



# Principal's Supervisory Practices for Teacher Professional Development: Bureaucratic and Professional Perspectives

Research Article

Gokce OZDEMIR<sup>1</sup>, Sevilay SAHİN<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Gaziantep University, Faculty of Education, Department of Art, Gaziantep, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0002-2608-6004

<sup>2</sup>University, Faculty of Education, Department of Art, X, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-002-7140-821X

**To cite this article:** Ozdemir, G., & Sahin, S. (2020). Principal's Supervisory Practices for Teacher Professional Development: Bureaucratic and Professional Perspectives, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 12(1), X.

## ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 29.07.2019

Available online:  
13.02.2020

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to determine the opinions of teachers about the supervisory practices of school principals and the approaches they adopt based on the supervision of teaching practice, professional development and evaluation. It is a mixed method study. It was preferred to include samples from different geographical regions and provinces of Turkey in order to increase the level of representativeness of the sample. Accordingly, the research data were collected from the teachers working at public kindergartens, primary schools, secondary schools and high schools in the provinces of Bursa, Gaziantep, Izmir, Antalya, Samsun, Batman and Eskisehir during the spring semester of 2016-2017 academic year. For the qualitative data, the study group consisted of 28 teachers specified through the maximum diversity sampling method. According to the research results, the opinions of the teachers about the supervisory practices differed in three sub-headings and the qualitative findings supported the quantitative ones. In addition, it was concluded that the principals adopted the bureaucratic approach in the supervisory process based on the means of the responses to the questionnaire.

© 2020 IOJES. All rights reserved

### Keywords:

Educational supervision, teacher professional development, bureaucratic and professional supervision

## Introduction

The universal objective of schools is to provide the students with the fundamental gains of knowledge, skills and attitude by focusing on the student's learning process (Glickman, Gordon & Gordon, 2014). It is necessary to concentrate on teacher learning in order to achieve this goal and to increase the effectiveness of the process. An effective supervision process is also needed to support the learning process of teachers and to evaluate what the student has learned and to what extent. Blasé and Blasé (2004) regard supervision as a

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author's address: Gaziantep Üniversitesi  
Telephone: +905327060758  
e-mail: gozdemir@gantep.edu.tr  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2020.01.002>

combination of supervisory beliefs and educational philosophies to build trust, empower teachers, and encourage reflection. According to Sullivan and Glanz (2000), supervision is the task of evaluating teachers during the educational process in order to enhance and develop the teaching process and to increase student achievement. The determination of the level of realization of organizational objectives, the improvement of the deficiencies if any, and the promotion of teachers in terms of professional development are shaped in accordance with the underlying perspective. In their study, May and Zimpher (1986) listed three perspectives for supervisory practice; positivist, phenomenological and critical theorist.

The role positivism in supervisory practice can be expressed as technical, behaviouristic and rationalistic and focused on efficiency and effectiveness which can be considered as focusing on same points with bureaucratic approach to supervision. In phenomenological perspective, they emphasized that supervision tended to be more indirect and required more active participation in teachers' own learning. From this perspective the role of supervisor changes in style from listening, encouraging, clarifying, presenting and solving problems with the teacher utilizing a self-plan to presenting clarifying, listening, problem solving and negotiating with the teacher and supervisor using a contract system. Supervision from critical theorist perspective can be considered directive and prescriptive. Practical examples of critical theory in supervision process are the belief that teaching is reflective, moral and ethical actions found in a socially constructed framework. In this perspective, critical theorists assist teachers' in the development of personal beliefs in teaching, schooling, children and themselves. Depending on these perspectives, it can be said that between 1850 and 1990 many different approaches were defined; different processes in supervision including scientific management, democratic interaction approach, collaborative supervision, curriculum development supervision, clinical supervision, group dynamics, coaching and the supervision of teaching practice were emphasized (Blasé & Blasé, 2004). In addition, the questions about how the supervision should be carried out have led to the emergence of two different supervision approaches as bureaucratic and professional. In line with the idea of bureaucratic approach in the supervision that emerged in the 1890s (Glanz, 1998; Hanson, 1996; Reitzug, 1997), the supervisors evaluated teachers within the framework of a set of pre-determined criteria in the process of scientific supervision. Based on the definition of bureaucracy, there is a hierarchy of authority, defined roles and non-personal orientation in bureaucratic supervision. After the 1890s, the idea of professional approach for the supervisory process emerged, noting the constraints of bureaucratic approach in supervision. In this approach, while Peplinski (2009) considers professionalism in supervision as a situation in which the teachers are included in the process within the framework of democratic ideals, Oliva and Pawlas (2001) describe professionalism as a school-based and collaborative process, with the belief that teachers are professionals, and that they have the ability to guide and participate in their own development and supervision.

At the present time, supervision has many different forms and is emphasized to be a structure with different components in educational organizations. Harris (1998) defined five contemporary aspects of supervision: developing teaching and learning, adapting to changing external realities, providing support and feedback to teachers on professional development, understanding that the school is integrative to promote learning, inducing new and advanced pioneering implementations. Acheson and Waite (1998) also emphasized that supervision has two aims: to promote meaningful professional growth and to encourage student learning. The supervisory process should be able to enhance teachers' own capacities by developing the regeneration and growing abilities of an institution as well as improving the instructional processes. Zepeda (2007) scrutinizes supervision as a three-stage process for the supervision of teaching practice, professional development and evaluation. These phases are the main headings that address all aspects of teacher and teaching in the supervisory process. Instructional supervision, which is defined as the ideal supervision in increasing the effectiveness of the educational process (Goldhammer, Anderson & Krajewski, 1980), plays an important role in improving student achievement through the professional development of

teachers. Instructional supervision, which is the process of performing supervision through the professional development of teachers, aims to promote growth, development, interaction, error-free problem solving and capacity building in teachers (Zepeta, 2007). Instructional supervision covers far more than just a teacher's assessment on paper and proposes to support the professional development processes and the coaching system considering teachers' career development. Nolan and Hoover (2008) also defined instructional supervision as encouraging the continuous growth of teachers and helping them to be aware of their responsibilities. Instructional supervision refers to assisting teachers to improve the teaching process rather than the processes of controlling or judging them (Aydın, 2014). Taking all these into account, we can say that the role of school principals has expanded to include more than management. Chao and Dugger (1996) expressed in their study that a supervisor should focus on the promotion of the professional development of teachers in order to improve the instructional process and to make improvements if necessary, rather than supervising the quality of teaching. In the supervisory process, school principals are expected to be expert in teaching, support curricula, create professional development environments, use data-based decision making, have the vision to bring the school's material and spiritual resources and staff into a unified force to increase student achievement (Tucker, 2003). Moreover, school principals should set criteria, rethink the available system and practices of instruction, and demonstrate good practice examples to standardize the instruction of teaching. Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005) noted that school principals, as instructional leaders, should exert themselves to improve the effectiveness of the supervisory process for continuous development, build trust and work on short-term goals. That's why, the effectiveness of the supervisory process is a part of the school principals' instructional leadership behaviour. The behaviours of school principals as instructional leaders will increase the quality of the teaching process, raise the quality of educational outputs, support the professional development of teachers, and contribute to the cooperation, communication and coordination between teacher and supervisor (Memduhoğlu & Zengin, 2012).

Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2009) listed the points that should be considered for the effectiveness of the supervision so as to contribute to the effectiveness of instructional processes and teacher professional development:

- Having information about the process of all parties involved in the supervision procedure,
- The supervision procedure's enabling a reflective inquiry towards the professional development of the supervised staff,
- The supervision procedure's enabling organizational development as a synergy of individual and group efforts,
- Encouraging teachers and students to recognize their differences and to achieve common goals,
- Integrating the supervision procedure into the whole organization,
- Being aware the fact that the supervision procedure is a long-term process and that interpersonal relationships do affect the process,
- The supervision procedure's based on mutual trust and openness,
- The supervision procedure's encouraging people learning by doing and experiencing and taking risks,
- The successful supervision procedure's' creating a school climate encouraging experimentation and risk taking.

The supervision activities, which serve as a compass for increasing the level of the realization of the educational objectives and the functionality of the process, should be suitable for both institution level and the classroom level purposes (Erdem, 2006), and should be complementary and guiding for potential difficulties and deficiencies. The studies pertaining to educational supervision in Turkey proved that the supervisors in the audit process are inadequate in finding solutions to educational problems, in supporting the professional development of teachers, in increasing student achievement and in motivating the teachers. In these

researches, it was also concluded that the guidance was insufficient in terms of communicating effectively with the environment, making lesson plans and evaluating student achievement and that teachers were not provided with necessary assistance in finding solutions to problems related to classroom teaching (Balçı, Aydın, Yılmaz, Memduhoğlu & Apaydın, 2007; Burgaz, 1995; Memduhoğlu, 2009; Sarıyar, 1997; Yücel & Toprakçı, 2009).

When field research is conducted, the studies for the evaluation of the supervisory practices of school principals appears to be limited in Turkey. It is considered that this study will contribute to reveal the current implementations in the supervisory process, to improve the missing aspects and to the supervision practices expected to be performed in line with the 2023 vision document. That's why, the focus of the differentiation in the supervisory processes is teacher and school-based guidance for the improvement of teaching and the guidance aspect of inspection system for school development stands out in the 2023 vision document. Furthermore, the vision document states that temperament and talent-based recognition approach is critical for the development of the actors of the educational system, and indicates that the individual's self-recognition and its maintenance means having a personalized roadmap on the journey of education. The teacher who learns to recognize himself / herself and the students will act toward the approach that every child is distinct and each brain learns differently and arranges the curriculum, learning environment and materials in accordance with these characteristics by identifying the students' level of readiness (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2018). In this regard, the aim of this study was to determine the opinions of teachers about the supervisory practices of school principals and the approaches they adopt based on the supervision of teaching practice, professional development and evaluation.

### **Methodology**

The study was designed based on a mixed method research approach, a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods. Mixed method research, which provides more powerful data collection than single-method research, is a method in which both quantitative and qualitative approaches are used together (Ivankova and Kawamura, 2010). An exploratory sequential mixed research design was used in the study as qualitative data were collected depending on quantitative ones. The qualitative data were used to reveal a more in-depth study of the negative opinions and those without any comments obtained within the context of quantitative results, the reasons of shortcomings in the implementations and teachers' expectations from the school principals during the supervision process.

#### **The working group of the study**

It was aimed to include samples from different geographical regions and provinces of Turkey in order to increase the level of representativeness of the sample. Accordingly, the research data were collected from the teachers working at public kindergartens, primary schools, secondary schools and high schools in the provinces of Bursa, Gaziantep, İzmir, Antalya, Samsun, Batman and Eskisehir during the spring semester of 2016-2017 academic year. In order to collect data, 1075 instruments were distributed in 70 schools, and 975 of which were returned. Among the participants, 19.5% work at kindergartens, 34.4% at primary schools, 25% at secondary schools and 21.1% at high schools. In terms of the level of education, 91.3% of the participants hold undergraduate degrees while only 8.7% of them have graduate degrees. Participants have professional seniority between 1-5 years with 36.1%, 6-10 years with 35.1% and 11 years and over with 28.8%.

For the qualitative data, the study group consisted of 28 teachers specified through the maximum diversity sampling method. To ensure maximum diversity, one teacher from 4 groups in 7 participating provinces in the study was included in the working group considering various demographic variables (being in different groups of ages and professional seniority).

## The instrument of the study

The research data were collected through the “Instructional Leadership Inventory” that used by Peplinski (2009) in his doctoral dissertation titled “Teacher Supervision According to the Perceptions of School Principals and Teachers.” While the original inventory comprises 84 items, its 30-item part related to knowledge and practice for classroom training, knowledge and practice for professional development and supervision practices was used within the scope of this study to reveal Zepeda’s (2007) opinions about supervision under the sub-headings of the supervision of teaching practice (5,8,9,16,22,28,29,33,36,37), professional development (2,3,4,7,13,18,20,26,27,35) and evaluation (1,15,17,23,45,46,48,49,50,52) [12]. Furthermore, the supervisory approaches of the principals were addressed under two sub-categories in the inventory as professional (2,3,4,5,7,8,9,13,16,18,20,22,28,29,33,35,36,37) and bureaucratic (1,15,17,23,26,27,45,46,48,49,50,52) approaches. In order to find out to what extent the practices were conducted, 5-point Likert scale grading was used from never (1) to great extent (5).

The qualitative data of the study were collected through semi-structured interview form based on the items with medium and low level of agreement under the three sub-headings of the inventory according to the results obtained from the quantitative data. To improve the validity and reliability of qualitative data;

- Contact meetings were held with the participants before the interviews.
- The participant confirmation was granted after the recorded data were transcribed.
- The two-way data encoding process was realized and the inter-coder consistency coefficient was estimated; 95% of compliance was found to exist based on the formula of Reliability = Consistency / (Consensus + Disagreement). According to Miles and Huberman (1994), the scores over 90% are ordinarily considered to be high for the estimation of reliability coefficient.
- The direct quotations of participants were provided to increase the external validity of the data (P1: “There is no initiative for professional development...”).

## The operations on the inventory

The inventory used in the study was first translated into Turkish and then back into English to obtain language validity. In order to provide linguistic equivalence between Turkish translation and the original English form, the questions in Turkish and English were submitted on the same form with a 5-grade evaluation from 0: not at all to 5: fully met, and the validity of the translation was obtained from the English experts (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Translation validity evaluation form of Instructional Leadership Inventory

Items in Turkish	0	1	2	3	4	5	Items in English
Ne dereceye kadar?							To what extent?
Mesleki gelişim etkinlikleri ile ilgili olarak üniversitelerle ne dereceye kadar işbirliği yapılıyor?							Do you collaborate with university faculty for professional development activities?
Okulunuzda mentörlük ne dereceye kadar uygulanıyor?							Is mentoring used in your school?
Öğretmenler ne dereceye kadar kendi öğretimsel amaçlarını belirliyorlar?							Do your teachers set their own instructional goals?
Standartlaştırılmış testlerde öğrenci performansını ne ölçüde kullanırsınız?							Do you use student performance on standardized tests?

