International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences
March 2016, Vol. 6, No. 3
ISSN: 2222-6990

An Investigation on Developmental Supervision Model: Supervisors' and Administrators' Opinions and Teachers' Expectations*

Gulnar OZYILDIRIM
(Corresponding Author)
Department of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration
Supervision, Planning and Economy, Faculty of Education
Akdeniz University, Dumlupinar Bulvari-07058, Kampus-Antalya, Turkey
Email: gulnarozyildirim@gmail.com

Mualla BILGIN AKSU
Department of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration
Supervision, Planning and Economy, Faculty of Education
Akdeniz University, Dumlupinar Bulvari-07058, Kampus-Antalya, Turkey
Email: muallaaksu@akdeniz.edu.tr

DOI: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v6-i3/2055 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v6-i3/2055

ABSTRACT: The aim of the study was to determine supervisors' and school administrators' opinion and teachers' expectations of supervision according to Glickman's developmental supervision model. 70 supervisors, 66 school administrators and 529 teachers constituted the participants of the study and relation survey model was used as a method. Data were collected with a questionnaire developed by the researchers. Mann Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis test were carried out for analysis. As a result of the study, supervisors' and school administrators' opinion and teachers' expectations of supervision were found in line with Glickman's developmental supervision for only Scenario 2. Moreover; the most selected behavior was collaborative in Scenario1,4 and 5 as well as the most selected behavior was directive informational behavior in the other two scenarios. Finally, statistical significant differences were found in some comparisons to demographic variables.
Keywords: Glickman's Developmental Supervision, Supervisor, Administrator, Teacher

Introduction

It can be asserted that Supervision is a feedback system for every organization because it can be called as a system which provides information flows about functions of an organization. Thus, the organization can be aware of whether its ambitions have been fulfilled, what extent these ambitions are achieved, which resources are used during production process and the rest of resources. One of the systems providing information flows is supervision. Supervision is crucial for educational organizations whose input and output are human beings. Variety of the definitions of educational supervision in the literature lead us to think that there are different

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

opinions about it (Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski 1980; Başar 1995; Sullivian and Glanz, 2009; Oliva and Pawlas, 2001; Spears, 1956). Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski (1980) related educational supervision with educational administration, leadership and improvement of teaching activities. According to Başar (1995), supervision is a combination of three interrelated cyclical elements, description of the situation, evaluation and correction, improvement. Furthermore; to help teachers is emphasized in some definitions (Sullivian and Glanz, 2009; Oliva and Pawlas, 2001; Spears, 1956). Because of different definitions of supervision, its approaches, principles, and processes vary. Moreover; Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski (1980) stated that personal values, politic opinion and educational philosophy of both supervisors and supervisees affected approaches of supervision. Scientific supervision, human relationship supervision, clinical supervision are mentioned among these approaches in the literature. Apart from them, new supervision models have been researched and discussed. One of them is Glickman's developmental supervision. Glickman (1980) thought that there were different development stages from infancy to adulthood and people had different needs at each stage. Additionally, people had similar experiences at the same stage. From this point, every teacher wasn't at same developmental stage and behaved differently. Developmental supervision has three critical fundaments. First of them is that each teacher goes through different professional stages, for s\he hasn't got the same experiences. Secondly, same supervision approaches shouldn't be applied to teachers who have different abilities, efficiency and conceptual levels. And the last one, the vital aim of supervision must be teachers who decide on their own. Glickman, Gordon and Ross- Gordon (2010) summarized the developmental supervision -as follows: Developmental, expertise and commitment level of teachers or a group of teachers were matched with supervision approaches. Firstly, teachers were given an amount of responsibility which they could fulfill; and then the amount was getting more and more and the decisions which teachers made, were encouraged.

Piaget's theory of cognitive development emphasized that when people turned which stage and how long they stayed at the same stage could vary from one culture or society to another (Senemoğlu, 2012). Since some people understand a topic better when it is explained with a concrete relationship, however; some people don't internalize the same way, they prefer reading it or some people want to experience it. So, each teacher can be at different developmental stages (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988). Teachers can be at three different developmental stages (Burden, 1982; Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988). Burden (1982) stated that teachers who are at first developmental stage, are reluctant to try new teaching methods until they have control over traditional teaching methods. They have little information about complication properties of teaching and learning environment, thus they are sometimes unaware of these complicated situation and they need help about technical teaching skills. Teachers who are at second developmental stage, have learned some initial teaching skills and methods, moreover; they know teaching and learning activities and environment. They are getting more confident and relaxed. They are aware of which teaching methods are better in a particular teaching topic. And teachers who are at third developmental stage, know lots of teaching methods and which methods can satisfy better the students' needs. They can vary their teaching skills according to students' properties. They have enough self confidence to try new teaching methods and they are always ready for new experiences.

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

In developmental supervision, primarily the supervisor must determine the teachers' cognitive development level by observing and asking questions to them; then the supervisor uses one of suitable supervisory approaches which are respectively directive, collaborative and non directive behaviors. Finally, the supervisor supports them to advance higher supervisory behavior (Glickman and Gordon, 1987). Directive behavior is divided in two, directive control behavior and directive informational approach behavior. Directive control behaviors are for first stage teachers. The supervisor is responsible for everything of supervision process. This approach can be used when teachers have serious problems on teaching and they need first hand help, they haven't got any information about a topic and emergency case has happened (Glickman, Gordon and Ross- Gordon, 2010). Since this kind of teachers need not only guiding both also close supervision and following up (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988). The supervisor who applies directive informational behaviors, offers teachers informational resources nevertheless, he or she still has all responsibility. The main differences between directive control and directive informational behaviors are that the supervisor always asks teachers' opinion and teachers choose the options offered by the supervisor to improve teachers in directive informational behavior. The supervisor doesn't suggest any options to teachers, s\he says only what s\he wants to do in directive control behavior (Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2010).

The second main approach is collaborative behavior. This approach can be used for the teacher who is good at observing but passive at deciding about something (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988). In this approach, the supervisor and the supervisee take equal responsibility. That is, when finding a solution or making a decision, both the supervisor and the supervisee have equal right to speak. They share their opinions with each other. A decision and a development plan on which is achieved a consensus by them, rises at the end of this process. If they don't reach an agreement on it, a third person who isn't partial, gets involved in this process, or this process is begun from scratch (Glickman, Gordon and Ross- Gordon, 2010).

