

## Teachers' Views about the Course Supervision of Primary School Principals\*

Esra Firinciogullari Bige<sup>1</sup> and Pinar Yengin Sarpkaya<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics Specialist, Turkey*

<sup>2</sup>*Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences Department, Adnan Menderes University, Aydin, Turkey*

**KEYWORDS** Principals.Course Supervision.Clinical Supervision.Teachers' Views.School

**ABSTRACT**The aim of the present study is to determine the views of teachers about course supervision practices of primary school principals. The population of the study is 396 primary school teachers working in Sisli, Istanbul, Turkey in 2013-2014 academic years. Data collection tool was developed by the researchers. Some of the results of the research are: The views of teachers about primary school principals' course supervision are "positive" in all of the three sub-dimensions of the scale. No significant difference was found in three dimensions according to teachers' gender. According to the time that principals allocate for course supervision, a significant difference was found in three dimensions among the views of the teachers supervised by those principals. The expectations of the teachers from course supervision -by the order of importance- are "counseling, feedback, completing the lack of materials, determination of occupational inadequacies, increasing the quality of the rewards and education".

### INTRODUCTION

Educational practice is an ongoing phenomenon, occurring formally or informally. These days, the nature of educational practices that are deepening and getting more complex are tried to be understood and made effective. The primary concern considered is maximizing the student success. At this point, after genetic factors playing a role on student success, the most important factor that should be observed and developed is teachers. As it is difficult to affect genetic factors, affecting and enhancing the teachers becomes important (Ilgan 2012). Policy makers lay stress on teachers as a way to improve student outcomes (Harris et al. 2014) and teacher evaluation is in the center of education policy reforms of today (Master 2014: 207). Underperforming teachers both cause failure at reaching the aims and affect others by their behaviors (Jones et al. 2006). Besides, it is necessary to support and develop teachers. Developing teachers and helping them is not possible by telling simply what to do (Hammond and Bransford 2007). It is compulsory to determine what kind of help a teacher needs, to help him or her, and for this it is also compulsory to observe and supervise his or her works (Taymaz 2011). Today, supervision system is also affected by

the scientific developments, the same as all the other areas. Having this, contributions of teachers, administrators and supervisors working in educational institutions to change should be in a high level (Erdem and Eroglu 2012).

Supervision of teaching has been considered as an important research field in developed countries especially since 1980s. Supervision models which provide development in professional knowledge and skills, and fulfill interests, needs and expectations of teachers to realize effective teaching have been trying to be developed (Ozmen 2000).

Identifying the realization level of the targets, correcting the deviations -if there are any- and elimination of deficiencies are possible only through a healthy supervision process (Erdem 2006). Educational supervision plays an important role in achieving the educational aims. Besides, the determination of current status, supervision has theoretical and practical functions about what should be done for reaching the aims and how to provide professional development of teachers (Ozmen and Gungor 2008). In fact, supervision helps the teachers to organize a learning supportive environment in the classroom and at the school (Henson 2007).

According to the power given by guidelines, besides, educational supervisors, principals also have duties of supervising teachers and courses. Educational supervision in Turkey is under the responsibility of Ministry of National Education by the Basic Law of National Education

\* Through the thesis advisory of Assist. Prof. Dr. Pinar Yengin Sarpkaya, this paper is based on the master thesis of Esra Firinciogullari Bige have the same title.

no. 1739 article 56. Minister of National Education gives authority to Ministry of National Education Supervisors, to provincial national education supervisors and also to school principals.

In the article 60 of the guidelines on primary education institutions, there is an expression under the duties of a school principal as: "A school principal has the authority to realize his or her duties suitable for laws, regulations, guidelines, directions, curriculum and commands, to regulate and supervise the school environment, besides, giving lectures. A principal is responsible for administration of the school towards its aims" (MEB 2003). Both the article 76 of the guideline on secondary education institutions (MEB 2009) and article 60 of the guideline on primary education institutions (MEB 2001) give the authority of supervision to the principals.

Principals' actions suitable for contemporary supervision principles based on process management in the supervision of training are important in terms of academic effectiveness of the schools. Meeting this necessity is bound to both effective instructional leadership roles of principals and teachers' coordination of their actions towards the targets (Ozbas 2010). Principals' capabilities are influential in the process of reaching the goals of the institutions. Thus the perception of "A school is as capable as its principal" has occurred in recent years (Yildirim 1999). Principals are the most important and primary responsible individuals for providing the best learning (Zepeda 2007) and the most significant instructional leadership responsibilities of principals are supervision and evaluation of the teachers (Khan et al. 2009). Accordingly, there are some researches in literature showing that, teachers prefer to be supervised by their school principals (Altun 2014) and teacher evaluation conducted by school principals is a common worldwide practice (Orphanos 2014: 243).

