As an important point here, the management and supervision processes emerge. According to Başaran (2000), supervision is universal and there is a supervision process in all organizations regardless of their type, purpose and organization. Supervision, a sub-system of management, is a process that provides feedback to systems and exists in all organizations since controlling the process is considered to be an organizational and administrative necessity (Aydın, 2014). However, a critical point emerges when the terms used for this process are examined. Although the concepts "control" and "supervision" may sometimes be used synonymously, they function differently when used in the process of evaluation of a system.

For the concept "control" there have been many different definitions used so far and there has been some ambiguity in the related literature as well. As stated above, the concept is occasionally associated with some terms, such as "inspection" and "supervision" which do not fully meet the meaning of "control" most of the times. Control mostly focuses on identifying the problem rather than solving it whereas the focus of supervision is improvement, which comprises terms feedback, guidance and counselling in return. According to Bursalıoğlu (2013), supervision is a method of controlling the behavior in the public interest. Aydın (2014), on the other hand, defined supervision as the process of determining whether or not organizational actions are in line with accepted principles and rules. Supervision is also defined as a wide range of services, such as supervising and evaluating the work done, making recommendations to those involved, to make them more efficient, and assisting staff in institutions throughout their work and progress (Taymaz, 2002). Supervision in education system is mostly done by comparing the existing practices in the education system, detecting unwanted deviations from the objectives, revealing the causes of deviations and directing them in order to eliminate the existing and possible problems which may arise during the process (Bursalıoğlu, 2003; Başaran, 2000). Besides, the aim of supervision in education is to find the methods appropriate to the aims of education and training, to ensure progress in the process by

taking quality and quantity issues into consideration (Atay, 1996), to wit, to confirm that all students learn by increasing the quality of education and training performed in the classroom. At this point, supervision activities, which are considered as a part of professional development, are evaluated as a guidance-centered process that continues periodically to support development, providing feedback and increasing teachers' knowledge and skills (Başaran, 2000; Eren, 1993, p. 404). Education supervision helps to achieve the objectives of education as a sub-system of educational management. With this feature, supervision is of great importance for educational organizations.

There have been significant changes in the historical process in the sense of educational supervision. In parallel with the understanding in management, educational supervision was initially implemented with an understanding that focuses on reducing and correcting the mistakes of the education system and restricting the educators to only do what they need to do, and on the identification and elimination of deficiencies (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 2007; Sullivan and Glanz, 2005). As a result of the evolution in the understanding of educational supervision, contemporary supervision approaches started to put the emphasis on the process of education and teacher development; thus, guidance and professional assistance began to be discussed in the 2000s. In the new paradigm, participation, collaboration, research and evaluation based supervision practices are highlighted. Accordingly, the contemporary understanding of system control would require a participatory and interactive assistance process with emphasis on human relations, and consequently, a leadership role has been undertaken to improve the quality of education and training in the school, help teachers in their progress and facilitate students' learning (Kowalski and Brunner, 2005). In this sense, supervision is very important in making schools a more effective learning environments.

Especially novice teachers, who have graduated from university with a certain level of general, pedagogical, theoretical and methodological knowledge, may experience difficulties in putting the theoretical knowledge into practice in real classrooms when faced with complications (Budak and Demirel, 2003). Most of the time, they try to upgrade their teaching skills by means of their own experiences and efforts. It is important for the teacher development that supervision provides teachers with vocational guidance in this respect, and in some way, gives them the opportunity to be trained in the workplace. One aspect of the guidance function of supervision is that it allows to keep up with change. To be more precise, it serves the system

in its never ending adaptation process since the rapid changes in the needs of societies require the education systems to be dynamic. Aydın (2014) states that the knowledge and skills acquired in schools cannot be kept up to date in the face of rapid changes, and as a matter of fact, they become out of date. This phenomenon necessitates continuous self-renewal in teaching as in every profession. As a result, pioneers strongly suggest that teachers who are confronted with such a social phenomenon should not be left on their own.