The last main approach is non directive behavior in which the teacher is more responsible than the supervisor. According to Glickman, Gordon and Ross- Gordon (2010), profession, motivation and craft knowledge of the teacher are enough to design his/her own plan and decide for any issue. The supervisor shouldn't be directive and partial, s/he must listen to the teacher in an unprejudiced way, and moreover s/he encourages the teacher to find their own way. Furthermore; Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) stated that this kind of teachers could relate a problem with science and could look an issue from different aspects.

Researchers are in search of an effective supervision approach. For this purpose, different supervision approaches have been examined (Köklü, 1996; Özmen, 2000; İlğan,2008; Veloo, Komuji and Khalid, 2013; Ibara, 2013 etc.). Developmental supervision has been investigated recently. While in some researches, teachers' supervision tendency was tried to determine (Clarke and Collins, 2004; Çetinkanat and Sağnak, 2010), in the others, if teachers' development could be improved through developmental supervision was investigated (Barak and Avnion-Pearlman, 1987; Siens and Ebmeier, 1996). Barak and Avnion-Pearlman (1987) stated that a supervision model which is appropriate for teachers' developmental level and schedule and needs of schools should be designed and developmental supervision would provide an improvement for teaching and education.

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

The aim of this study was to determine supervisors' and school administrators' understanding and teachers' expectations of supervision according to Glickman's developmental supervision model. In this context, the following questions were addressed:
According to Glickman's developmental supervision model;
1. what are school administrators' and supervisors' opinions and teachers' expectations?
2. are there any differences between school administrators' and supervisors' opinions and teachers' expectations?
3. are there any differences among school administrators' and supervisors' opinions opinion and teachers' expectations with regard demographic variables?

Method

Research Model

Design of the study was a relational survey model, used in order to present an existing event and relationship between dependent and independent variables. According to Karasar (2008), with the help of this model, relationship and its level between two variables or among more than two variables can be determined.

Population and Sample

The population consists of supervisors working in Antalya province as well as teachers and school administrators working at (public and private) primary and secondary schools in central five districts and Serik which is the closest province of Antalya. Sampling was not used for supervisors owing to their limited number. The sampling of teachers and school administrators were determined with proportioned cluster sampling method by using random numbers table. Totally, 194 primary and secondary schools were counted in Kepez, Muratpaşa, Konyaaltı, Döşemealtı, Aksu and Serik. Being taken into consideration the proportion of the number of teachers and school administrators in population, sampling was made. Thus, ten percent of the number of primary and secondary schools were taken into the scope of this study. As a result, in 2013- 2014 academic year, 70 supervisors, 529 teachers and 66 administrators from six districts of Antalya were included in the study.

Data Collection Tool

As the data collection instrument, a questionnaire developed by the researchers was used in this study. This instrument consists of two main parts: First part includes some questions of demographic variables, second part includes five scenarios and four alternative behaviors on each scenario written based on Glickman's developmental supervision. In the first four scenarios, teachers having an instructional problem at different developmental stages were presented and four alternatives each of them includes one supervision behavior among four approaches (directive control [DC], one directive informational [DI], one collaborative [C] and one nondirective [ND] behaviors). In addition, an empty line for the open-ended answer choice is given under each scenario. Four alternatives given in the scenarios were constituted based on the principles of developmental supervision. The fifth scenario was written on a teacher whose developmental stage is not clear. The data collection instrument was conducted in February and March, 2014.

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences
March 2016, Vol. 6, No. 3
ISSN: 2222-6990

Validity and Reliability

Validity and reliability of the instrument were checked by following ways. Firstly, relevant literature was reviewed and a draft instrument was constituted. Then, the draft instrument was evaluated by five experts working educational administration and supervision departments at Akdeniz University, Cumhuriyet University and Anadolu University. For the first four scenarios, the experts gave 0 point to supervisory behaviors in each scenario if they weren't appropriate, they gave 1 point to them if they were suitable. The options of Scenario 5 weren't included, for there wasn't an expected behavior for it.

Table 1
The Appropriateness Points of Scenarios and Supervisory Behaviors to Experts' Opinions

1. Scenario Statement	1. Scenario Behavior 1	1. Scenario Behavior 2	1 Scenario Behavior 3	1. Scenario Behavior 4	2. Scenario Statement	2. Scenario Behavior 1
1	*0,4*	*0,8*	*0,8*	*0,8*	*0,8*	*0,2*
2. Scenario Behavior 2	2. Scenario Behavior 3	2. Scenario Behavior 4	3. Scenario Stateme nt	3. Scenario Behavior 1	3. Scenario Behavior 2	3. Scenario Behavior 3
0,8	*1*	*1*	*0,8*	*0,8*	*1*	*0,6*
3. Scenario Behavior 4	4. Scenario Stateme nt	4. Scenario Behavior 1	4. Scenario Behavior 2	4. Scenario Behavior 3	4. Scenario Behavior 4	5. Scenario Statement
1	*0,6*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*0,8*	*1*

The higher point, could be taken was 1 and the least point, could be taken was 0. The statements whose points were between 1 and 0,8 were placed in the instrument. The rest whose points were under 0,8 were revised.

Moreover; for the validity of this instrument, item-total correlation was done and for this, point serial correlation coefficient was calculated. Totally eighty three teachers, administrators and supervisors answered the questions in this instrument. When they selected the expected behavior for first four scenarios, they took 1 point. If they didn't choose the expected behavior, they took 0 point. Thus, every participant had 5 points at the most and 0 point at the least. SPSS 20.00 was used for data analyses.