According to the results of English language experts’ evaluation, it was concluded that the linguistic validity scores of the Instructional Leadership Inventory items ranged between 4 and 5 points. In order to provide the language and meaning validity of the Turkish form, the approval of Turkish language experts was obtained as a result of a 5-grade evaluation from 0: not understood at all to 5: fully understood. Based on the

evaluations, it was determined that the language and meaning validity scores of the inventory items ranged from 4 to 5 points. In addition, the inventory with language and meaning validity skimmed by ten participating teachers to provide comprehensibility. In order to determine the level of reliability of the final Turkish form, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was estimated and the internal consistency of the inventory was found to be .90. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed with the Lisrel 8.80 program to confirm the factor structure of the scale. According to the analysis results, the goodness of fit of the model the index values; RMSEA; 0.07 and  $\chi^2/df$ ; It was found to be 2.71. If the RMSEA value is in the range of  $0.05 \leq RMSEA \leq 0.08$  and the chi square / degree of freedom value is in the range of  $2 \leq \chi^2/df \leq 3$ , indicates goodness of fit values of the scale tested is above the acceptable values (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2014).

### Data analysis

Data analysis procedure was carried out in two stages for quantitative and qualitative data. In the quantitative data analysis, Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was calculated to ensure the reliability of the inventory. Then, skewness and kurtosis coefficients were examined to determine whether the data showed a normal distribution. As a result of the analysis, the skewness coefficient was found to be -.13 and the kurtosis coefficient as .05. As skewness and kurtosis coefficients are within the values of  $\pm 1$ , it can be said that the data show normal distribution (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2010).

Descriptive statistics were conducted for demographic variables and means and standard deviations of three sub-headings of the inventory were estimated. Additionally, one-way analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) was performed to reveal the differences among the opinions of teachers at kindergarten, primary school, secondary school and high school groups, and the Scheffe test was conducted to determine the differences between the group pairs.

For qualitative data, content analysis technique was used which is defined as the identification, numeration and interpretation of repetitive subjects, problems and concepts (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Silverman, 2006). During content analysis, themes were created and codes were generated accordingly for each question through examining the expressions within the framework of the three sub-headings used by Zepeda (2007) to define the supervision process. In the analysis process, direct quotations for the opinions of the participants were submitted. A code is given to each participant when transferring direct citations (T1, T2, T3...).

Moreover, the supervision approaches were determined as professional or bureaucratic ones considering the content and means of the inventory items.

### Findings

The means, standard deviations and the level of agreement of the opinions of teachers on the supervisory practices of school principals including the items under the sub-headings of instructional supervision, professional development and evaluation are given in Table 2.

**Table 2.** The Opinions on the Supervisory Practices of School Principals

Item No	Supervisory approach	Items	$\bar{X}$	Sd	Level of agreement
<b>The sub-heading of instructional supervision</b>					
5	Professional	Do your teachers set their own instructional goals?	3,58	1,00	High
8	Professional	Are teachers in your school part of any planning that impacts teaching and learning?	3,26	1,19	Moderate
9	Professional	Do you assist and coach teachers who are struggling?	2,99	1,26	Moderate
16	Professional	Do your teachers use peer coaching?	2,40	1,15	Low

22	Professional	Do teachers in your school feel safe to try new approaches in their classrooms?	3,10	1,12	Moderate
28	Professional	Are teachers in your school a part of the implementation of new strategies/techniques that affect teaching and learning in your school?	2,97	1,14	Moderate
29	Professional	Do teachers at your school take responsibility for improving instruction?	3,25	1,13	Moderate
33	Professional	Do teachers in your school observe other teachers and provide feedback?	2,67	1,32	Moderate
36	Professional	Do your teachers' professional skills in the classroom improve when they read and use current professional articles and practices?	3,12	1,16	Moderate
37	Professional	Are teachers in your school involved in curriculum design?	2,47	1,30	Low
<b>GENERAL AVERAGE</b>			<b>2,98</b>	<b>,801</b>	Moderate
<b>The sub-heading of professional development</b>					
2	Professional	Do you collaborate with university faculty for professional development activities?	2,10	1,00	Low
3	Professional	Do those at your site charged with planning professional development provide feedback to other faculty members?	2,36	1,22	Moderate
4	Professional	Is mentoring used in your school?	2,42	1,15	Low
7	Professional	Do you discuss individual professional development when conferencing with teachers?	2,59	1,19	Low
13	Professional	Do your teachers grow professionally when they engage in dialogue with other teachers?	3,64	1,12	High
18	Professional	Do your teachers meet to discuss instructional practices in their classrooms?	2,36	1,09	Low
20	Professional	Do your teachers meet to discuss research articles in order to improve instructional practices in their classrooms?	1,95	1,11	Low
26	Bureaucratic	Are professional development activities related to your school goals?	2,37	1,07	Low
27	Bureaucratic	Do you utilize data (such as standardized test scores, portfolios, and teacher made tests) to plan your professional development activities?	2,64	1,13	Moderate
35	Professional	Do your teachers set their own professional development goals and activities?	3,75	1,35	High
<b>GENERAL AVERAGE</b>			<b>2,40</b>	<b>,635</b>	Low
<b>The sub-heading of evaluation</b>					
1	Bureaucratic	Do you make decisions regarding supervision based on the influences of outside entities?	3,79	,944	High
15	Bureaucratic	Do you mandate the use of specific instructional practices in the classroom?	4,03	,915	High
17	Bureaucratic	Do standards drive instruction at your school?	3,61	1,01	High
23	Bureaucratic	Do your principal expect to see a specific sequence of instructional activities when observing in the classroom?	3,65	,982	High
45	Bureaucratic	To what extent student performance on standardized tests is used?	3,45	1,05	High
46	Bureaucratic	To what extent teacher participation in professional development activities is used?	3,15	1,08	Moderate
48	Bureaucratic	To what extent do your principal use diagnostic or standardized tools that assess teaching methods?	3,15	1,16	Moderate
49	Bureaucratic	To what extent do your principal mind adherence by the teacher to a specific lesson design?	3,64	1,13	High
50	Bureaucratic	To what extent do your principal use number of grades in a teacher's grade book?	3,05	1,28	Moderate
52	Bureaucratic	To what extent do your principal use students meeting predetermined proficiencies in core subject areas?	2,91	1,16	Moderate
<b>GENERAL AVERAGE</b>			<b>3,44</b>	<b>,547</b>	High

As seen in Table 2, professional development is the dimension with the lowest mean according to teachers' answers related to the supervisory practices of school principals under three sub-headings ( $\bar{X}=2,40$ ). As a result of an in-depth examination of teachers' opinions in relation to this issue, a large majority of them stated that school principals do not have any efforts to get external support for professional development, to work with relevant institutions, to prepare development plans, to read about the field extensively, to cultivate learning into culture and to provide peer interaction and they explained all these outcomes resulting from the school principals' not having information about these kind of activities (n=10), their underestimation of the issue (n=5), their having a heavy workload (3), their lack of communication (n=2) and their not having a culture of learning (n=2). Very few of the teachers declared that they cooperate with the universities in the provinces where they live for social activities such as folk dance, music and painting (n=6). In addition, teachers emphasized that they have such expectations from the school principals to be entrepreneur (n=9), to be active (n=6), to be a researcher (n=5), to have a high level of awareness (n=4), to be guiding (n=4), and data-driven working (n=3).