The fact that principals' duties and responsibilities are numerous and educational administration is not being accepted as a professional area in Turkey has caused the outcome of principals taking the responsibility of instructional leadership and supervisory roles insufficiently (Bayraktutan 2011). However, school principals, as instructional leaders, are necessary to supervise teachers' instructional activities in the classroom and to organize programs to develop these activities. Instructional leadership roles of the principals are as important as financial and bureaucratic procedures. In addition, principals should supervise classroom activities, have

close relationships with teachers and provide guidance to the teachers. The aim of all the activities is naturally to improve the instructional process. From this point of view, this study is thought to raise the awareness of course supervision roles of the principals.

As societies' expectations from students rise, expectations from teachers increase naturally. Besides, teachers face many struggles, changes and reforms in educational life (Day 2012) and they need professional support (Taymaz 2011). Thus, school principals need to dedicate more time to develop teachers (Bullis 2014) and this is possible with effective course supervision. In fact, supervision is the core of the improvement of teaching (Sullivan and Glanz 2009). Since, the supervision of teachers may be the cores of national education policies, the researches about teacher supervision are crucial. In literature there are many researches about supervision and supervisory behavior, on the other hand there are limited researches targeting the issues in "teacher supervision guides". The present study considers all the items relating teacher supervision in Ministry of National Education's Teacher Supervision Guide. Besides, in this research, the expectations of teachers from course supervision are collected by not a well-structured scale, but an open ended question form.

The problem sentence of this study is: What are the teachers' views about primary education principals' course supervision? Sub-problems of the research are below:

1. What are the teachers' views about the course supervision of the principals in "planning", "classroom management and communication", "classroom activities and student orientation" dimensions of the scale.
2. Are there any significant difference between the teachers' views in "planning", "classroom management and communication", "classroom activities and student orientation" dimensions of the scale related to the course supervision of the principals and the teachers' gender, total service years and last graduated schools; principals' branches and time allocated by the principals for course supervision?
3. What do the teachers expect from the principals related to the course supervision?

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Method

In this study, descriptive survey model was chosen to identify the views of the teachers about

primary school principals' course supervision (Johnson and Christensen 2004; Lodico et al. 2006). The aim of the descriptive survey modeled study is to determine the views of the population as high level as possible (Crano and Brever 2002).

### Population and Sampling

The population of the present study is composed of 369 primary school teachers working at 18 primary schools in Sisli County in Istanbul in 2012-2013 academic years. 298 teachers voluntarily participated in the study. However, 33 scales were eliminated in the process of data analysis as they were not fully answered, had extreme values or were answered in a manner which was not reflecting the reality. In brief, the study was conducted with 266 primary school teachers. 168 (63.2%) of the teachers are female and 98 (36.8%) of them are male; the average of teachers' total service year is ( $X=15.9$ ).

### Data Collection Tool

Data collection tool used in the study was developed based on the items in "Teacher Assessment Form" given in "Teacher Supervision Guide" prepared by Ministry of National Education in 2011. Properties expected from the teachers, which are given in "Teacher Assessment Form" were dealt with 43 items and 6 sub-dimensions.

Data collection tool included two parts. The first one was composed of 9 questions about demographic variables of the teachers and an open-ended question in which attendants were asked to write their expectations from supervision by the order of importance. The second part of the scale consisted of 42 items which provided the views of the teachers about principals' course supervision. These 42 items, in fact, are the items that principals and supervisors have to consider in "Teacher Assessment Form". The 13<sup>th</sup> item in the "Teacher Assessment Form" used in the institutions of Ministry of National Education was eliminated as it assessed similar properties with the 12<sup>th</sup> item.

For the validity of scale, three educational administration experts' views were consulted. Explanatory Factor Analysis was also performed for the validity of the scale. Before factor analysis, anti-image correlation coefficients of the items were taken. Anti-image correlation coeffi-

cients of the items were found above 50. Thus, all of the items were included in the study. The KMO test result of the scale is  $96 > .05$  and Bartlett test result of the scale is  $12299, 797 > .05$ . For determining the sub-dimensions of the scale which are independent from each other "Principal Component Analysis" was performed (Buyukozturk 2012). At the end of the analysis according to varimax method 3 factor and 32 items were found. After the analysis, 10 items were eliminated from the scale. 15 of the scale items are under the first factor, 9 of them are under the second and 8 of them are under the third factor. As a result, it was observed that these 3 factors, whose eigenvalues are above 1.00 explain the 72% of the total variance. The first factor explaining 28.5% of the total variance was named as "planning", the second factor explaining 26% of the total variance was named as "classroom management and communication" and the third factor which explained 17% of the total variance was named as "classroom activities and student orientation". Factor loads were resulted between 862-693 in the first factor, 898-690 in the second factor, 838-686 in the third factor and 745-307 in the fourth factor. After the reliability test, cronbach alpha coefficient of "planning" was found as  $\alpha=.93$ , "classroom management and communication" and "classroom activities and student orientation" were found as  $\alpha=.97$ .