Table 2
Point by Serial Correlation Coefficient

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences
March 2016, Vol. 6, No. 3
ISSN: 2222-6990

		Scenario1	Scenario2	Scenario3	Scenario4	Scenario5	Total Point
Scenario 1	Pearsoncorr.	1	,075	,031	-,056	-,132	,153
	Sig(2-tailed)		,476	,765	,594	,206	,142
	N	93	93	93	93	93	93
Scenario 2	Pearsoncorr.	,075	1	,045	,023	,055	,580(**)
	Sig(2-tailed)	,476		,672	,826	,603	,000
	N	93	93	93	93	93	93
Scenario 3	Pearsoncorr.	,031	,045	1	,170	,142	,597(**)
	Sig(2-tailed)	,765	,672		,104	,175	,000
	N	93	93	93	93	93	93
Scenario 4	Pearsoncorr.	-,056	,023	,170	1	,101	,416(**)
	Sig(2-tailed)	,594	,826	,104		,337	,000
	N	93	93	93	93	93	93
Scenario 5	Pearsoncorr.	-,132	,055	,142	,101	1	,586(**)
	Sig(2-tailed)	,206	,603	,175	,337		,000
	N	93	93	93	93	93	93
Total Point	Pearsoncorr.	,153	,580(**)	,597(**)	,416(**)	,586(**)	1
	Sig(2-tailed)	,142	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	93	93	93	93	93	93

* p< .05 ** p<.001

According to Table 2, correlation coefficient was found quite low in only Scenario 1. The other correlation coefficients were (respectively r = 0,580 p < 0,01, r = 0,597 p < 0,01, r = 0,416 p < 0,01, r = 0,586 p < 0,01) statically significant. As a result, the instrument generally was reliable. As a result reliability of the instrument was proved.

Analysis of Data

Frequencies and percentages and non-parametric tests were applied as data analyzing techniques. Mann-Whitney U test was used when the level of independent variables was two, and Kruskal Wallis test was used when the level of independent variables was more than two.

Findings

Findings were presented below in terms of five scenarios. Firstly, comparisons were made through data obtained from supervisors, administrators, and teachers. Secondly, only significant differences obtained on demographic variables of each sample were presented.

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences
March 2016, Vol. 6, No. 3
ISSN: 2222-6990

Comparison among Supervisors' and School Administrators' Opinions and Teachers' Expectations on Developmental Supervision

Table 3

According to Occupation of Participations, Frequencies, Percentages and Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Scenario 1

Occupation		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p
Teacher	f	38	58	411	22	529	331,51	2	,480	,786
	%	7,2	11,0	77,7	4,2	100,0				
Administrator	f	4	4	54	4	66	344,02			
	%	6,1	6,1	81,8	6,1	100,0				
Supervisor	f	6	4	55	5	70	333,85			
	%	8,6	5,7	78,6	7,1	100,0				
Total	f	48	6,6	520	31	655				
	%	7,2	9,9	78,2	4,7	100,0				

p> .05

The data presented at Table 3 shows that in the situation requiring directive control behavior for, only 7,2 percent of teachers expected this kind of behavior; 6,1 percent of administrators and 8,6 percent of supervisors were in favor of directive control behavior. As it was seen in the table, most of the supervisors (78,6%), school administrators (81,8%) and teachers (77,7%) selected the collaborative behavior. Furthermore; although administrators' mean rank related to their supervision opinion was higher than supervisors' and the mean rank of teachers' expectation, a statistical differences among mean ranks was not [χ^2 (sd=2, n= 655) =,480 p>0,05] found significant.

Table 4

According to Occupation of Participations, Frequencies, Percentages and Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Scenario 2

Occupation	DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean	sd	χ^2	p

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences
March 2016, Vol. 6, No. 3
ISSN: 2222-6990

							Rank			
Teacher	f	17	290	210	12	529	333,43	2	,047	,977
	%	3,2	54,8	39,7	2,3	100,0				
Administrator	f	7	38	21	0	66	328,74			
	%	10,6	57,6	31,8	0	100,0				
Supervisor	f	2	39	29	0	70	333,76			
	%	2,9	55,7	41,4	0	100,0				
Total	f	26	367	260	12	655				
	%	3,9	55,2	39,1	1,8	100,0				

p> .05

The data presented at Table 4 shows that in the situation requiring directive informational behavior for, 54,8 percent of teachers expected this kind of behavior; 57,6 percent of administrators and 55,7 percent of supervisors were in favor of directive informational behavior. As it was seen in the table, the collaborative behavior became second the most preferred options. These proportions were 39,7% in teachers, 31,8% in administrators and 41,4% in supervisors. Furthermore; according to Kruskal Wallis test, administrators' mean rank related to their supervision opinion was lower than supervisors' and the mean rank of teachers' expectations though the differences among mean ranks weren't [χ^2 (sd=2, n= 655) =,047 p>0,05] statically significant.

Table 5

According to Occupation of Participations, Frequencies, Percentages and Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Scenario 3

Occupation		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p
Teacher	f	150	238	28	113	529	332,87	2	,749	,688
	%	28,4	45,0	5,3	21,4	100,0				
Administrator	f	21	31	4	10	66	319,78			
	%	31,8	47,0	6,1	15,2	100,0				
Supervisor	f	19	30	6	15	70	346,46			
	%	27,1	42,9	8,6	21,4	100,0				
Total	f	190	299	38	138	655				
	%	28,6	45,0	5,7	20,8	100,0				

p> .05

The data presented at Table 5 shows that in the situation requiring collaborative behavior for, only 5,3 percent of teachers expected this kind of behavior; 6,1 percent of administrators and 8,6 percent of supervisors were in favor of collaborative behavior. As it was seen in the table, most of the supervisors (42,9%), school administrators (47,0%) and teachers (45,0%) selected directive informational behavior. Furthermore; according to Kruskal Wallis test, supervisors' mean rank related to their supervision opinion was higher than administrators' and the mean rank of teachers' expectations though the differences among mean ranks weren't χ^2 [(sd=2, n= 655) =,749 p>0,05] statically significant.