Teachers' opinions on the sub-heading of professional development are as follows:

T1: *"Our principal cooperates with the relevant department of university for the activities in which we and the students can participate in music and folklore together."*

T5: *"I appreciate that our principal makes projects either in collaboration with NGOs or with the university on painting, music and so on in order to help our socialization process or to live up our teaching procedure."*

T9: *"I am trying to make my personal development plan by myself. Unfortunately, our school principal cannot advise me or other friends about it. Because s/he doesn't think it's important enough to focus on, or s/he thinks that it's our problem."*

T12: *"I think that our principal is not informed about what professional development is, its importance for teachers, and the responsibilities of school administrators about it."*

T19: *"Unfortunately, our principal is unable to guide on what we can do pertaining to our field or teamwork beside a coterie of teachers, because there are many different issues that s/he has to deal with other than educational ones, so I think s/he does not have enough time."*

T25: *"I think that an individual should have a social personality with high communication skills in order to receive external support in professional development. But it is not possible to say it for our principal as we do not observe manner seven within the school towards us in positive sense."*

T28: *"Our school principal should cooperate with different institutions, especially with universities. S/He should be a researcher in instructional matters, so that s/he can motivate us and s/he can do the right things..."*

According to Table 2, teachers' opinions on the supervisory practices of school principals are moderate ( $\bar{X}=2,98$ ). The participants who reported negatively about the instructional supervision practices pointed out that they do not come together to talk about instructional issues except for a coterie of teachers, they do not do much planning with their principals about instructional processes, their efforts are not adequately supported, they lack of the qualities of being open to innovations and using new instructional techniques and they do not have any information about peer coaching. They justified their position with no bureaucratic difference whether the teachers exert extra effort or not (n=5), not following current professional articles and practices (n=4), very few individuals 'desire to take responsibility to try new implementations (n=4), everyone's belief that s/he is perfect (n=3), a coterie of teachers meetings' being regarded as not but for routine (n=11). The participants who opined positively emphasized that they routinely come together every day (n=17), each individual supports the decisions made by a coterie of teachers (n=16), they receive material support required to enrich the teaching environment (n=15), they involve in the decision-making process especially for instructional ones (n=15) and they are supported by the administration to perform unusual practices to enrich teaching (n=12). Teachers remarked that they have expectation from their principals about giving positive or negative feedback on what they interact (n=22), giving access to financial support providers

to meet the requirements of educational issues (n=20), speeding up the implementation process by ensuring participation in decision-making (n=17), teacher-based instructional planning from the beginning of the semester together with the principal (n=12) and maintaining the continuity of supervision (n=5).

Teachers' opinions on the sub-heading of instructional supervision are as follows:

T3: *"The school where I work involves the individuals with hard living conditions in terms of socio-economic status and as this is the case, our principal and most of the teachers just save the day and do not concern about the idea of trying new methods or following good practices."*

T8: *"We gather and organize our routine meetings as meetings are regarded to be a necessity. I don't believe that a coterie of teachers is very effective. The discussion of issues such as reviewing and interpreting research in professional matters, encouraging to use new techniques, using different tools for assessment and evaluation etc. will be more efficient for us under normal circumstances."*

T14: *"I think we have too much deficiencies in the issues of goal setting in instructional matters at the beginning of the semester, and determining to what extent the goals have been reached, if not, why, what can be done, how can we support each other at the end of the semester. We fail because everyone thinks s/he does everything very well."*

T17: *"Our school principal is constantly supporting us in terms of learning by doing to enrich the teaching process, providing material support to enrich the teaching environment and participative decision-making on instructional issues."*

T20: *"Both we, as teachers, and our school principal are quite supportive to each other in motivating for instructional matters. Our principal listens to us and takes care to decide together especially in all matters related to teaching. Thus, the decisions will be supported by everyone."*

T27: *"Providing feedback on the functioning of our instructional processes will help us to notice our own shortcomings..."*

T28: *"At the beginning of each semester, instructional goals should be set together with the teachers and most importantly, the continuity of supervision should be ensured."*

As shown in Table 2, teachers found the supervisory practices of school principals related to the sub-heading of evaluation at the highest level ( $\bar{X}=3,44$ ). Teachers mentioned that their school principals act in accordance with the laws and regulations during the evaluation process (n=24), they have freed teachers during in-class activities (n=26), they follow general standards in the follow-up of instructional processes (n=23), they pay attention to the use of different teaching methods in the supervision of teaching practice (n=12), they include standard test results in the evaluation process (n=28) and they attach importance to commitment to lesson plans (n=28). Some other participants emphasized that their school principals do not use a number of assessment tools allowing to make accurate measurements during the evaluation process (n=6). They uttered their expectations from school principals in the evaluation process as giving more information about the process (n=12), paying attention to cooperation (n=15), being objective (n=13) and appreciating the achievements (n=8).

Teachers' opinions on the sub-heading of evaluation are as follows:

T1: *"Our school principal cares about using different teaching techniques. S/he can give us useful feedback upon observing different practices of each teacher."*

T9: *"Our school does not interfere with the practices we plan to do in the teaching process because s/he trusts us. S/He is constructive and guiding in general."*

T13: *"S/He enforces laws and regulations regarding the supervision determined by MoNE..."*

T15: *"S/He attaches great importance to overall exam results to increase the academic achievement, and interviews with the relevant field teachers if there is the level is below the expectance..."*

T18: *"If the supervision process is honestly conducted in accordance with its principles, it provides an enriching, constructive and holistic content for teaching processes. Therefore, it is necessary to give feedback to the teachers about the process, to plan*

*the process in a collaborative manner between supervisor and teacher and, most importantly, to take into account the principle of objectivity."*

T21: *"My biggest expectation for the evaluation process is the recognition of achievements to be encouraging..."*

T25: *"For the effective evaluation, the supervising and supervised parties should firstly manage and plan the process together..."*

In addition, when the contents and means of the survey items under the three sub-headings are ranked from highest to lowest, it is observed that while the principals' approaches in the supervisory process are thought to be less adequate by the teachers in terms of exhibiting professional approach, they regarded to be more sufficient to show bureaucratic approach. Teachers pointed out that their school principals lay more emphasis on fulfilling the procedures (n=28), identifying the teachers who are attached to the lesson plans as exemplary teachers (n=17), making evaluations based on the standard test results (n=28) and maintaining the status quo (n=10).

Teachers' opinions on which issues their principal show bureaucratic approach is:

T13: *"Our principal pays great importance not to disrupt the order, not to be at odds with others, and to follow what the regulation decrees..."*

T15: *"S/He is very supportive on many issues but like every principal, refers to the standard test results..."*

T21: *"It is very important for him/her that we thoroughly follow the lesson plans..."*

T23: *"S/He is quite sensitive in doing what is standard exactly and taking the standard test results into account..."*

T27: *"S/He applies to the full range of laws and regulations and even so s/he does not want to take any risks..."*

While teachers found the supervisory practices of school principals related to the sub-heading of professional development inadequate, they regarded the practices in the sub-heading of instructional supervision at medium level in general together with low scores on supporting the efforts, to be included in the curriculum process, and receiving feedback. They considered many of the practices in the sub-heading of evaluation high enough. According to the findings obtained in the interviews, it can be alleged that the expectations of the teachers regarding the supervision process are high to make the existing practices more meaningful and fit for purpose.