### Data Collection

Necessary permissions were obtained; data collection tools were handed out to 299 voluntary teachers by the researcher and some of them were collected at the same day and the others were collected a few days later from the schools. Sisli is one of the biggest and most composite counties in Istanbul in terms of socio-economic and socio-cultural status. Teachers' not being eager to participate in a study related to education as this is negative as they work in a big county like Sisli. On the contrary, falling in with teachers and principals supporting this study and willing to get feedback about the study is positive.

### Data Analysis

Percentage, frequency, average and standard deviation for each of the expressions were used

to determine the views of the teachers about primary school principals' course supervision. Views of the teachers about primary school principals' course supervision was analyzed by t-test for two-group independent variables (as gender) and by F test for three-group ones (as the latest school graduated from, the branches, the time allocated for supervision). When there was a significant difference, the source of the difference was tried to be found via Scheffe test.

Answers in the scale were scored as *strongly disagree* (1), *disagree* (2), *slightly agree* (3), *agree* (4) and *strongly agree* (5). Items 1, 2, 23, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50 and 53 were coded reversely. Averages were interpreted with the ranges as *strongly disagree*: 1.00-1.79, *disagree*: 1.80-2.59, *slightly agree*: 2.60-3.39, *agree*: 3.40-4.19 and *strongly agree*: 4.20-5.00. Collected data were saved and analyzed via SPSS 18.0 for windows.

## RESULTS

Findings for the first sub-purpose of the study concerning "What are the teachers' views about the course supervision of the primary school principals in "planning", "classroom management and communication", "classroom activities and student orientation" dimensions of the scale are given in Table 1.

As indicated in Table 1, average of the views of the teachers about principals' course supervision is in the level of "agree" in all three dimensions. Thus, teachers' views about the principals' course supervision are in the level of "positive"

for the dimensions of planning, classroom management and communication, classroom activities and student orientation. Teachers' views in the dimension of classroom activities and student orientation have the highest average. Thus, it can be stated that teachers agree to be supervised mostly in this dimension.

Findings for the second sub-purpose identified as "Are there any significant difference between the teachers' views about the course supervision of the primary school principals in "planning", "classroom management and communication", "classroom activities and student orientation" dimensions of the scale and teachers' gender, total service years and last graduated schools; principals' branches and time allocated for course supervision?" are given in Tables 2 and 3.

As indicated in Table 2, there is no significant difference in the dimensions of "planning"  $t_{(264)} = -1.621, p > .05$ , "classroom management and communication"  $t_{(264)} = -.863, p > .05$  and "classroom activities and student orientation" according to teachers' gender.

As indicated in Table 3, teachers' views about the primary school principals' course supervision don't show a significant difference in the dimensions of "planning"  $F_{(3, 262)} = 1.418, p > .05$ , "classroom management and communication"  $F_{(3, 262)} = .663, p > .05$  and "classroom activities and student orientation"  $F_{(3, 262)} = .353, p > .05$  according to their total service years. Thus, it can be deduced that principals supervise teachers having different seniorities similarly.

**Table 1: Findings related to the sub-dimensions of the teachers views about primary school principals' course supervision scale**

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>ss</i>	<i>Choice</i>	<i>Level of positiveness</i>
<i>Planning</i>	3.53	.928	Agree	Positive
<i>Classroom Management and Communication</i>	3.57	.893	Agree	Positive
<i>Classroom Activities and Student Orientation</i>	3.60	.908	Agree	Positive

**Table 2: t-test results related to the sub-dimensions of the teachers views about primary school principals' course supervision scale and teachers' gender**

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>ss</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Planning</i>	Female	168	3.46	.954	264	-1.621	.106
	Male	98	3.65	.873			
<i>Classroom Management and Communication</i>	Female	168	3.53	.881	264	-.863	.389
	Male	98	3.63	.915			
<i>Classroom Activities and Student Orientation</i>	Female	168	3.58	.895	264	-.467	.641
	Male	98	3.64	.933			

**Table 3: One way variance analysis results related to the teachers' views about primary school principals' course supervision scale and teachers' total service years**

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Source of variance</i>	<i>Sum of squares</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>Square average</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P*</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
<i>Planning</i>	Between groups	3.651	3	1.217	1.418	.238	-
	Within groups	224.844	262	.858			
	Total	228.495	265				
<i>Classroom Management and Communication</i>	Between groups	1.595	3	.532	.663	.575	-
	Within groups	209.988	262	.801			
	Total	211.582	265				
<i>Classroom Activities and Student Orientation</i>	Between groups	.880	3	.293	.353	.787	-
	Within groups	217.174	262	.831			
	Total	218.594	265				

\*P<.05

The views of the teachers about primary school principals' course supervision don't show any significant difference (p>.05) according to their last graduated schools in all three dimensions of the scale. Last graduated schools of the teachers don't have any effect on their views about principals' course supervision. This result is represented in Table 4.