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences
March 2016, Vol. 6, No. 3
ISSN: 2222-6990

Table 6
According to Occupation of Participations, Frequencies, Percentages and Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Scenario 4

Occupation		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p
Teacher	f	16	126	315	72	529	338,31	2	4,099	,129
	%	3,0	23,8	59,5	13,6	100,0				
Administrator	f	3	18	39	6	66	331,20			
	%	4,5	27,3	59,1	9,1	100,0				
Supervisor	f	3	23	33	11	70	294,54			
	%	4,3	32,9	47,1	15,7	100,0				
Total	f	22	167	387	89	655				
	%	7,2	25,1	58,2	13,4	100,0				

p>.05

The data presented at Table 6 shows that in the situation requiring non directive behavior for, only 13,6 percent of teachers expected this kind of behavior; 9,1 percent of administrators and 15,7 percent of supervisors were in favor of non directive behavior. As it was seen in the table, most of the supervisors (47,1%), school administrators (59,1%) and teachers (59,5%) selected collaborative behavior. Furthermore; according to Kruskal Wallis test, teachers' mean rank related to their supervision expectations was higher than the mean rank of administrators' and supervisors' opinions though the differences among mean ranks weren't χ^2 [(sd=2, n= 655) =4,099 p>0,05] statically significant.

Table 7
According to Occupation of Participations, Frequencies, Percentages and Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Scenario 5

Occupation		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p
Teacher	f	32	97	261	139	529	332,29	2	,573	,751
	%	6,1	18,3	49,3	26,3	100,0				
Administrator	f	4	10	27	25	66	347,21			
	%	6,1	15,2	40,9	37,9	100,0				
Supervisor	f	2	7	35	26	70	324,95			
	%	2,9	10	50,0	37,1	100,0				
Total	f	38	114	323	190	655				
	%	5,7	17,1	48,6	28,6	100,0				

p>.05

The data presented at Table 7 shows that in the situation requiring no specific supervisory behavior for, only 49,3 percent of teachers expected collaborative behavior; 40,9 percent of administrators and 50,0 percent of supervisors were in favor of this kind of behavior As it was seen in the table, the non directive behavior became second the most preferred options. These proportions were 26,3% in teachers, 37,9% in administrators and 37,1% in supervisors. Furthermore; according to Kruskal Wallis test, administrators' mean rank related to their

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

supervision opinion was higher than supervisors' and the mean rank of teachers' expectations though the differences among mean ranks weren't [χ^2 (sd=2, n= 655) =,573 p>0,05] statically significant.

The Comparison of Supervisors' Supervision Opinion to Demographic Variables

Table 8

According to Their Branches, Descriptive and Statistic Data to Supervisors' Preferences and Mann-Whitney U Test Results For Scenario 3

Type of The Study		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Rank Sum	Mean Rank	U	z	p
Class Teacher	f	11	27	3	8	49	1517,00	37,50	292,000	-3,021	,003
	%	22,4	55,1	6,1	16,3	100,0					
Branch Teacher	f	8	3	3	7	21	968,00	30,83			
	%	38,1	14,3	14,3	33,3	100,0					
Total	f	19	30	6	15	70					
	%	27,1	42,9	8,6	21,4	100,0					

*p< .05

The data presented at Table 8 shows that in the situation requiring collaborative behavior for, only 6,1 percent of supervisors having worked as a class teacher and 9,1 percent of supervisors having worked as a branch teacher were in favor of the expected behavior. As it was seen in the table, while directive information behavior became the most preferred option by supervisors having worked as a class teacher, directive control behavior was the most preferred option by supervisors having worked as a branch teacher. These proportions were 55,1% in supervisors having worked as a class teacher, 38,1% in supervisors having worked as a branch teacher.

Furthermore; according to Mann-Whitney U Test, there was a difference between supervisors having worked as a class teacher and supervisors having worked as a branch teacher. It was determined that the mean rank of supervisors having worked as a class teacher was higher than the other group supervisor and it was statically significant (U=292,000; p< 0,05).

Table 9

According to Educational Position, Descriptive and Statistic Data to Supervisors' Preferences and Kruskal Wallis Test Results For Scenario 1

Educational Position		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p
Training Institute	f	3	2	13	1	19	32,34	2	7,705	,021

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

/ Two- year degree/College	%	15,8	10,5	68,4	5,3	100,0	
Educational Administration and Supervision	f	2	2	40	2	46	38,39
	%	4,3	4,3	87,0	4,3	100,0	
Graduate	f	1	0	2	2	5	20,90
	%	20,0	0,0	40,0	40,0	100,0	
Total	f	6	4	55	5	70	
	%	8,6	5,7	78,6	7,1	100,0	

*p< .05

The data presented at Table 9 shows that in the situation requiring directive control behavior for, 13,8 percent of supervisors graduated from Training Institute / Two- year degree/College; 4,3 percent of supervisors graduated from Educational Administration and Supervision and 20,0 percent of supervisors having a graduate degree were in favor of the expected behavior. As it was seen in the table, collaborative behavior became the most preferred behavior by supervisors graduated from Training Institute / Two- year degree/College (%68,4) and graduated from Educational Administration and Supervision(87,0%). Supervisors having a graduate degree (40%) selected non directive and collaborative behavior equally.

Furthermore; according to Kruskal Wallis test, there was a mean rank difference between supervisors having a graduate degree and the other supervisor groups. It was seen that the mean rank of supervisors having a graduate degree was lower than the others and this difference was found χ^2 [(sd=2, n= 70) =7,705 p< 0,05,] statically significant. Then to find out the resource of the difference, Mann Whitney-U test was done. It showed that there was a significant difference between the supervisors having a graduate degree and the supervisors graduated from educational administration and supervision program.

Table 10

According to Managerial Seniority, Descriptive and Statistic Data to Supervisors' Preferences and Kruskal Wallis Test Results For Scenario 2

Yöneticilik Kıdemi		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p
0 year	f	1	9	11	0	21	30,83	2	7,861	,020

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences
March 2016, Vol. 6, No. 3
ISSN: 2222-6990

	%	4,8	10,5	52,4	0,0	100,0		
1-5 years	f	1	19	17	0	37	34,04	
	%	2,7	4,3	45,9	0,0	100,0		
6 years and+	f	0	11	1	0	12	48,17	
	%	0,0	91,7	8,3	0,0	100,0		
Total	f	2	39	29	0	70		
	%	2,9	55,7	41,4	0,0	100,0		

*p< .05

The data presented at Table 10 shows that in the situation requiring directive informational behavior for, the only 10,5 percent of supervisors who didn't have any seniorities as an administrator, 4,3 percent of supervisors whose seniorities as an administrator were 1-5 years, 91,7 percent of supervisors whose seniorities as an administrator were 6 years and more were in favor of the expected behavior. As it was seen in the table, collaborative behavior became the most preferred behavior by the supervisors who didn't have any seniorities as an administrator (52,4%) and the supervisors whose seniorities as an administrator were 1-5 years (45,9%). Moreover; the supervisors whose seniorities as an administrator were 6 years and more selected directive informational behavior at most.