One-way variance analysis (ANOVA) was performed to determine whether teachers' responses to the items of inventory differ by the type of school. The results of one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) conducted to determine the difference between the opinions by the variable of school type are given in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Anova results of teachers' opinions on the supervisory practices of school principals by the variable of school type

Sub-heading	School type	n	$\bar{X}$	Sd	df	F	p
Instructional supervision	Kindergarten	190	3,00	,834	3 971	,287	,83
	Primary school	335	3,10	,761			
	Secondary School	244	3,05	,910			
	High school	206	3,01	,711			
Professional development	Kindergarten	190	2,41	,568	3 971	,755	,52
	Primary school	335	2,50	,506			
	Secondary School	244	2,30	,578			
	High school	206	2,39	,556			
Evaluation	Kindergarten	190	3,40	,615	3 971	,149	,93
	Primary school	335	3,50	,614			
	Secondary School	244	3,55	,705			
	High school	206	3,47	,597			

As shown in Table 3, there is no statistical difference between the sub-heading of instructional supervision and the variable of school type [ $F_{(3-971)} = ,287, p > .05$ ], between the sub-heading of professional development and the variable of school type [ $F_{(3-971)} = ,755, p > .05$ ] and the sub-heading of evaluation and the variable of school type [ $F_{(3-971)} = ,149, p > .05$ ]. In other words, although school types vary, the answers to the three sub-headings do not differ to a great extent.

### **Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions**

Today, supervisors should not only fulfil the legal procedures, but also model good teaching practices, and support the professional development of teachers to enhance and develop teaching. In this study, it was aimed to reveal the supervisory practices of school principals to cover the sub-headings of instructional supervision, professional development and evaluation, and the supervisory approaches they show when performing those practices. When the quantitative findings are evaluated, it was determined that the teachers' opinions on the sub-dimension of professional development related to the supervisory practices of school principals were at low levels. However, the adaptation of teachers and the educational processes to the potential alterations and innovations can be eased through minimizing the deviations in instructional objectives and the professional development of teachers. According to Sergiovanni (1995), principals have the responsibility to provide support and consultancy in developing the instructional practices of teachers. The qualitative findings with regard to this sub-heading demonstrate that the school principals were deemed insufficient by teachers in terms of cooperating with different institutions and organizations in order to support professional development, reading about the field, performing mentoring processes and most importantly creating the culture of learning at school. It indicates that qualitative findings support the quantitative ones. In parallel to the opinions of teachers, Bowers (1999), in his study, concluded that peer observation assisted to develop new ideas on teaching-learning processes at school and to enable people for sharing their experiences through contributing to teacher professional development. It can be alleged that professional development is an important process that should be supported by the school principals so that teachers can make learning a philosophy of life. There are a great many studies in the literature pointing out that professional development is a significant part of the supervision (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Carter, 2001; Oliva & Pawlas, 2001; Cooley & Shen, 2003; Zepeda, 2007). By the 2000s, the professional development of efficient teachers has been emphasized within the educational policies of number countries, especially the USA (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Achille & Tienken, 2005). In qualitative findings, teachers explained the reasons why school principals undertake professional development at a low level with having a high level of workload other than educational affairs, lacking of communication, and underestimating professional development. They expect their principals to be entrepreneur, active, researcher, guiding with high awareness, and have the principle of data-driven working. Quantitative and qualitative findings in this sub-heading show that school principals meet the expectations of teachers only at a low level to support professional development. In support of this finding, Buchberger, Campos, Kallos and Stephenson (2000) uttered that continuous professional development is not regarded as an integral part of the teaching process by both administrators and teachers. However, it can be asserted that professional development that is internalized by administrators and teachers can become a process that contributes both to the individual development of the teacher and to the realization of instructional goals and objectives, including many elements such as coaching relations, action research, resource supply and collaborative work. Zepada (2007) also stressed the importance of school principals to prepare professional development plans with every single teacher according to their individual needs using data obtained from the supervision process.

In the study, it was found that teachers participated the practices in the sub-heading of instructional supervision at the middle level. Peplinski (2009) achieved similar results in his study to determine the opinions of teachers and principals about the supervisory practices. While the conception of classical supervision loses

importance, effective supervision models, where professional development is at the forefront, have become a necessity both practically and theoretically (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon 2007; Range, 2010; Lunenburg & Irby, 2011). Here in, instructional supervision, which forms the basis for collaborative work and becomes a requirement for effective supervision, comes into prominence. As a result of an in-depth examination of the teachers' opinions, it was concluded that while some of the teachers opined positively about the supervision of teaching practice, the others have a negative view. The participants who opined negatively expressed that they do not come together to talk about instructional issues except for a coterie of teachers, their efforts are not adequately supported, there is little participation in using new methods and they do not apply peer coaching due to lack of information. Depending on this finding, it can be claimed that a coterie of teachers is regarded as routine rituals by the participants and it does not provide the anticipated contribution to the professional development of teachers and instructional processes. On the other hand, the participants who have positive opinions about the practices in the instructional supervision process believe that a coterie of teachers is used effectively for the instructional processes, it facilitates the implementation of the decisions taken, they receive the necessary material support to enrich teaching and all decisions about instructional issues are taken by common sense. The notion of instructional supervision aiming at contributing to teacher professional development can be viewed not only for the best interests of teachers, but also for students to have a more qualified education. Team work, communication, interaction and the understanding of neutral observation between teacher and supervisor play a critical role for the success of this process. It was concluded that the participants had expectations from the principals in the process of instructional supervision about getting feedback on the process, continual supervision, taking part in the decision-making process and conducting instructional planning together. In support of this finding, Topçu (2010) concluded in his study that the assessment and evaluation process should be conducted in order to develop both the administrator and the teacher in mutual cooperation. Principals should provide continuous support and incentives on instructional issues to improve teaching practices and to increase the effectiveness of their schools.

Teachers' opinions were estimated to be at a high level in the sub-heading of evaluation related to the supervisory practices of school principals. In other words, it can be interpreted that the practices of evaluation are regarded to be more adequate according to the participating teachers. In support of quantitative findings, it was concluded in qualitative findings that principals act in accordance with the laws and regulations, support in-class instructional issues, fulfill the general standards of the supervisory process, and take into account the standard achievement tests for the students' level of success during the supervision process. Supporting this result, the participating group of Hillyer's (2005) study also perceived the teacher assessment process to be effective. Some of the participating teachers stated that their principals do not use diagnostic and standardized testing tools during the evaluation process, but they have the expectation that their principals should use objective measurement tools to make unbiased evaluation. Costa, Garmston and Lambert (1988) emphasized that teacher evaluation should be done using a rating scale that includes performance-related value judgments. In addition, it was concluded that the participants had expectations from school principals to be objective, to give feedback, to pay attention to cooperation and to reward achievements. This finding can be interpreted that teachers have a concern for the neutrality of the supervision process and they are involved enough in the planning phase of the process. However, the school principals, who are the evaluators of teaching process, should present their opinions about the process and the data they have obtained to the knowledge of teachers and ensure this information to be used for the determination of new objectives. That's why, while the development of teaching practices is the first task of the principals in the evaluation process, the second task is to provide feedback about the findings.