Both in Turkey and around the world, teachers' supervision and development have gained importance; however, the existing models have been criticized for not being as effective as expected, and suggestions for new models have been tried to be developed in order to facilitate the process. More specifically, the discussions on practices are largely about the persons and institutions involved in the audit, the supervisors' cooperation with teachers and communication process (Yavuz & Yıldırım, 2009; Aksu & Mulla, 2009; Yaman, 2009; Samancı, Taşçıoğlu, & Çetin, 2009; Beycioğlu & Dönmez, 2009). In relevance with one of mostly directed criticisms, it is of great importance for the teacher to be evaluated correctly and impartially in the professional development process and to be guided towards self-development. Therefore, in order to evaluate and improve teacher performance in a realistic way, data on this subject should be collected from various people and sources. However, current practices are considered to be insufficient to evaluate teachers' performance and to guide them through the process. In the light of the discussions on supervision, it can be said that supervision and professional development should be done in a complementary process. In other words, it is suggested that teachers, who are the main object of the supervision, should no longer be in a passive position in the supervision process and subject to a mechanical supervision in a narrow process.

Supervisions applied to ensure the effectiveness of schools with economic, political and social functions are carried out as institution supervision and course supervision in the Turkish education system. The supervision of the institution comprises the examination of all activities held in the educational institutions; thus, it is more concerned with the management of educational organizations and the monitoring, control and evaluation of human and substance resources, utilization and utilization of human and material resources, and it is carried out in order to achieve the objectives of the educational organization. Lesson supervision, on the other

hand, is the observation, examination and evaluation of the activities of teachers who work as instructors in an educational institution (Taymaz, 2002). In Turkey, education supervision activities are carried out by inspectors. Article 57 of the Regulation on the Presidency of Guidance and Inspection of the Ministry of National Education and the Presidency of Inspectors of Inspectors, which entered into force on 24.05.2014, includes the duties stated in Article 17 of the Decree Law No. 652. In the related article of the Decree Law No. 652, the tasks of inspecting the teacher activities in the classroom is not mentioned specifically. As a result, the inspection of the institutions would continue to be carried out by the inspectors, yet with the implementation of the new regulation the inspectors would no longer participated the course inspections regularly unless a problem is reported. In order to fill the gap of lesson supervision, school principals were assigned for this task (The Ministry of National Education, Teacher Appointment and Relocation Regulation, Article 54) in April 17, 2015 announced in the Official Paper, stating that " At the end of each course year, for the sake of measuring their success, productivity and efforts, the evaluation of the teachers, who are working in all degrees and types of educational institutions and who have completed the candidacy phase, is done by the school principal of the educational institution where the teachers are working."

As a result of the abovementioned changes done in Turkey's education system, the tasks appointed to the principals have changed, and the major factor of incorporating them in the supervision process as well as the management one is that they have been considered to be education leaders in the new paradigm. In this respect, the school principals, as education leaders, should supervise the teaching activities in the classroom and make necessary applications and organizations in order to improve the teaching activities at issue. In other words, school principals would need to establish a close and active relationship with teachers who they are working with. Therefore, all these developments increase the importance of supervision activities to be performed by school principals (Yılmaz, 2009).

Increasing the effectiveness of the principal in course supervision is a matter of discussion in the current literature because, first, assigning the school supervision role to school principals is a new issue, thus, some ambiguity may arise in the process, and second, this may have some disadvantages besides its advantages, such as the principal's not having any special training for the supervision, the teachers' being the principal's colleague or the lack of objectivity in the supervision process. The most significant positive side, on the other hand, is considered to be

the principle's being more accessible than a supervisor appointed by the Ministry of Education. In this research, it was aimed to determine the teachers' views about the principals regarding their course supervision task in schools. By examining teachers' views about school principals' supervisory role it was aimed to help to fill the research gap in this area. Furthermore, considering that there are limited number of studies on this subject, all kinds of research data will contribute to this subject.

Aim of the Study

In this research, it is aimed to reveal teacher opinions about the school principals' lesson supervision task. For this purpose, the following questions were sought:

According to the teachers,
1) what is course supervision?
2) what role should the school principal have in the course of the supervision?
3) what are the contributions of the school principal's carrying the supervision task to the teacher?
4) who should take charge of course supervision in schools?

Methodology

This qualitative study done by taking phenomenological design into consideration aimed to examine teachers' opinions about the principal's course supervisory task and their role in the supervision process. The phenomenological model focuses on cases that we are aware of, yet do not have in-depth and detailed understanding of. According to Yıldırım and Şimşek (2006, p.113) the aim of phenomenological studies is to reveal individuals' experiences and perceptions about a case and meanings they attributed to it.