Furthermore; according to Kruskal Wallis test, there was a mean rank difference between the supervisors whose seniorities as an administrator were 6 years and over it and the other supervisor groups. It was seen that the mean rank of supervisors whose seniorities as an administrator were 6 years and more was higher than the others and this difference was found [(sd=2, n= 70) =7,861 p< 0,05] statically significant. Then to find out the resource of the difference, Mann Whitney-U test was done. It showed that there was a significant difference between supervisors whose seniorities as an administrator were 6 years and more and supervisors who didn't have any seniorities as an administrator as well as between supervisors whose seniorities as an administrator were 6 years and more and supervisors whose seniorities as an administrator were 1-5 years.

Table 11

According to Seniority as Supervisor, Descriptive and Statistic Data to Supervisors' Preferences and Kruskal Wallis Test Results For Scenario 5

Seniority as Supervisor		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p
1-10 years	f	0	0	8	1	9	21,61	2	6,095	,047

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

	%	0,0	0,0	88,9	11,1	100,0		
11-20 years	f	0	3	16	20	39	38,44	
	%	0,0	7,7	41,0	51,3	100,0		
21 years and +	f	2	7	11	2	22	35,98	
	%	9,1	31,8	50,0	9,1	100,0		
Total	f	2	10	35	23	70		
	%	2,9	10,0	50,0	0,0	100,0		

*p< .05

The data presented at Table 11 shows that in the situation requiring no supervisory behavior for, the supervision opinion of only 88,9 percent of the supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 1-10 years, 50,0 percent of supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 21 years and more were in favor of the collaborative behavior. However; the supervision opinion of the supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 11-20 years was in direction of nondirective behavior. As it was seen in the table, the second most preferred behavior changed into groups. 11,1 percent of the supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 1-10 years selected nondirective behavior, 41,0 percent of supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 11-20 years chose collaborative behavior and 31,8 percent of supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 21 years and more selected directive informational behavior.

Furthermore; according to Kruskal Wallis test, there was a mean rank between supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 11-20 years and the other supervisor groups. It was seen that the mean rank of supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 11-20 years was higher than the others and this difference was found [χ^2 (sd=2, n= 70) =,6,095 p< 0,05] statically significant. Then to find out the resource of the difference, Mann Whitney-U test was done. It showed that there was a significant difference between supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 11-20 years and supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 1-10 years as well as between supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 11-20 years and supervisors whose seniorities as a supervisor were 21 years.

The Comparison of School Administrators' Supervision Opinion to Demographic Variables

Table 12

According to The Type of the Study, Descriptive and Statistic Data to Administrators' Preferences and Kruskal Wallis Test Results For Scenario 4

The Type Of The Study	DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

Basic Fields	f	0	13	14	4	31	28,37	3	7,998	,046
	%	0,0	41,9	45,2	12,9	100,0				
Social Fields	f	2	2	8	2	14	34,57			
	%	14,3	14,3	57,1	14,3	100,0				
Numeric Fields	f	0	2	3	0	5	32,00			
	%	0,0	40,0	60,0	0,0	100				
Other Fields	f	1	1	14	0	16	42,97			
	%	6,2	6,2	87,5	0,0	100,0				
Total	f	3	18	39	6	66				
	%	4,5	27,3	59,1	9,1	100,0				

*p< .05

The data presented at Table 12 shows that in the situation requiring nondirective behavior for, 12,9 percent of administrators whose branches were basic fields, only 14,3 percent of administrators whose branches were social fields were in favor of this behavior. However; the supervision opinion of administrators whose branches were numeric and other fields weren't in direction of the expected behavior. As it was seen in the table, collaborative behavior became the most preferred behavior. These proportions were 45,2% in administrators whose branches were basic fields, 57,1% in administrators whose branches were social fields, 60,0% in administrators whose branches were numeric branches and 87,5% in administrators whose branches were other field.

Furthermore; according to Kruskal Wallis test, there was a mean rank difference related with supervision opinion between administrators whose branches were other and the other administrator groups. It was seen that the mean rank of administrators whose branches were other was higher than the others and this difference was found difference [χ^2 (sd=3, n= 66) =,460 p< 0,05] a statically significant. Then to find out the resource of the difference, Mann Whitney-U test was done. It showed that there were significant difference between administrators from basic fields and administrators from other fields.

Table 13

According to Educational Position, Descriptive and Statistic Data to Administrators' Preferences and Kruskal Wallis Test Results For Scenario 2

Educational Position		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p
Training Institute / Two- year degree/College	f	4	4	5	0	13	22,77	2	6,761	,034
	%	30,8	30,8	38,5	0,0	100,0				

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

Undergraduate	f	3	31	15	0	49	35,81	
	%	6,1	63,3	30,6	0,0	100,0		
Graduate	f	0	3	1	0	4	40,13	
	%	0,0	75,0	25,0	0,0	100,0		
Total	f	7	38	21	0	66		
	%	10,6	57,6	31,8	0,0	100,0		

*p< .05

The data presented at Table13 shows that in the situation requiring directive informational behavior for, 30,8 percent of administrators graduated from Training Institute / Two- year degree/College; 63,3 percent of administrators graduated from an undergraduate program and 75,0 percent of administrators having a graduate degree were in favor of the expected behavior. As it was seen in the table, collaborative behavior became the most preferred behavior by administrators graduated from Training Institute / Two- year degree/College (38,5%). The administrators having a graduate or undergraduate degree selected collaborative behavior at most.

Furthermore; according to Kruskal Wallis test, there was a mean rank difference between administrators having a graduate degree and the other administrator groups. It was seen that the mean rank of administrators having a graduate degree was higher than the others and this difference was found [χ^2 (sd=3, n= 66) =6,761 p< 0,05] statically significant. Then to find out the resource of the difference, Mann Whitney-U test was done. It was seen that there was a significant difference between the administrators having a graduate degree and the administrators graduated from Training Institute / Two- year degree/College.