According to the teachers' opinions, it was concluded that the principals adopted the bureaucratic approach in the supervisory process based on the means of the answers given to the inventory. It can be interpreted as the fact that school principals tend to continue their scientific supervision approach and

autocratic behaviours in the supervisory process. Wanzare (2012) asserted that some of the supervisory practices of principals could deteriorate the professional development of the teachers; that managers use harassing monitoring practices to encourage particularly low-performing teachers to quit job; that they even apply to questionable supervisory practices to ensure adherence to school rules; and that they prioritize the procedures rather than the objectives in the supervisory process. However, explicit policies for the supervisory process should be developed and the required resources, feedback and follow-up support (Tesfaw & Hofman, 2012; Wanzare, 2012) should be provided.

It was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the groups in the ANOVA test, which was conducted to reveal the difference between teachers' opinions about the supervisory practices by the variable of school type. This finding implies that whatever the type of school is, teachers' opinions are similar. In contrast to this finding, Deniz and Erdener (2016) found a significant difference between the instructional supervision behaviours of principals in the sub-dimensions of "teaching and teacher development" and "class visits and feedback" by the type of school. The difference between the two research may be due to the study group or the fact that our study embraces the supervisory processes as a whole. That's why, while the study of Deniz and Erdener (2016) is only limited to Bursa, our study includes data collected from seven different cities of Turkey.

When the obtained findings are evaluated in general, teachers' opinions on supervisory practices differ in three sub-headings. Based on the findings, it can be claimed that meeting the expectations of teachers regarding the practices in the supervisory process is important for the meaningfulness of the process. The study suggests that the supervisory process of school principals should be considered in a holistic approach. That's why, as the support for the professional development of teachers increases, the practices of instructional supervision will be improved, and so the scientific supervision practices in the evaluation process and the behaviours that are thought to be autocratic may be reduced.

In light of research results, the following can be suggested:

- The planning of supervisory processes at the beginning of each academic year with the cooperation of teacher and principal,
- The adoption of professional approach in supervisory practices,
- The principals' prosecution and implementation of innovations regarding the supervision process,
- Revealing the supervisory philosophies underlying the principals' own perspectives, their supervisory practices and supervision approaches through conducting studies on different sample groups.

## GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

### Bürokratik ve Profesyonel Perspektif Bağlamında Okul Müdürlerinin Denetim Uygulamaları

#### Problem cümlesi ve çalışmanın amacı

Okulların evrensel amacı öğrencinin öğrenme süreci üzerine odaklanarak (Glickman, Gordon ve Gordon, 2014), onlara gerekli olan bilgi-beceri ve tutumları kazandırmaktır. İşte bu amacın gerçekleştirilebilmesi ve sürecin etkililiğinin artırılabilmesi için öğretmen öğrenmesi üzerine odaklanmak gerekmektedir. Öğretmenin öğrenme sürecini desteklemek, öğrencinin neyi, ne kadar öğrendiğini değerlendirebilmek içinde etkili denetim sürecine ihtiyaç vardır. Blasé ve Blasé (2004) denetimi, güven inşa etmek, öğretmenleri güçlendirmek ve yansıtmayı teşvik etmek amacıyla denetleyici inançların ve eğitim felsefelerinin bir birleşimi olarak görmektedirler. Bilimsel yönetim, demokratik etkileşim yaklaşımı, işbirlikçi denetim, müfredat geliştirme denetimi, klinik denetim, grup dinamikleri, koçluk ve öğretim denetimi de dahil olmak üzere denetimde farklı süreçlere vurgu yapılmıştır (Blasé ve Blasé, 2004). Ayrıca, denetimin nasıl yapılması gerektiğine yönelik sorular denetim sürecinde, bürokratik ve profesyonel denetim yaklaşımı olarak iki farklı denetim yaklaşımının ortaya çıkmasına sebep olmuştur. 1890'larda ortaya çıkan denetimde bürokratik yaklaşım fikri (Glanz, 1998; Hanson, 1996; Reitzug, 1997) ile denetçiler, öğretmenleri bilimsel denetim sürecinde önceden belirlenmiş bir dizi kriter çerçevesinde değerlendirmişlerdir. 1890'lar sonrasında ise bürokratik yaklaşımın denetimde kısıtlılığına dikkat çekilerek, denetim süreci için profesyonel yaklaşım fikri ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu yaklaşımda Peplinski (2009) denetimde profesyonelliği, demokratik idealler çerçevesinde öğretmenlerin süreç içerisinde dahil edildiği bir durum olarak ele almıştır. Özellikle eğitim-öğretim sürecinin etkililiğinin artırılmasında ideal denetim olarak tanımlanan öğretimsel denetim (Goldhammer, Anderson ve Krajewski, 1980), öğretmen mesleki gelişimi yoluyla öğrenci başarısının iyileştirilmesinde önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Denetim sürecindeki başarının en büyük belirleyici olan okul müdürlerini de önemli görevler düşmektedir. Bu süreçte okul müdürlerinin öğretim uzmanı olması, müfredatı desteklemesi, mesleki gelişim sağlayıcı ortamlar oluşturması, veriye dayalı karar vermeyi kullanması, vizyon sahibi olarak okulun sahip olduğu maddi/manevi kaynakları ve personeli öğrenci başarısını arttırmak için birleşik bir güç haline getirebilmesi beklenmektedir (Tucker, 2003).

Türkiye'de eğitim denetimine ilişkin yapılan çalışmalar incelendiğinde, denetim sürecinde denetmenlerin, öğretimsel sorunlara çözüm bulma, öğretmen mesleki gelişimini destekleme, öğrenci başarısını artırma ve öğretmeni güdüleme konularında yetersiz oldukları sonucuna ulaşıldığı görülmektedir. Ayrıca alan araştırması yapıldığında Türkiye'de okul müdürünün denetim uygulamalarını değerlendirmeye yönelik yapılan çalışmaların sınırlı olduğu da görülmektedir. Bu çalışmanın, denetim sürecinde mevcutta yapılan uygulamaların neler olduğunun ortaya çıkarılmasına, eksik olan yönlerin geliştirilmesine ve 2023 vizyon belgesinde denetim konusunda yapılması beklenen uygulamalara katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir. Çünkü 2023 vizyon belgesinde denetim süreçlerindeki farklılaşmanın odağında öğretimin iyileştirilmesine yönelik öğretmen ve okul temelli rehberlik yer almakta ve teftiş sisteminin okul geliştirme amaçlı rehberlik boyutu öne çıkmaktadır. Bu bağlamda bu araştırmanın amacı okul müdürlerinin, öğretim denetimi, mesleki gelişim ve değerlendirme uygulamaları esas alınarak, denetim uygulamalarına ve uygulamalarda benimsedikleri denetim yaklaşımlarına yönelik öğretmen görüşlerini belirlemektir.