The views of the teachers about principals' course supervision does not show any significant difference according to the branches of the principals in the dimension of "planning"; while it does in the dimensions of "classroom manage-

ment and communication" and "classroom activities and student orientation". Views of the teachers whose principals' branch is "Primary school teacher" (X=3.69) are significantly more positive than the views of the teachers whose principals' branch is one of the "Social Sciences" (X=3.41) in the dimension of classroom management and communication. This shows that teachers' views about principals' course supervision is affected by the branch of the principal in the dimension of classroom management and communication as indicated in Table 5.

**Table 4: t-test results related to the sub-dimensions of the teachers views about primary school principals' course supervision scale and teachers' latest school graduated from**

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Latest school graduated from</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>ss</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Planning</i>	Teacher training schools	207	3.52	.901	264	-.145	.885
	Others	59	3.54	1.02			
<i>Classroom Management and Communication</i>	Teacher training schools	207	3.57	.870	264	.023	.982
	Others	59	3.57	.979			
<i>Classroom Activities and Student Orientation</i>	Teacher training schools	207	3.60	.871	264	-.071	.943
	Others	59	3.61	1.033			

**Table 5: t-test results related to the sub-dimensions of the teachers views about primary school principals' course supervision scale and principals' branches**

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Branch of the principal</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Ss</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Planning</i>	Primary school teacher	142	3.55	.910	255	.616	.539
	Social Sciences	115	3.48	.948			
<i>Classroom Management and Communication</i>	Primary school teacher	142	3.69	.825	255	2.517	.012*
	Social Courses	115	3.41	.939			
<i>Classroom Activities and Student Orientation</i>	Primary school teacher	142	3.73	.829	255	2.368	.019*
	Social Courses	115	3.47	.964			

\*p<.05



As indicated in Table 5, the views of the teachers whose principals' branch is Primary school teacher ( $X=3.73$ ) in the dimension of classroom activities and student orientation is significantly more positive than views of the teachers whose principals' branch is one of the Social sciences ( $X=3.47$ ).

Table 6 represents that the teachers' views about principals' course supervision, shows a significant difference according to the time allocated by the principal for course supervision in the dimension of planning. Time allocated by the principal for course supervision in a semester causes difference between the views of the teachers in the dimension of planning. To determine between which groups stands a difference, Scheffe test was performed. According to the Scheffe test results, the views of the teachers ( $X=3.99$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "41-80 minutes" are more positive than the views of the teachers ( $X=3.89$ ) indicating the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "81 minutes and more"; the views of the teachers ( $X=3.48$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "49 minutes and less" are more positive than the views of the teachers ( $X=2.79$ ) who told that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "never"; the views of the teachers ( $X=3.89$ ) who told that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "81 minutes and more" are more positive than the views of the teachers ( $X=3.48$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "40 minutes and less" in the dimension of planning.

According to Table 6, teachers' views about principals' course supervision, shows a significant difference according to the time allocated by the principal for course supervision in the dimension of classroom management and communication. Time allocated by the principal for course supervision in a semester causes difference between the views of the teachers in the dimension of classroom management and communication. To determine between which groups there stands a difference, Scheffe test was performed. According to the Scheffe test results, the views of the teachers ( $X=3.54$ ) who told that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "40 minutes and less" are more positive than the views of the teachers ( $X=2.98$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "never"; the views of the teachers ( $X=3.98$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "41-80 minutes" are more positive than the views of the teachers ( $X=3.54$ ) who told that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "40 minutes and less"; the views of the teachers ( $X=4.00$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "81 minutes and more" are more positive than the views of the teachers ( $X=3.98$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is "41-80 minutes" in the dimension of classroom management and communication.

Teachers' views about principals' course supervision, shows a significant difference according to the time allocated by the principal for

**Table 6: One-way variance analysis results related to the sub-dimensions of the teachers views about primary school principals' course supervision scale and time allocated for course supervision by the principals**

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Source of variance</i>	<i>Sum of squares</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>Square average</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
<i>Planning</i>	Between groups	36.216	3	12.072	16.546	.000*	2-1
	Within groups	176.564	242	.730			3-4
	Total	212.780	245				4-2
<i>Classroom Management and Communication</i>	Between groups	26.215	3	8.737	13.013	.000*	2-1
	Within groups	162.502	242	.671			3-2
	Total	188.717	245				4-3
<i>Classroom Activities and Student Orientation</i>	Between groups	18.451	3	6.150	8.195	.000*	2-1
	Within groups	181.630	242	.751			3-4
	Total	200.081	245				4-2

\* $p < .05$  Allocated time: 1=Never, 2= 40 minutes and less, 3= 41-80 minutes, 4= 81 minutes and more

course supervision in the dimension of classroom activities and student orientation. Scheffe test was performed to determine between which groups, there stands a difference. According to the Scheffe test results, in the dimension of classroom activities and student orientation, the views of the teachers ( $X=4.00$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is “41-80 minutes” are more positive than the views of the teachers ( $X=3.82$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is “81 minutes and more”; the views of the teachers ( $X=3.55$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is “40 minutes and less” are more positive than the views of the teachers ( $X=3.18$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is “never”; the views of the teachers ( $X=3.82$ ) indicating that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is “81 minutes and more” are more positive than the views of the teachers ( $X=3.55$ ) who told that the time allocated by principals for course supervision in a semester is “40 minutes and less” as indicated in Table 6.