Participants

Eight teachers working in Tepebaşı district in Eskişehir, Turkey constitute the study group. While presenting information about teachers, the confidentiality of the participants was ensured

by coding them as T1, T2,…, T5. Demographic characteristics of the teachers in the study group are given in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Teachers in the Working Group

	Gender	Age	Year of Experience	Subject	Education
T1	Female	27	5	English	BA
T2	Male	32	10	Turkish	BA
T3	Female	35	5	Music	BA
T4	Male	29	5	English	BA
T5	Female	26	2	English	BA
T6	Male	33	8	Mathematics	BA
T7	Male	31	7	Social Studies	BA
T8	Female	31	8	Philosophy	BA

As shown in Table 1, four of the teachers in the study group were male and four were female and their ages were between 26 and 35. Their professional seniority is between 2 and 10 years. It is seen that three of the teachers in the study group are English teachers, and there is one teacher for each of the subjects: Turkish, Music, Mathematics, Social Studies and Philosophy. All teachers are undergraduates.

Data Collection Tools

A semi-structured interview form developed by the researchers was used as data collection tool. In the semi-structured interview technique, the researcher prepares the interview protocol containing the questions he / she plans to ask in advance. The most important convenience that the semi-structured interview technique offers to the researcher is that it provides more systematic and comparable information because the interview is conducted in accordance with the pre-prepared interview protocol (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2006). The semi-structured interview technique provides a certain standard and flexibility at the same time, especially for educational science researches (Türnüklü, 2000). While creating the semi-structured interview form, the related literature was scanned in detail. Moreover, various questions were asked about how teachers evaluated the school supervisory task and expert opinion was applied. As a result of the expert examination, the questions in the interview form were rearranged and after the

necessary arrangements were made on the missing questions so that they became appropriate, understandable and applicable in terms of being a data collection tool.

Data Collection and Analysis

The research data were collected through semi-structured interviews done by consisting five open-ended questions asked to the participants. The interviews were conducted one-to-one with each participant. Supported with follow up questions, the interview with each participant lasted approximately 90 minutes. Descriptive and content analysis techniques were used while analyzing the obtained data. In the descriptive analysis, the findings that identify the subjects are evaluated and the summarized and interpreted data by the descriptive analysis are subjected to a deeper process in the content analysis. In this phase, the concepts and themes that cannot be noticed by the descriptive approach can be discovered by means of content analysis techniques. The basic process of content analysis is to bring similar data together within the framework of certain concepts and themes and to interpret them in a way that the reader can understand (Yıldırım & Şimşek). After the data were transcribed, analyzes were performed with a qualitative data analysis program. In this process, the researchers first made independent coding and then worked together until an agreement was reached. After the coding key was revealed, the reliability study process was completed with the third expert's opinion. The codes were determined by the abovementioned analyses, and by taking the codes account, sub-themes were created. Direct quotations are included to reflect the views of the participants as they are. During the presentation of the findings, direct quotations were made for teachers and teachers were coded as T1, T2, T3, etc.

Findings

In this study, which aimed to determine teachers' views about principals' course supervision tasks, the findings are discussed in accordance with the sub-objectives of the research. Within the scope of the research, five questions were asked to the teachers and their answers were presented depending on the purpose of the research. The first question which was directed to the teachers was: "If you would use a metaphor, what concept would you use for course

supervision? (How do you perceive course supervision? What does it stand for in your mind?) Explain with the reasons.

The themes of the teachers' answers to this question are given in Table 2.

Table 2.

Metaphors Used for Supervision

Sub Themes	Participants
Waste	T1
Dinosaurs (Something that does not exist anymore)	T2
Torture	T3
Divine Commedia	T4
Yield Meter	T5
Tüvtürk periodical vehicle examination	T6
A spoon in someone's glass who does not use sugar	T7
Detective	T8

When Table 2 is examined, it can be seen that teachers produced metaphors such as "superfluous, dinosaur, torture, divine comedy, yield meter, Tüvtürk vehicle examination, teaspoon in the glass of a non-sugar user". Direct quotations from some of the teachers' views on this subject are as follows:

> *"I see supervision as a redundant business. It's impossible to understand a teacher in 40 minutes. Actually, our headmasters cannot do that anyway." (T1)*

> *"Supervision is an extinct concept like dinosaurs. I think, there hasn't been any supervision done for a long time". (T2)*

> *"Divine Comedy. The tragicomic situation which teaching is dragged into. It's like a butcher checking a grocery store. There should be supervision for sure, but it should be carried out by experts who have completed their development with a certain experience in the field and branch to be supervised". (T4)*