The Comparison of Teachers' Supervision Expectations to Demographic Variables

Table 14

According to Types of School, Descriptive and Statistic Data to Teachers' Preferences and Mann-Whitney U Test Results For Scenario 1

Type Of The School		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	U	z	p
Private	f	9	25	58	3	95	221,15	16449,50	-4,243	,000
	%	9,5	26,3	61,1	3,2	100,0				

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences
March 2016, Vol. 6, No. 3
ISSN: 2222-6990

Public	f	29	33	353	19	434	274,60	
	%	6,7	7,6	81,3	4,4	100,0		
Total	f	38	58	411	22	529		
	%	7,2	11,0	77,7	4,2	100,0		

*p< .05

The data presented at Table 14 shows that in the situation requiring directive control behavior for, 9,5 percent of teachers working in the private schools and 6,7 percent of teachers working in the public schools were in favor of the expected. As it was seen in the table, collaborative behavior became the most preferred supervisory behavior. These proportions were 61,1% in teachers working in the private schools, 81,3% in teachers working in the public schools.

Furthermore; according to Mann-Whitney U Test, there was a mean rank difference between the teachers working in the private schools and the teachers working in the public schools. It was seen that mean rank of the teachers working in the public schools was higher and found that this difference (U=16449,50; p<0,05) was statically significant.

Table 15

According to The Type of the Study, Descriptive and Statistic Data to Teachers' Preferences and Kruskal Wallis Test Results For Scenario 5

Type of Study		DC	DI	C	ND	Total	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p
Basic Fields	f	11	31	123	60	225	247,82	3	8,301	,040
	%	4,9	13,8	54,7	26,7	100,0				
Social Fields	f	8	31	63	26	128	273,54			
	%	6,3	24,2	49,2	20,3	100,0				
Numeric Fields	f	7	20	31	26	84	297,76			
	%	8,3	23,8	36,9	31,0	100				
Other Fields	f	6	15	44	27	92	265,22			
	%	6,5	16,3	47,8	29,3	100,0				
Total	f	31	97	261	139	529				
	%	5,9	18,3	49,3	26,3	100,0				

*p< .05

The data presented at Table 15 shows that in the situation requiring no supervisory behavior for, 54,7 percent of teachers whose branches were basic fields, 49,2 percent of teachers whose branches were social fields, 36,9 percent of teachers whose branches were numeric and 47,8 percent of teachers whose branches were other fields were in favor of collaborative behavior. As it was seen in the table, nondirective behavior was chosen the second most preferred behavior by teachers whose branches were basic fields, numeric fields and other fields. These proportions were 26,7% in teachers whose branches were basic fields, 31,0% in teachers whose branches were numeric fields and 29,3% in teachers whose branches were other fields.

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences
March 2016, Vol. 6, No. 3
ISSN: 2222-6990

Directive informational behavior became the second most preferred behavior for teachers (24,2%) whose branches were social fields.

Furthermore; according to Kruskal Wallis test, there was a mean rank difference between teachers whose branches were numeric fields and the other teacher groups. It was seen that the mean rank of between teachers whose branches were numeric fields was higher than the others and this difference was found difference [χ^2 (sd=3, n= 529) =8,301p<0,05] a statically significant. Then to find out the resource of the difference, Mann Whitney-U test was done. It showed that there were significant difference between teachers from basic fields and teachers from numeric fields.

Conclusion and Discussion

According to Glickman's developmental model, in Scenario 1 the issue on the teacher which was at the low developmental level and unaware of the problem s\he experienced, was discussed. Selection of directive control behavior in which the responsibility of supervision process was completely on supervisors, was expected. School administrators, supervisors and teachers preferred collaborative behavior rather than directive control behavior most. Supervisors selected collaborative behavior in the situation requiring directive control showed that supervisors had positive attitude on cooperating. This result coincided with the data of Gordon (1990). An application on developmental supervision was done in the related study. Gordon (1990) stated that during the application, supervisors approached collaborative behaviors more positively than the other behaviors. Supervisors desired to negotiate with teacher if only the teacher was at low developmental level could be thought they tried to prioritize toleration and human relations. The data of Bostancı, Bulut and Özbey (2013) supported this finding. In their study, it was determined that supervisors applied the human relation dimension of the artistic supervision at most according to teachers and supervisors. Memduhoğlu and Zengin (2011) mentioned supervisors had excessive workload and spent on less time with teachers. For that reason, it can be difficult for the supervisors to have knowledge on issues. In these circumstances, even when teacher's developmental level is low, why they chose a higher supervisory behavior can be understood. The selections of school administrators were collaborative behaviors can be explained that the study of Turan, Yıldırım and Aydoğdu (2012). The researchers indicated that school administrators felt responsible for human relations at most. School administrators might have chosen collaborative behavior rather than directive control behavior in this study owing to their desire of protection of positive climate in the school. For effective supervision, teachers' involvement in decision making process was important (Pierce and Rowell, 2006). Moreover; teachers expected collaborative supervision (Brundage, 1996) and empathy from their supervisors (Aksu and Mulla, 2009) can explain why teachers preferred collaborative behavior for related scenario.

According to the related supervisory model, a teacher who was in low developmental level and aware of the problem s\he experienced but didn't know how it could be solved was described in Scenario 2. In this situation, responsibility of supervision process was also on the supervisor but s\he was in information sources role. For the related scenario, it was expected that directive informational behavior chose. School administrators, supervisors and teachers preferred this behavior at most. In this scenario, supervisors selected directive informational

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

behavior can be related to the study of Karakuş and Yasan (2013). They stated that supervisors thought they had enough knowledge about educational issues. Thus, supervisors might have chosen this behavior with the sense that they could understand the teacher's problem. Supervisors can present choices, beneficial for teachers, might concern with criticizing constructively and developing empathy. Okutan, Akgül and Kahvecioğlu (2010) came through supervisors thought they were successful at these topics. According to Topçu and Aslan (2009) as well as Arslanargun and Göksoy (2013) school administrators were close to teachers and knew them better. This situation brought to mind that school administrators knew what kind of problems the teacher experienced and administrators could help the teacher about how the problems could be solved. That can be the reason why administrators chose directive informational behavior must. Moreover; according to Bouchamma and Basque (2012) school administrators cared positive climate. This data can be clarified why school administrators wanted to give selection right to teachers, though it was restricted, rather than forcing them to do something. Teachers preferred directive informational behavior for this scenario can be interpreted that they need help for their own and instruction issues (McGill, 1991) and they expect informative and close supervision (Özdoğa Yılmazoğlu, 2012). This situation can be likened to a person who wants to set off somewhere, s\he hasn't gone yet, needs somebody having already gone there. The person who has gone somewhere for the first time might desire the knowledge and close following of old hand.