#### Yöntem

Araştırma karma yöntem araştırma yaklaşımına göre tasarlanmıştır. Veriler, 2016-2017 eğitim-öğretim yılı bahar dönemi boyunca Bursa, Gaziantep, İzmir, Antalya, Samsun, Batman ve Eskişehir illerindeki kamuya bağlı anaokulu, ilkökul, ortaokul ve liselerde çalışan öğretmenlerden toplanmıştır. Nitel veri için çalışma grubunu, maksimum çeşitlilik örnekleme yöntemine göre belirlenmiş 28 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır.

Araştırma verileri Peplinski'nin (2009) "Okul müdürü ve öğretmen algılarına göre öğretmen denetimi" adlı doktora çalışmasında kullandığı "Öğretimsel Liderlik Envanteri" aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Araştırmanın nitel verileri ise yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formu ile toplanmıştır. Nicel veri analizinde, ölçme aracının güvenilirliği için Cronbach Alpha güvenilirlik katsayısı bulunmuş, ayrıca betimsel istatistik, tek yönlü varyans analizi ve Scheffe testi yapılmıştır. Nitel veri analizinde ise içerik analiz tekniği kullanılmıştır.

### **Bulgular ve tartışma**

Nicel bulgular değerlendirildiğinde, müdürlerin denetim uygulamaları içerisinde yer alan mesleki gelişim alt boyutuna ilişkin öğretmen görüşlerinin düşük düzeyde olduğu belirlenmiştir. Oysaki öğretmen mesleki gelişimi ile öğretimsel hedeflerdeki sapmalar en aza indirilerek, ortaya çıkabilecek değişme ve yenileşmelere gerek öğretmenlerin uyumu gerekse öğretim süreçlerinin adapte olması daha da kolaylaşabilir. Sergiovanni (1995)'e göre, müdürlerin, öğretmenlere karşı öğretimsel uygulamalarını geliştirebilme noktasında destek sağlama ve onlara danışmanlık etme gibi sorumlulukları vardır.

Araştırmada öğretmenlerin, öğretimsel denetim alt başlığında yapılan uygulamalara orta düzeyde katıldıkları bulgusuna ulaşılmıştır. Benzer sonuca Peplinski (2009) de denetim uygulamalarına yönelik öğretmen ve müdür görüşlerini belirlemeye yönelik çalışmasında ulaşmıştır. Klasik denetim anlayışının önemini kaybederek, mesleki gelişimin ön planda olduğu etkili denetim modelleri gerek uygulama, gerekse kuramsal açıdan bir zorunluluk haline gelmiştir (Glickman, Gordon ve Ross, Gordon 2007; Range, 2010; Lunenburg ve Irby, 2011). Bu noktada işbirlikçi çalışmayı temele alan ve etkili denetim için gereklilik haline gelen öğretimsel denetim ön plana çıkmaktadır. Öğretmen görüşlerinin derinlemesine incelemesi sonucunda da öğretim denetimi uygulamalarına yönelik öğretmenlerin bazılarının olumlu, bazılarının ise olumsuz görüş bildirdikleri sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Öğretmen mesleki gelişimine katkıda bulunmayı amaç edinen öğretimsel denetim anlayışı, sadece öğretmenlerin yüksek yararına değil aynı zamanda öğrencilerin de daha nitelikli bir eğitim almalarına katkı sağlayacaktır denebilir.

Okul müdürlerinin denetim uygulamalarının, değerlendirme alt başlığında öğretmen görüşleri yüksek düzeyde ortaya çıkmıştır. Başka bir ifadeyle değerlendirmeye yönelik yapılan uygulamalar katılımcı öğretmenler tarafından daha yeterli görülmüştür denebilir. Nicel bulguları destekler nitelikte, nitel bulgularda, müdürlerin yasa ve yönetmeliğe uygun davrandıkları, sınıf içi öğretimsel konularda destek oldukları, denetim sürecinin genel standartlarını yerine getirdikleri ve genel başarı testlerindeki öğrenci başarısını denetim sürecinde dikkate aldıkları sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Bu sonucu destekler nitelikte, Hillyer (2005)'in araştırmasında da katılımcı grup, öğretmen değerlendirme sürecini etkili olarak algılamışlardır.

Öğretmen görüşlerine göre anket sorulara verilen cevapların aritmetik ortalamaları esas alınarak yapılan değerlendirmede müdürlerin denetim sürecinde bürokratik yaklaşımı benimsediklerini sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Buda okul müdürlerinin, denetim sürecinde hala bilimsel denetim yaklaşımını ve otokratik davranışları sürdürme eğiliminde oldukları şeklinde yorumlanabilir.

Okul türü değişkenine göre denetim uygulamalarına yönelik öğretmen görüşleri arasındaki farkı ortaya çıkarmaya yönelik yapılmış ANOVA testinde, gruplar arasında istatistiki olarak anlamlı bir farkın olmadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu bulgu okul türü her ne olursa olsun, öğretmen görüşlerinin birbirleri ile benzer olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu bulgudan farklı olarak, Deniz ve Erdener (2016) müdürlerin sergiledikleri öğretimsel denetim davranışlarının "öğretimi ve öğretmeni geliştirme" ile "sınıf ziyaretleri ve geri bildirim sunma" alt boyutlarında okul türü açısından anlamlı bir farklılık olduğunu bulmuşlardır.

### **Sonuç ve Öneri**

Genel olarak elde edilen bulgular değerlendirildiğinde öğretmenlerin, denetim uygulamalarına ilişkin görüşleri 3 alt başlıkta farklılık göstermektedir. Bulgulara dayalı olarak, öğretmenlerin denetim sürecindeki

uygulamalara yönelik beklentilerinin karşılanmasının sürecin anlamlılığı açısından önemli olduğu söylenebilir. Araştırma göstermektedir ki okul müdürlerinin denetim uygulamaları bütünsel bir yaklaşım içerisinde düşünülmelidir. Çünkü öğretmenlerin mesleki gelişimlerine destek arttıkça, öğretimsel denetim uygulamaları iyileşecek, böylece de değerlendirme sürecindeki bilimsel denetim uygulamaları ve otokratik olduğu düşünülen davranışlar azalabilecektir.

Araştırma sonuçlarından elde edilen bulgular ışığında şunlar önerilebilir:

- Denetim süreçlerinin öğretmen, müdür işbirliği ile her eğitim-öğretim dönemi başlangıcında planlanması,
- Denetim uygulamalarında profesyonel yaklaşımın benimsenmesi.