> *"Evaluation process – For me it is the evaluation of the course efficacy which enables to observe both student achievement and teacher success". (T5)*

> *"We can draw a parallel with Tüvtürk vehicle inspection. It is done routinely. If the vehicles are unproblematic, they pass smoothly. On the other hand, the problematic vehicles can also pass with small reparations which will show the vehicles as unproblematic, eventhough they are, so that they can go through that examination,*

but in the end, every vehicle passes. Lesson supervision is the same, if the teacher is doing his job well, the supervision goes smoothly, and if he doesn't do his job well, he does it well and the supervision goes smoothly again". (T6)

"Maybe we can call it investigation, what detectives do. But I even don't believe that class supervision is exactly what detectives do. For the sake of the procedure, only administrators are allowed in the process. Thus, an administrator who is not proficient in a branch only witnesses a certain part of the teaching process and cannot contribute effectively. It is done just because it is assigned, thus, not effectively at all". (T8)

It can be said that the teachers' participation in the research is usually related to negative metaphors due to the lack of supervision practices in the classrooms.

As the second question to the teachers in the research, "What should be the role of the school principal in the course of supervision? (guidance-professional assistance, evaluation of the quality of education and training activities, control, etc.) Please explain the reasons. " was asked to the participants. In addition, as the third question of the research, in order to obtain more detailed information on this subject, "Do you think the school principal can perform the supervisor roles effectively? Please explain the reasons." was asked. The themes of the teachers' answers to these questions are given in Table 3.

Table 3.

The role of the School Principal in the Classroom Supervision Process

Supporting supervision and professional help
Encouraging
Motivating
Increasing student success (Increasing the education quality)

When Table 3 is examined, it can be seen that the teachers stated that the roles that the school principal should undertake in the course of supervision should be guidance and vocational help, encouragement, motivation and increasing the quality of education. The views of some teachers on this subject are as follows:

"There might be guidance and professional assistance. He can share his experiences." (T1)

"Certainly, it should aim to guide. He knows a lot more than us, and he should be guiding us in expressing our shortcomings or pros". (T3)

"It should be guiding and encouraging. The focus needs to be teacher motivation. Student achievement is of course a tool for the supervision of the teacher". (T5)

"An experienced, active and innovator-aware manager can be more effective in the process by guiding it a little further, but I believe that teaching is a profession with a personal approach, idealism. That is, the administrator cannot at least place this idealism in the course of his supervision. I think the course supervisions have a temporary effect". (T8)

In the research, the fourth question was, "How do you think the school principal contributed to you during the course supervision? Explain the positive and negative effects with the reasons."

Table 4.
Positive And Negative Effects of the School Principal's Supervision Process

Positive Sides
Being prepared for the class (Having a plan and being programmed)
Sharing and transferring experience
Taking responsibility
Negative Sides
Unnecessary documentation
Competence and discrimination
Stress and anxiety
Making wrong judgments due to insufficient time

When Table 4 is examined, it seen that the teachers believe that school principals contribute to the process, such as by having teacher be prepared for the lesson, transferring experience, gaining responsibility and doing their job with care. However, the teachers stated that lesson supervision has negative effects such as creating unnecessary piles of documents, merit and nepotism, creating stress and tension, and making wrong judgments due to insufficient time. The views of some teachers on this subject are as follows:

"We understand how important documents are. I also learned that taking notes in the guide books is helpful in preparing for the lesson. This is actually the only benefit I can spell". (T1)

"Positive past experience is very useful and decision-making is easier. On the other hand, in this system, merit and nepotism are seen in many principals". (T2)

"I don't think it adds anything other than extra excitement. Both teachers and students experience unnecessary tension". (T3)

"Everyone should do their own work. Do you think an administrator can have sufficient knowledge in every field? Or can this administrator be guided in every field?" (T4)

"I don't think that course supervisions add anything other than being a little more careful in the work and operations to be done depending on the annoying share of being supervised". (T6)

Teachers believe that school principals contribute to the supervision process through their experiences. However, it can be a disadvantage that school principals provide guidance to all teachers as teachers' professional knowledge and that their field expertise is different from each other. Each teacher cannot help everyone at the same rate due to different branches.

As the fifth question of the research, the teachers were asked about whom the supervision should be done. (School principal, colleagues, group teachers, commissions, supervisors, etc.) The themes obtained from the teachers' opinions are given in Table 5.

Table 5.