Participants were asked to write their expectations from supervision. 153 teachers answered this question. The expectation of “Guidance” was written 73 times. The expectation which teachers considered as the most important and mostly written by them is guidance. Teachers expecting guidance expressed their ideas by the statements of “counseling, planning, and leading”. It is summarized in Table 7.

According to Table 7 “Feedback” was written 66 times and its proportion is 22.4% among all the answers. Teachers expecting feedback expressed that as “principals’ positive or negative criticisms, principal’s help for solving the problems, suggestions, getting objective assessment results, to be informed about the results in

person”. Frequency of the expectation of “Determination of the material deficiencies” is 53 (18%). For this expectation teachers used statements such as “determination of the physical deficiencies in the classroom, providing necessary materials, determination of required technology and meeting technological requirements”.

Frequency of the expectation of “Determining professional inadequacies” is 49 and it represents 16.6% of all the answers. Under this expression teachers indicated expressions such as “determination of the deficiencies of classroom management, identification of the inadequateness for improving the professional productivity and satisfying the inadequacies in teacher-student relationships” as indicated in Table 7.

The expectation of “Reward-Appreciation” was written 41 times (13.9%) and it represents the 13% of all answers. Under this expectation teachers expressed their ideas by the statements of “appreciation of the success after supervision process, giving motivating rewards and reinforces and emphasizing positive sides of a teacher in staff meetings” as mentioned in Table 7.

According to Table 7, the expectation of “Raising the quality of education” was written 13 times by the teachers and it represents 4.4% of the all answers. Under this statement they mentioned the expressions such as “Raising the quality of education and strengthen the education”.

As a result teachers did not express their ideas at “strongly negative”, “negative” and “strongly positive” levels about course supervision of primary education principals much. These findings show that very good and/or very bad cases are not encountered in the process of supervision, views are “slightly positive” and “positive” in general and so it is possible to mention about a medium level of effectiveness.

**Table 7: Findings related to the expectations of the teachers from supervision**

<i>Expectation</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>ss</i>
Guidance	73	24.7	.730
Feedback	66	22.4	.661
Determination of material deficiencies	53	18.0	.527
Determination of professional insufficiencies	49	16.6	.661
Reward-appreciation	41	13.9	.740
Raising the quality of education	13	4.4	.832
Total	295	100	

## DISCUSSION

Teacher's views about principals' course supervision are in "positive" level in the dimensions of planning, classroom management and communication and classroom activities and student orientation. Thus, it can be inferred from this finding that principals take care of the items in the "Teachers Views about Primary School Principals' Course Supervision Scale" in the dimensions of planning, classroom management and communication and classroom activities and student orientation. As Yildirim indicated (2007) social sciences teachers generally assess the activities in the process of course supervision as "partially" and express more positive views than the former findings. In the present study similar results were obtained as Yildirim's. According to the findings of the study conducted by Topcu and Aslan (2009) both the principals and most of the teachers agree that classroom activities and teacher assessment should be supervised by school principals. Moreover according the results of the study conducted by Altun (2014), both school administrators and teachers suggest school principals as the ones for teacher supervision. One of the reasons why teachers and principals prefer courses to be supervised by principals is the thought of principals being at school constantly and supervision's can be conducted more functionally by the principals. Principals think that classroom observations are necessary to discover whether the students attend the lesson, if they are interested in the lesson and whether they communicate or not (Tyagi 2009). Moreover, according to Ayeni's (2012) study most of the teachers being interviewed expressed that their principals had raised their interests in their jobs and basic responsibilities of the principals are observation of educational activities and supervision of them. Moreover, Master's (2014) study findings indicate that school administrators' overall formative teacher evaluation ratings are significant and substantial predictors of future personnel decisions. This may also lead teachers to prefer school principals as responsible for teacher classroom supervision. In the current research it was found that principals supervise classroom activities by attending the lessons. When evaluated together with previous studies this finding shows that the principals supervise classroom activities and this finding is satisfactory.

According to the current research, teachers' views about primary school principals' course supervision show no significant difference in the dimensions of planning, classroom management and communication and classroom activities and student orientation according to their gender. For this finding principals' supervision of the classroom activities is considered as "positive" by both female and male teachers. This finding does not fully correspond to the study by Ozbas (2002). However, as indicated by Goktas (2008) when the averages of the groups about the behavior of "being able to consider the environment and process preparation which will provide students to participate learning activities actively" are analyzed, there is no difference between the views of both female and male teachers and they expressed principals as "frequently qualified" in terms of this proficiency.