In regard to the related supervisory approach, in Scenario 3 a teacher who was at middle developmental level and aware of the problem s\he experienced and its possible solution was mentioned, it was expected supervisors, school administrators and teachers prefer collaborative behavior. However, supervisor, school administrators and teachers selected directive information behavior at most. Supervisors didn't choose collaborative behavior for Scenario 3 contradicted with the data of Greene (1992). According to Greene (1992), supervisors desired to take equal responsibility with teachers. Supervisors and teachers have equal right to speak in collaborative behavior. But it was emphasized that supervision in Turkish education system was still aimed at controlling (Gökçe, 2009; Sabancı and Ömeroğlu, 2013). Maybe this situation prevents supervisors from sharing responsibility with teachers. School administrators didn't prefer collaborative behavior coincided with the studies of Gündüz (2010) and Gökçe (2009) in which they emphasized that hierarchical structure in personal relationship still existed. This gave rise to thought that hierarchical structure obstructed democratic behaviors though development level of teachers required more democratical supervisory behaviors. Range, Scherz and Holt (2011) stated administrators didn't enough time to supervise the teachers and the teachers are reluctant to changes. This kind of thought may be direct them not to use collaborative behaviors. Teachers desired to take equally responsibility (Greene, 1992) contrasted with they chose collaborative behavior at least.

With reference to Glickman's developmental supervision model, a teacher who was at high developmental level and aware of his\her problem and its solution was described in Scenario 4. For this scenario, though it was expected that nondirective behavior was chosen, supervisors, school administrators and teachers preferred the collaborative behavior at most. Supervisors wanted to share responsibility with teacher who could be make his\her own decisions, rather than to give all responsibility to the teacher coincided with the Gordon' (1990)

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

study in which he stated that supervisors had negative attitude towards non directive behaviors. Yılmaz (2004) put forth the problems, experienced in supervisory process, could be originated from inadequate informing of school administrators. So, school administrators preferred to be involved in making decision process in a situation requiring they had to encourage the teacher only to think showed they couldn't match the developmental level of the teachers with supervisory behavior. Whereas school administrators should take on a facilitator role rather than a main unit role in order that teachers can reach appropriate level in school environment (Young and Heichberger, 1975). Teachers preferred non directive behavior at least in this scenario had parallels with some research data (Gordon, 1990) although it contradicted to with some researches data(Clarke and Collins, 2004; Çetinkanat and Sağnak, 2010). According to the study of Gordon (1990) teachers weren't in favor of non directive behavior but they desired to be informed about resources and to be taken their needs into consideration. But, according to Clarke and Collins (2004) as well as Çetinkanat and Sağnak (2010), teachers selected non directive behavior more than the other supervisory approaches.

In Scenario 5, only the existence of a problem was presented. In this scenario, there wasn't any information on development level of a teacher. So any specific behavior wasn't expected for it. Supervisors, school administrators and teachers selected the collaborative behavior at most. Supervisors preferred collaborative behavior contradicted to the study of Clarke and Colin (2004). Their study showed that supervisors supported nondirective behavior. However, in the study of Köroğlu and Oğuz (2011), supervisors thought they guided teachers very much supported this data. In collaborative behavior, supervisor doesn't take on repressive role; however he or she takes on reconciliatory role. It can be thought that democratic attitude is important for this behavior. Burden (1982) stated that teachers thought school administrators supported teachers' developments. The teachers wanted to cooperate with supervisors (Young and Heichberger, 1975) and didn't desire a kind of supervisor who tried to impose their own ideas had parallels with that teachers preferred the collaborative behavior for Scenario 5.

Some statistically significant differences were found. There were statically significant differences among supervisors according to educational position in Scenario 1, seniority as a school administrator in Scenario 2, the type of the study in Scenario 3 and seniority as a supervisor in Scenario 5. Moreover, there were statically significant differences among school administrators according to the type of the study in Scenario 4 and educational position in Scenario 2. Finally, there were statically significant differences among teachers according to the type of school in Scenario 1 and the type of the study in Scenario 5.

Suggestions and Limitations

Scenarios and teacher behaviors placed in choices might have been thought differently and participants might answer the questions according to aspects of their own organization. So, researchers who tend to make researches on developmental supervision should take cultural properties into consideration. This study was limited to the supervisors, school administrators and teachers working in Antalya province in 2013-2014 school year, therefore the findings cannot be generalized to all Turkish educational system. However, the Ministry of National Education can be expected to benefit from the data of this study for their system changes.

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

Some suggestions related with results of this study were constituted. People who are interested in developmental supervision should be encouraged. Not only teachers and supervisors opening for improvement can benefit from this supervisory model, but also voluntary school administrators can apply developmental supervision in the real instruction field. The awareness of supervisors and supervisees on different supervisory approaches should be increase. Thus, positive attitude can be constituted. Presentation on developmental supervision and enlightenments on teachers' developmental levels should be done to supervisors, school administrators and teachers to apply it in Turkey. Then pilot studies can be applied in some voluntary schools. Moreover, this study conducted in primary and secondary schools can be done in high schools and the reasons of the supervisory behavior selection which participants chose can be examined through qualitative research method. Finally, the scenarios placed in the instrument adopted from the book of Glickman's developmental supervision. This instrument can be updated through real events which were desired from teachers, school administrators and supervisors.

References

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

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

Barak, M., Avnion., & Pearlman, S. (1997). Using developmental supervision to improve science and technology instruction in Israel. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 12 (4),* 367-382.

Başar, H. (1995). *Eğitim Denetçisi* (3. baskı b.). Ankara. Pegem Özel Eğitim Hizmetleri Ltd. Ştd.