Who should do the course supervision?

Teachers who teach the subject at issue
Professional supervisors
Independent professionals or professional organizations
Principals
No one

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that teachers want to be supervised by group teachers, expert supervisors, independent persons and institutions and school principal respectively. A teacher thinks that there should be no supervision. The views of some teachers on this aspect are as follows:

"It should be done by independent persons and institutions. For example, university students can do it with the help of an associate professor". (T2)

"Experts.. what I mean by experts is teachers who have reached a certain level of experience and proficiency.. they should be in charge while supervising ". (T4)

"Group teachers support each other with the contribution of joint exams. In addition, since the group teachers have mastered the skills of that course, they will know better what to look for in the supervision. Therefore, the group teachers can take on both supervisory and supportive tasks". (T5)

"If the course is to be supervised, it should be done by a commission consisting of a group of teachers. To explain the reason.. let's think that the supervisor is originally expert in social sciences and he or she investigates an English language classroom. I don't think that the supervisor can be objective effective in this process. I don't think that a supervisor can be supervise the course without even knowing that foreign language." (T6)

"It is most appropriate to be done by group teachers. During the supervision, the process can teach different techniques and methods to the teacher. The person who performs the supervision can learn by seeing different techniques and methods". (T7)
"If the course supervisions want to achieve their purpose, each branch should have its own supervisors. They should do so with a dynamic and questioning approach that is competent and proven in their fields. Ministry inspectors can carry out course inspections". (T8)

The majority of the teachers stated that they should supervise themselves.

Discussion and Conclusion

In this research, it was tried to put forward the opinions of the school principals about the supervisory duties in the schools. From the current supervision approach, which has been implemented in Turkey, it is expected to be carried out in accordance with the objectives of the training program and evaluate teacher performances. One of the most important tasks assigned to school principals is to train teachers on the job and make them more qualified. School principals are the ones who know the teachers better than anyone else and know what is expected of them as long as they are in contact with the teachers. Therefore, if the opportunities are used correctly, they can help the professional development of each teacher and increase the success of the teacher, and as a result of this, supervision can help to increase the quality of education. In this context, the task of evaluating and improving the teacher assigned to school principals in the existing system is of great importance. The school principal, who foresees a change in the behaviors of teachers regarding education and training, should evaluate their

expectations correctly (Bursalıoğlu, 1980) and determine the successful and unsuccessful aspects of the activities (Taymaz, 2000).

As a result of this research aiming to determine the opinions of teachers about the supervision of school principals, it was seen that teachers produced metaphors such as "waste, dinosaur, torture, divine comedy, yield meter, Tüvtürk vehicle examination, sugar spoon of a person who does not use sugar". All of the metaphors used by teachers seem to have negative meaning. As can be seen from this, teachers approach the concept of supervision and the supervision process negatively. Memduhoğlu and Mazlum (2014), as a result of their study investigating the stakeholders of education as supervisors, administrators and teachers, aiming to determine the metaphoric perceptions of educational supervisors, stated that perceptions about supervision and the supervision of education have changed significantly since 10 years, but they are not sufficient enough. As far as the teachers' opinions are concerned, school principals either do not fulfill the task of supervising the courses at all or they fall short because of lack of time, lack of expertise in the field and so on for effective reasons. Therefore, it can be stated that this insufficiency may have affected teachers' opinions negatively.

Another finding of the study is that the role of the school principal in the course supervision process should be guiding, encouraging, motivating and improving the quality of education. In addition, it was found that all teachers felt that school principals could not effectively demonstrate their supervisory roles. According to the research findings of Firincioglu Bige (2014) which was held to determine the teachers 'opinions about primary school principals' course inspections, the expectations of teachers from course supervisions are in order of importance; "Guidance, feedback, completion of material deficiencies, determination of professional deficiencies, reward-appreciation and increased quality of education". The findings obtained are similar to the results of Firincioglu Bige's research.

In the research, it was concluded that the course inspections have negative effects, such as unnecessary documents, favoritism and discrimination, stress, and reaching wrong judgments due to lack of time, in addition to contributions such as coming-planned, being programmed, transferring experience, and gaining responsibility. In the study conducted by Yeşil and Kış (2015) in order to determine the teachers' opinions about school supervision tasks in the schools, it was seen that the teachers reported that the school supervision contributed to the

teacher. It was found that the most contribution of the course inspections was to see the deficiencies of the teachers. In the research conducted by Karabay (2014) in order to determine the contribution of school administrators to the professional development of branch teachers in terms of course controls, no findings were found that school principals contributed to the professional development of branch teachers. According to the results of the research, it is stated that school administrators should always take into consideration the activities that will ensure the professional development of teachers in course supervisions.