As observed in the findings of research, teachers whose principal's branch is "Primary school teaching" are having significantly more positive views about principal's course supervision than the teachers whose principal's branch is one of the "Social sciences" have. This suggested that the teachers' views about principals' course supervision is affected by the branch of the principal in the dimensions of classroom management and communication. For this finding it can be thought that the principals whose branch is Primary school teaching behave sensitively about classroom management and communication in the supervision process. Primary school teachers are continuously have a direct communication and interaction with the same class, thus they may care about communication with the class and classroom management more and hence may supervise this issue mostly.

Teachers whose principal's branch is "Primary school teaching" are having significantly more positive views about principal's course supervision than those whose principal's branch is one of the "Social sciences" according to the averages of the answers in the dimension of classroom activities and student orientation. Social sciences lessons are the ones that being taught one or two hours in a week. Teachers from these branches may expect students to understand the lesson and to analyze what they learned as a result of students' age and of teachers' having less communication (as they have less hours in a week) with the students thus just directing them less and teaching their lessons.



However, for the teachers whose branch is Primary school teaching organizing activities for student learning, student orientation is more important. Therefore, it can be thought that principals whose branch is classroom teaching supervise courses cautiously and attentively.

As principals allow more time for supervision under the dimensions of planning, classroom management and communication, classroom activities and student orientation in a semester, teachers' views about supervision become more positive.

It is found that primary school principals have different expectations from the teachers about course supervision. Difference in these expectations may be thought to be caused by the difference in their individual needs (Britton et al. 2002). These expectations are guidance, providing feedback, determining the material deficiency, occupational inadequacies, increasing the quality of the prizes and training in general. Some researches show that school principals have the capacity to identify the most effective teachers for a particular aspect of teachers' work (Orphanos 2014: 253). This may depend on the expectations of principals.

Teachers whose expectation from the supervision is "guidance" mentioned about counseling, planning and guidance. In Britton et al.'s (2002) paper, supervision was expressed as a counseling process, too. In the former studies, Ozbek (1998) and Akis (1999) found that teachers expect counseling from the supervision process at the high levels. But their expectations of counseling is not met sufficiently (Akis 1999; Saglam 2002; Yakut 2006; Yildirim 2007). The findings in the literature related to the expectation of the teachers from the ones who supervise them in terms of counseling supports this study. With the adoption of the human relations approach, supervision is supposed to be more counseling driven (Sergiovanni and Starratt 1979).

According to the study, it is determined that teachers wish to get feedback at the end of the supervision process. Similar findings were obtained in the researches by Ates (2007) and Atkins (1996). Rizzo (2004) emphasized providing feedback about supervision process. Florence (2005) indicated that 99% of the teachers expressed that improving feedback should be a part of the supervision process. Marshall (2005) indicates that principals visit the lessons; however when the teachers were asked what kind of feed-

backs were provided, they expressed that principals talk about their classroom observations so rarely. Real time feedbacks closes the gap between the theory and practice of education (Santoyo, 2014) so feedback may be the important component of supervision.

The teachers whose expectation is the determination of material deficiency gave answers such as: Determination of physical deficiencies in the classroom, providing necessary materials, determination of required technology and meeting technological requirements. Accordingly, it can be inferred that teachers have expectations about the determination and satisfaction of the physical deficiencies and these deficiencies should be considered in the process of supervision.

The teachers whose expectation from the supervision is determining professional inadequacies gave answers as: determination of the deficiency of classroom management, the inadequateness for improving the professional productivity and teacher-student relationships. The result of "Supervisor's identification of the inadequacies together with the teacher" of Ates's (2007) study is one of the expectations expressed by the teachers. In the same study it was found that primary school teachers gave the answer of "every time" for the item "Inadequacies should be expressed clearly". But they also stated that their expectations are satisfied in "medium" level. These findings support this research's findings. Moreover Ophanos's (2014) research findings indicate that teacher academic performances have a positive effect on principal ratings. Academic performance is related to professional inadequacies. So, principals may inform teacher about them and develop them professionally.

The teachers whose expectation is "Reward-Appreciation" stated appreciation of the success after supervision, motivating prizes, reinforces, emphasizing positive sides of a teacher in staff meetings as answers. In his research, Sarpkaya (2003), found that teachers have prize expectations and both primary and secondary school teachers care internal rewards more than external ones. Basol and Kaya (2009) indicated that teachers frequently expressed that they are not appreciated sufficiently. Ates (2007) remarked that supervisors do not prefer expressing positive sides of the teachers much and Sarpkaya (2006) stated that supervisors accomplish their goals formally and they consider teachers' inadequacies rather than appreciating them. It can be re-

alized that teachers should be rewarded both internal and externally to do their jobs well. In this study it was found that teachers wish to be appreciated for their positive efforts.

The responses of teachers who expect “Improving the quality of education” from the supervision process are improving the quality of education and strengthen the education. According to the findings in Field’s (2013) study, teachers expressed that classroom observations may contribute to the effectiveness of the teacher, and hence student success and quality of education. In his study Ates (2007) found that teachers expect improvement of the quality from the supervision process. Besides, teachers highly expect that success should be improved via supervision process but they think their expectations are not satisfied completely by the process of supervision. Memisoglu (2001) stated that supervisors thought they fulfill the statement “Trying to improve teaching and learning process” completely in the course of supervision; on the contrary teachers expressed negative ideas about this case. All these results support the findings of the current study.