Bostancı, B. A., Şanlı Bulut, M., & Özbey, H. (2011). Öğretmen denetiminde sanatsal denetim yaklaşımının uygulamasına yönelik öğretmen ve denetmen görüşleri.*Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *1*(22), 238-254.

Bouchamma, Y., & Basque, M. (2012). Supervision practices of school principals. reflection in action.*US-China Education Review, (7), 627-637.*

Burden, P. R.(1982). Developmental supervision. Reducing teacher stress at different career stages. *U.S Department Of Education Educational Resources Information Center*. Presented at Association of Teacher Educators National Conference, Phoenix.

Brundage, S. E. (1996). What kind of supervision do veteran teachers need? an invitation to expand collegial dialogue and research. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *12*(1), 90-94.

Clarke, A., & Collins, J.B. (2004). Glickman's supervisory belief inventory. A cautionary note. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *20 (1),* 76-87.

Çetinkanat, C., & Sağnak, M. (2010). İlköğretim okullarında görevli öğretmenlerin denetim stillerine ilişkin tercihleri. 2*. Uluslararası Katılımlı Ulusal Eğitim Denetimi Sempozyumu*. *23-25 Haziran 2010.* (ss. 85-93) Kütahya. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross- Gordon, J. M. (2010). *Supervision and Instructional leadership: A Developmental Approach* (Eighth Edition b.). Boston. Pearson.

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

Glickman, C. D., & Gordon, S. P. (1987).Clarifying developmental supervision. *Educational Leadeship,44 (8),* 64-68.

Glickman, C. D. (1980) The developmental approach to supervision. *Educational Leadeship,* 38 (2), 178-180.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. a., & Krajewski, R.(1980). *Clinical Supervision. (Second ed.).* New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gordon, S. P. (1990). Developmental supervision. an exploratory study of a promising model. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *5(4),* 293-307.

Gökçe, A. (2010). Bilimsel yönetim anlayışında denetim. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (18),* 74-89.

Gündüz, Y. (2010). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin ilköğretim müfettişlerine ilişkin tutumlarının incelenmesi. *Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,11*(2). 1-23

Greene, M. L. (1992). Teacher supervision as professional development. Does it work?. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *7 (2),* 131-148.

Ibara, E. C. (2013). Exploring clinical supervision as instrument for effective teacher supervision. *Africa Education Review*, *10*(2), 238-252.

İlğan, A. (2008). Klinik denetimden gelişimsel ve yansıtıcı denetime geçiş. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *25*, 263-282.

Karakuş, M., & Yasan, T. (2013). Denetmen ve öğretmen algılarına göre il eğitim denetmenlerinin yeterlilikleri. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi, (21),* 1-19.

Karasar, N. (2008). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri* (18. edt). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Köklü, M. (1996). Etkili denetim. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, *2*(2), 259-268.

Köroğlu, H., & Oğuz, E. (2011). Eğitim müfettişlerinin rehberlik rollerine yönelik öğretmen, yönetici ve eğitim müfettişi görüşleri. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırma Dergisi. 1(2),* 9-22

Memduhoğlu, H. B., & Zengin, M. (2012). Çağdaş eğitim denetimi modeli olarak öğretimsel denetimin Türk eğitim sisteminde uygulanabilirliği. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science/Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi, 5(1),* 131-142.

McGill, M. V. (1991). A reseach agenda the changing face of supervision. A developmental art. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 6 (3),* 255-264.

Okutan, M., Akgül, A., & Kahvecioğlu, A. (2010). İlköğretim müfettişlerinin insani yeterlilikleri.*II. Uluslararası Katılımlı Ulusal Eğitim Denetimi Sempozyumu*. *23-25 Haziran 2010.* (ss. 362-374) Kütahya. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi.

Oliva, P. F., & Pawlas, G. E. (2001). *Supervision for Today's Schools* (Sixth edition b.). NewYork. Wiley Global Education.

Özdoğa, Yılmazoğlu, B. (2012) Denetim kaygısına yönelik öğretmen ve denetmen algıları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. *Özel sayı (2),* 98-109.

Özmen, F. (2000). Klinik denetim öngörüleri çerçevesinde denetçi görüsleri. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 10/1.

Pierce, R. A., & Rowell, J. S. (2006). The 10 keys to effective supervision. A developmental approach. *Rising Sun Consultants*. 1-4.

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.

International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences
March 2016, Vol. 6, No. 3
ISSN: 2222-6990

Sabancı, A., & Ömeroğlu, M. (2013).Views of independent kindergarten teachers about inspection done by province inspectors. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5 (3), 685-700.

Range, B. G., Scherz, S., Holt, C. R., & Young, S. (2011). Supervision and evaluation. The Wyoming perspective. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *23*(3), 243-265.

Senemoğlu, N. (2012). *Gelişim ve Öğrenme*. Ankara. Pegem Akademi

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1988). *Supervision. Human Perspectives* (Fourth edition b.). New York, Amerika. McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Siens, C. M., & Ebmeier, H. (1996). Developmental supervision and the reflective thinking of teachers. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *11*(4), 299-319.

Spears, H. (1956). *Improving The Supervision of Instruction* (Fourth edition b.). USA. Prentice-Hall, INC

Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2009). *Supervision That Improves Teaching And Learning. Strategies And Techniques* (Third editionb.). California. Sage Publication.

Topçu, İ., & Aslan, B. (2009*).* İlköğretim okullarında yöneticilerin öğretimin denetimi yerine getirme biçemleri*. I. Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Araştırmaları Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı, (s.* 1-22). Çanakkale. On Sekiz Mart Üniversitesi.

Turan, S., Yıldırım, N., & Aydoğdu, E. (2012). Okul müdürlerinin kendi görevlerine ilişkin bakış açıları. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, *2*(3), 63-76.

Veloo, A., Komuji, M. M. A., &Khalid, R. (2013). The effects of clinical supervision on the teaching performance of secondary school teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93,* 35-39.

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

Young, J. M., & Heichberger, R. L. (1975). Teachers' perceptions of an effective school supervision and evaluation program. *Education*, *96*(1) 10-19.

* This manuscript is produced from master thesis of first author under supervision of second author.