According to the results of the research, the majority of the teachers stated that they wanted the inspections to be carried out by the group teachers. In Green and Winter (2015), Başol and Kaya (2009), the majority of teachers want the supervisor to conduct the course inspections. When the teachers asked the supervisor to do the supervision, it is thought that there may be reasons such that the principal and the teacher are in the same environment and that the principal has the opportunity to evaluate the teacher in all aspects. Similarly, in the study conducted by Altun (2014), it is seen that the primary preferences of the participants about who should conduct teacher supervision are school principal, assistant school principal, head of the department and MoNE provincial inspectors. Aslanargun and Göksoy (2013) stated that as a result of their research aiming to determine the opinions of teachers about who should perform teacher supervision, teachers reported opinions in the form of institution manager, self-supervision, all education stakeholders and education supervisors. The main findings of the research are that the school principals know the teachers to be supervised better than the supervisors among the reasons of conducting the supervision, that the teachers know the aspects that need to be developed, that the teachers are aware of all the activities they perform, that the teachers are aware of the activities not only during the lecture hours but also during the extracurricular times (Yılmaz, 2009).

In general, when the opinions of the teachers are considered, it is seen that teachers mostly want to be evaluated with a supervision approach that can guide them, shed light on them during the education process, change them positively by seeing their deficiencies and motivate them. This can be explained by the desire of teachers to be in a comfortable environment during the supervision and evaluation process, to overcome the problems arising from lack of experience with the support of more experienced people and to provide maximum benefit to all stakeholders in the education cycle by developing solid relationships in this process.

Because, as it is understood from the teachers' statements, in the schools where they work, teachers are evaluated with a control-oriented supervision approach or supervision activities are superficial and as a result, they approach the supervision process negatively. As a matter of fact, all the teachers participating in the study think that school principals cannot effectively demonstrate their course supervision roles.

According to the teachers' statements, the evaluation of their courses causes serious discomfort to the teachers and creates stress on them. In this case, teachers may try to be more attentive and try to appear as if they are necessarily doing their job perfectly during the course supervision process. In addition, it may be another reason for the tension that the course inspections are conducted only at certain times of the year and that a positive or negative judgment is made about the teachers within a limited time period. The fact that the school principal is also a colleague and the development of informal relations within the school may have brought to mind "discrimination and injustice". Furthermore, rather than how teachers carry out the lessons or operate the teaching-learning process, the control of whether the necessary documents are prepared only shows that the training is carried out on the basis of documents rather than quality.

This may be due to the fact that the group teachers are in the same field of expertise, the teachers can see their positive and negative aspects more easily and offer realistic solutions, share information, make them feel more comfortable among themselves and operate the communication process between them more positively. In addition, employing more than one evaluator instead of performing the supervision by a single person can both enhance the objectivity of the assessment and help capture missed points.

Suggestions

At this point, by considering the opinions and expectations of the teacher and restructuring the supervision understanding, it should be questioned what the main purpose of the supervision should be, what should be done in the process of achieving this goal, how the supervision process can be operated effectively and who should be assigned for the supervision task. Supervision activities of school principals if done properly, may prevent the consequences,

such as being too result-oriented and generally carrying too much document control. Moreover, they can contribute to the development and training of school personnel. School principals can observe all the activities of teachers and other school personnel to reveal the real situation and correct the deficiencies determined as a result of the supervision as they have the chance to know the environment well. In order for such a situation to be realized, the principals' awareness level should be increased and they should be supported to work selflessly. In addition, if the school principals will continue their course supervision duties in the following periods, arrangements can be made regarding the training of school principals in the fields of supervision and guidance-counseling, workload and supervision duties. However, as it is frequently emphasized in the studies on supervision, it is seen that Turkish Educational System needs philosophical and structural arrangements that will meet the need for supervision.

In this study, only the views of teachers were used and the majority of the teachers wanted to supervise themselves. However, other cases have also identified different conditions. Therefore, the situation can be examined for those who perform the supervision themselves or the working group can be diversified and a qualitative study can be conducted on the reasons for the differences of opinions of the supervisors, administrators and teachers about who should perform the supervision. In addition, data were obtained only through interviews. For the sake of understanding the process of supervision in more detail, different data collection tools, such as observations, document review, etc. can be examined.