### CONCLUSION

Teachers’ views regarding principals course supervision is moderately positive in all three dimension of the scale. It is concluded that, the principals’ of the teachers participated in the study supervises the courses in Primary schools. In the light of teachers views it is concluded that the principals whose branch is Primary school teacher consider the items in the scale during supervision more than the principals whose branch is one of the Social sciences do in the dimensions “classroom management and communication” and “classroom activities and student orientation”. In general, the principals who allocate much more time for supervision consider the items of supervision indicated in scale more than the other principals. Teachers’ most common three expectations regarding the benefits of principals’ course supervision are as follows sequentially: being guided by principals, getting feedback from principals and determination of the material deficiencies in classrooms by principals.

As a result, although, it has been presented in various papers that teachers evaluate the effectiveness of the supervision process negatively, no supporting result for this case was found

in this study. It is concluded that “Teacher Supervision Guide” should be used by school principals regarding teachers’ expectations from supervision.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Following suggestions can be put forward according to the results of the present study. Time for supervision allocated by the principals should be increased. Teachers’ opinions should also be considered in the process of supervision. A healthy communication process should be developed for teachers to state their expectations. Problems discovered by the principal should be negotiated with the teachers by considering causes and results. Principals should determine the strengths and weaknesses of the teachers and provide necessary counseling to satisfy the inadequacies. Especially, supervisors (inspectors, principals) should consider the expectations of teachers in the process of supervision.

### REFERENCES

- Akis Metin 1999. *İlkokul Öğretmenlerinin Çağdaş Denetmen Rollerine İlişkin Algı ve Beklentileri*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University.
- Altun Burcu 2014. *Denetime Elestirel Yaklaşım: Öğretmen Denetimi Nasıl Olmalı?* Master Thesis, Unpublished. Aydın: Adnan Menderes University.
- Ates Fidel 2007. *İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Denetim Sürecinden Beklentileri ve Bunların Gerçekleşme Düzeyleri*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. Malatya: İnönü University.
- Atkins AO 1996. Teachers’ Opinions of the Teacher Evaluation Process. From <www.eric.ed.gov ED0 27791> (Retrieved on 4 April 2014).
- Ayeni AJ 2012. Assessment of principals’ supervisory roles for quality assurance in secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *World Journal of Education*, 2(1): 62-69.
- Basol G, Kaya I 2009. İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Performanslarının Okul Yöneticileri Tarafından Değerlendirilmesi Üzerine Görüşleri. *Paper presented in 1. Uluslararası Türkiye Eğitim Araştırmaları Kongresi* in Çanakkale 18 Mart University, Çanakkale, May 1 to 3, 2009.
- Bayraktutan İlkay 2011. *İlköğretim Okul Müdürlerinin Denetim Rollerini (Sivas İli Örneği)*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. Sivas: Cumhuriyet University.
- Britton JP, Goodman JM, Rak CF 2002. Presenting workshops on supervision: A didactic-experiential format. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 42(1): 31-39.
- Bullis Brian 2014. *The Perceived Impact of Teacher Performance Ratings on the Teacher Evaluation*