## REFERENCES

- Acheson, K.A., & Waite, D.E. (1998). Foundations in supervision. In F. Gerald & E. Pajak (Ed.). *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 177-180). NY: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.
- Achilles, C.M., & Tienken, C.H. (2005). Professional development and educational improvement? In L.W. Hughes (Ed). *Current issues in school leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associated, Publishers.
- Arslan, H., & Beytekin, F. (2004). *İlköğretim okul müdürleri için eğitim liderliği standartlarının araştırılması* [Öz]. Oral presentation in XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı, 6-9 Temmuz 2004, Malatya. Accessed from <http://www.pegem.net/dosyalar/dokuman/82.pdf>.
- Aydın, İ. (2014). *Öğretimde denetim*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Balcı, A., Aydın, İ., Yılmaz, K., Memduhoğlu, H. B., & Apaydın, Ç. (2007). Türk eğitim sisteminde ilköğretimin yönetimi ve denetimi: mevcut durum ve yeni perspektifler. In S. Özdemir, H. Bacanlı, & M. Sözer (Ed.). *Türkiye'de okul öncesi ve ilköğretim sistemi: temel sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri*. Ankara: Türk Eğitim Derneği Yayını.
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (2004). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How successful principals promotes teaching and learning* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bowers, D. L. (1999). *Teachers' use of peer observation and feedback as a means of professional development* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California (UMI Number: 9933793).
- Buchberger, F., Campos, B.P., Kallos, D., & Stephenson, J. (Ed.). (2000). *Greenpaper on teacher education in Europe: High quality teacher education for high quality education and training* [Electronic version]. Accessed from <http://tntee.umu.se/publications/greenpaper.html>
- Burgaz, B. (1995). İlköğretim kurumlarının denetiminde yeterince yerine getirilmediği görülen bazı denetim rolleri ve nedenleri [Enough in the supervision of primary educational institutions some auditing roles and reason that were mot made]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11, 127-134.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. Çakmak, E., Akgün, E.Ö., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2010). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (6<sup>th</sup> Edition). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Carter, S. C. (2001). *No Excuses: Lessons from 21 High-performing, high-poverty schools*. Washington D.C.: The Heritage Foundation.
- Chao, C-Y., & Dugger, J.C. (1996). A total quality management model for instructional supervision in vocational technical programs. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 33(4), 23-35.
- Cooley, V. E., & Shen, J. (2003). School accountability and professional job responsibilities: A perspective from secondary principals. *National Association of Secondary Principal's Bulletin*, 87, 10-25.
- Costs, A.L., Garmston, R., & Lambert, L. (1988). Evaluation of teaching: The cognitive development view. In S.J. Stanley & W. J. Popham (Ed.). *Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success* (pp. 145-172). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Deniz, Ü., & Erdener, M. A. (2016). Okul müdürlerinin sergilediği öğretimsel denetim davranışlarına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. In Tüfekçi, Ö. K. (Ed.). *Sosyal bilimlerde stratejik araştırmalar* (pp. 69-81). Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Erdem, A. R. (2006). Eğitimin denetimsel temelleri. In V. Sönmez (Ed.). *Eğitim bilimine giriş* (pp. 243-260), Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

- Glanz, J. (1998). Roles, responsibilities, and relationships. In F. Gerald & E. Pajak (Ed.). *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 375-396). NY: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.
- Glickman, C., Gordon, S. and Ross-Gordon, J. (2007). *Supervision and instructional leadership - A developmental approach*. Pearson Education Inc.
- Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P., & J.M. Ross-Gordon (2014). *Supervision an instructional leadership: A developmental approach*. Boston: MaAllyn and Bacon.
- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H., & Krajewski, R. J. (1980). *Clinical supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New-York: Holt/Rinehart/Wiston.
- Gürbüz, S., & F., Şahin (2017). *Sosyal Bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Hanson, E. M. (1996). *Instructional behavior and organizational behavior*, (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Harris, B. M. (1998). Paradigms and parameters of supervision in education. In F. Gerald & E. Pajak (Ed.). *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 1-34). NY: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.
- Hillyer, D. (2005). *A case study of teacher evaluation and supervision at a high performing urban elementary school* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern, California.
- Ivankova, N., & Kawamura, Y. (2010). Emerging trends in the utilization of integrated designs in the social, behavioural, and health sciences. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddie (Ed.). *Handbook of mixed methods in social&behavioral research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 581-611). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lunenburg, F., & Irby, B. (2011). Instructional strategies to facilitate learning. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(1), 20-21.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wanda, M.T., & Zimpher, N. L. (1986). An examination of three theoretical perspectives on supervision: Perceptions of preservice field supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 1(2), 83-99.
- MoNE (2018). 2023 Vizyon Belgesi. Accessed from <http://2023vizyonu.meb.gov.tr>
- Memduhoğlu, H. B., & Engin, M. (2012). Çağdaş eğitim denetimi modeli olarak öğretimsel denetimin Türk eğitim sisteminde uygulanabilirliği [Implementability instructional supervision as a contemporary educational supervision model in Turkish educational system]. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi*, 5(1), 131-142.
- Memduhoğlu, H. B. (2009). *Paydaşların gözüyle Türkiye’de eğitim denetimi sorunsalı* [Öz]. Oral presentation in IV. Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi, 14-15 Mayıs 2009, Denizli. Accessed from [https://www.pegem.net/akademi/kongrebildiri\\_detay.aspx?id=48633](https://www.pegem.net/akademi/kongrebildiri_detay.aspx?id=48633)
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis* (Second edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Nolan, J. F., & Hoover, L. A. (2008). *Teacher supervision and evaluation: Theory into practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Oliva, P. F., & Pawlas, G., E. (2001). *Supervision for today’s school* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: John Wiley&Sons, Inc.
- Peplinski, R.M. (2009). *Pirincipals’ and teachers’ perceptions of teacher supervision*. PHD Thesis, College University of Nevada, LasVegas

- Range, B. (2010). Instructional supervision: The principal's role in modeling Professional development standard. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 5(4), 1-4.
- Reitzug, U.C. (1997). Images of principal as instruction leadership: from super-vision to collaborative inquiry. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 12, 356-366.
- Sarıyar, Y. (1997). *İlköğretim okullarında branş öğretmenlerinin denetiminde kullanılmakta olan teftiş formunun ilköğretim müfettişleri ve branş öğretmenlerinde değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elâzığ.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2000). Alternative approaches to supervision: Cases from the Field. *Journal of curriculum and supervision*, 15(3), 212-35.
- Tesfaw, T.A., & Hofman, R.H. (2012). *Instructional supervision and its relationship with professional development: Perception of private and government secondary school teachers in Addis Ababa*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Groningen, Netherlands.
- Topçu, İ. (2010). Devlet ve özel ilköğretim okullarında yöneticilerin öğretimin denetimi görevini yerine getirme biçimleri [Supervisory and evolutionary styles of school administrators in Turkish state and primary schools]. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 34(2),31-39.
- Tucker, P. D. (2003). The principalship: Renewed call for instructional leadership. In L. Duke, M. Grogan, PD Tucker, and WF Heineke (Ed.). *Educational leadership in the age of accountability: The Virginia experience* (pp. 97-113). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Wanzare, Z. (2012). Instructional Supervision in Public Secondary Schools in Kenya. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 40 (2), 188-216.
- Yücel, H., & Toprakçı, E. (2009). *Öğretmen denetiminin ihmal edilen boyutu olarak eğitsel denetim* [Öz]. Oral presentation in Uluslararası Katılımlı Ulusal Eğitim Denetimi Sempozyumu, 22-23 Haziran 2009, Türk Eğitimciler ve Müfettişler Sendikası, Ankara.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2007). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). NY: Eye on Education.