References

Aksu, M.B., & Mulla, E. (2009). *İlköğretim denetmenlerinin insan ilişkileri yeterlikleri*, 1. Uluslar Arası Katılımlı Ulusal Eğitim Denetimi Sempozyumu, Ankara: 22-23 Haziran.

Altun, B. (2014*). Denetime eleştirel yaklaşım: Öğretmen denetimi nasıl olmalı?* Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.

Aslanargun, E., & Göksoy, S. (2013). Öğretmen denetimini kim yapmalıdır? *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Özel Sayı, 98-121.

Atay, K. (1996). İlköğretim müfettişlerinin yeterlilikleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 2*(1), 25-38.

Aydın, M. (2014). *Çağdaş eğitim denetimi* (6.baskı). Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.

Başaran, İ. E. (2000). *Eğitim yönetimi*. Ankara: Kadıoğlu Matbaacılık.

Başol, G., & Kaya, I. (2009). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin performanslarının okul yöneticileri tarafından değerlendirilmesi üzerine görüşleri.* I. Uluslararası Türkiye Eğitim Araştırmaları Kongresi Bildiri Kitapçığı, Çanakkale.

Beycioğlu, K., & Dönmez, B. (2009). Eğitim denetimini yeniden düşünmek. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *10*(2), 71-93.

Budak, Y., & Demirel, Ö. (2003). Öğretmenlerin hizmet içi eğitim ihtiyacı. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 33*, 62-81.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1980). *Eğitim yöneticisinin davranış etkenleri.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayını.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2003). *Eğitim yönetiminde teori ve uygulama*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayınları.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2013). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış* (18. baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Eren, E. (1993). *Yönetim psikolojisi* (4. Baskı). İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.

Fırıncıoğulları Bige, E. (2014). *İlkokul müdürlerinin ders denetimleri ile ilgili öğretmen görüşleri.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.

Karabay, H. (2014). *Okul yöneticilerinin ders denetimleri yönüyle branş öğretmenlerinin mesleki gelişimlerine katkıları.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Kowalski, T. J., & Brunner, C. C. (2005). The school superintendent: Roles, challenges, and issues. In F. W. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership: Advances in theory, research, and practice* (142-167). London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

MEB (2011). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığının Teşkilat ve Görevleri Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararname. Resmi Gazete, 28054; 14 Eylül 2011.

MEB (2014). *Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Rehberlik ve Denetim Başkanlığı İle Maarif Müfettişleri Başkanlıkları Yönetmeliği.*Resmi Gazete, 29009; 5 Mayıs 2014.

MEB (2015). *Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Öğretmen Atama ve Yer Değiştirme Yönetmeliği.* Resmi Gazete, 29329;17 Nisan 2015.

Memduhoğlu, H. B., & Mazlum, M. M. (2014). Bir değişim hikâyesi: Eğitim denetmenlerine ilişkin metaforik algılar. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 4*(1), 28-4.

Samancı, O., Taşçıoğlu, N., & Çetin, İ. (2009). *İlköğretimde görev yapan öğretmenlerin müfettişlerden beklentileri,* 1. Uluslar Arası Katılımlı Ulusal Eğitim Denetimi Sempozyumu, Ankara: 22-23 Haziran.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1993). *Supervision: A redefinition.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2005). *Supervision that improves teaching.* California: Corwin Press.

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

Taymaz, A. H. (2002). *Eğitim sisteminde teftiş* (5.baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Türnüklü, A. (2000). Eğitim bilimi araştırmalarında etkin olarak kullanabilecek nitel bir araştırma tekniği: Görüşme. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *6*(4), 543-559.

Yaman, E. (2009). Müfettişlerin rehberlik rollerini rehber öğretmenler değerlendiriyor, *International Online Journal of EducationalSciences*, *1*(1), 106-123.

Yavuz, M., & Yıldırım, A. (2009). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin seçimi ve yetiştirilmelerine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri,*1. Uluslararası Katılımlı Ulusal Eğitim Denetimi Sempozyumu, Ankara: 22-23 Haziran.

Yeşil, D., & Kış, A. (2015). Okul müdürlerinin ders denetimine ilişkin öğretmen görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2(3),27-45.*

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

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2006). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (6. Baskı). Ankara: Seçkin.