- Process: Voices from the Field*. Doctorate Thesis, Unpublished. Chicago: Loyola University.
- Buyukozturk S 2012. *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi yayıncılık.
- Crano WD, Brever MB 2002. *Principles and Methods of Social Research*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.
- Day C 2012. New lives of teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 39(1): 7-26.
- Erdem AR 2006. Öğretimin denetiminde yeni bakış açisi: Sürekli geliştirme temeline dayalı öğretimin denetimi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16: 275-294.
- Erdem AR, Erogul MG 2012. Sınıf öğretmenlerinin görüşlerine göre ders denetiminde eğitim müfettişlerinin öğretmene ilişkin tutumları. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(1): 13-26.
- Fields Cary 2013. *Classroom Walkthroughs: Does Such an Approach to Supervision Contribute to District Improvement?* Master Thesis, Unpublished. Virginia: College of Saint Elizabeth.
- Florence Gregory Wayne 2005. *Teacher Supervision Methods in Virginia*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished Virginia: Virginia Commonwealth University.
- Goktas Aslı 2008. *İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin ve İlköğretim Müfettişlerinin Ders Denetimine İlişkin İlerliklerinin Sınıf Öğretmenlerince Değerlendirilmesi (Kırıkkale İl Örneği)*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. Kırıkkale: Kırıkkale University.
- Hammond LD, Bransford J 2007. *Preparing Teachers For a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able To Do*. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.
- Harris DN, Ingle WK, Rutledge SA 2014. How teacher evaluation methods matter for accountability: A comparative analysis of teacher effectiveness ratings by principals and teacher value-added measures. *American Education Research Journal*, 51(1): 73-112.
- Henson KA 2007. *Supervision: A Collaborative Approach to Instructional Improvement*. USA: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Ilgan A 2012. *Öğretmenlerin Mesleki Gelisimi ve Denetimi*. Ankara: Ani Yayıncılık.
- Johnson B, Christensen L 2004. *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Approaches*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Jones J, Jenkin M, Lord S 2006. *Developing Effective Teacher Performance*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Khan Z, Khan UA, Shah RU, Iqbal J 2009. Instructional leadership, supervision and teacher development. *The Dialouge*, 4(4): 580-592.
- Lodico MG, Spaulding DT, Voegtle KH 2006. *Methods in Educational Research: From Theory to Practice*. 1<sup>st</sup> Edition. USA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Marshall K 2005. It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(10): 727-735.
- Master B 2014. Staffing for success: Linking teacher evaluation and school personnel management in practice. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 36(2): 207-227.
- MEB 2001. İlköğretim Müfettişleri Başkanlıkları Rehberlik ve Teftis Yönergesi. *Tebliğler Dergisi*, No: 2521.
- MEB 2003. İlköğretim Kurumları Yönetmeliği, 25212 *Sayıli Resmi Gazete*.
- MEB 2009. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Ortaöğretim Kurumları Yönetmeliği. *Tebliğler Dergisi*: 2623, *Resmi Gazete*: 31.7.2009/ 27305.
- Memisoglu Salih Pasa 2001. *Çağdas Eğitim Denetimi İlkeleri Açısından İlköğretim Okullarında Öğretmen Denetimi Uygulamalarının Değerlendirilmesi*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Bolu: Abant İzzet Baysal University.
- Orphanos S 2014. What matters to principals when they evaluate teachers? Evidence from Cyprus. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 42(2): 243-258.
- Ozbas M 2010. İlköğretim Okullarında Öğretimin Denetimi Ve Müdürlerin Öğretimin Denetimine İlişkin Görevleri. *Paper presented in I. Eğitim Yönetimi Sempozyumu* Ankara.
- Ozbas Mehmet 2002. *İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Sınıf İçeri Etkinliklerin Denetiminde Yapmaları Gerekten ve Yapmakta Oldukları İşler Konusunda Müdür ve Öğretmen Görüşleri*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. Ankara: Hacettepe University.
- Ozbek Belgin 1998. *İlköğretim II. Kademe Ders Denetimi Sorunları (İzmir İli Örneği)*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University.
- Ozmen F 2000. Klinik denetim öngörülleri çerçevesinde denetçi görüşleri. *Firat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (Firat University Journal of Social Science)*, 10(1): 119-157.
- Ozmen F, Gungor A 2008. Denetimde etik. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(15): 137-155.
- Rizzo John F 2004. Teachers' Supervisors' Perceptions of Current and Ideal Supervision and Evaluation Practices. Doctoral Dissertation. Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts, School of Education, Amherst. From <<http://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations/AAI3118327/>> (Retrieved on 4 April 2014).
- Saglam Bahtinur 2002. *İlköğretim Okullarında Öğretim Denetimine İlişkin Öğretmen, Müdür ve Denetmen Görüşleri*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University.
- Santoyo PB 2014. Giving and getting feedback in real time. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 95(4): 72-73.
- Sarpkaya R 2003. İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim öğretmenlerine yönelik disiplin ve ödüllendirme uygulamaları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 3(1): 189-225.
- Sarpkaya R 2006. Yöneticilerin öğretmenleri güdülemede içerik kuramlarından yararlanması ve bir örnek olay. *Burdur Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(77): 95-105.
- Sergiovanni TJ, Starratt RJ 1979. *Supervision a Redefinition*. USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Sullivan S, Glanz J 2009. *Supervision that Improves Teaching and Learning*. California: Corwin A SAGE Company.
- Taymaz H 2011. *Eğitim Sisteminde Teftis: Kavramlar, İlkeler, Yöntemler*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Topcu I, Aslan B 2009. İlköğretim Okullarında Yöneticilerin Öğretimin Denetimi Görevlerini Yerine Getirme Biçimleri. *Paper Presented in I. Uluslararası Türkiye Eğitim Araştırmaları Kongresi* in Canakkale 18 Mart University, Canakkale, May 1 to 3, 2009.

- Tyagi RS 2009. School-based instructional supervision and the effective professional development of teachers. *A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 9(1): 1-15.
- Yakut Günay 2006. *İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Mevzuattaki Görev Tanımlarına İlişkin Davranışları Gösterme Düzeyleri (İzmir İli Örneği)*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University.
- Yıldırım Gulten 2007. *Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenlerinin Ders Denetimine İlişkin Görüşleri (Denizli İli Örneği)*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. Muğla: Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University.
- Yıldırım N 1999. Denetim sürecinde ilköğretim okul müdürlerinin değerlendirilme formu üzerine değerlendirme. *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2: 199-212.
- Zepeda S 2007. *The Principal as Instructional Leader: A Handbook for Supervisors*. New York: Eye on Education.