Education Supervisors' Views Regarding Efficiency of Supervision System and In-service Training Courses*

Semiha ŞAHİN[a]
Dokuz Eylül University,

Fatma ÇEK
Dokuz Eylül University,

Nalân ZEYTİN
Izmir National Education Directorate

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to gather the educational supervisors' opinions regarding whether the supervision system and in-service training courses reaches its aim and to obtain their suggestions about the restructuring of the supervision system. The sample of the study is composed of 104 supervisors. The qualitative data were collected through the "Supervisors' Opinions and Suggestions regarding the Supervision System Form", which was made up of open-ended questions. The findings were obtained through content analysis. According to the results of the study, 30 % of the supervisors think that the supervision system reaches its aims, and 34% contend that it reaches its targets with regard to certain aspects whereas 36 % of the supervisors believe that the system does not reach its aims. The majority of the supervisors think that the in-service training program does not reach its aims (87 %). The supervisors' suggestions about the improvement of the system tend to focus on restructuring efforts about general system and supervision services.

Key Words

Education Supervisor, Supervision System, Supervisor, In-service Training, Restructuring.

Supervision of education has significant importance in education management in terms of doing analysis on available situation, providing feedback on applications, provision of aids to schools and institutions in order to reach the goal and provision of conditions to reach it, realization of required arrangements and methods for personal development and transformation (Bursalıoğlu, 1982; Kaya, 1993; Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB], 2001).

As a matter of fact, subjects such as content, structuring, patterns, re-description of education, and determination of persons who will better perform this work are discussed and there were any hesita-tions on the necessity and significance of supervision if the field is to be analyzed (Aydın, 1993; Başar, 1998; Beach & Reinhartz, 2000; Calabrese & Zepeda, 1997; Can, 2004; Garubo & Rothstein, 1998; Glickman, Gordon ve Ross-Gordon, 2005; Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Pajak, 2010; Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1993; Waite, 1995; Zepeda, 2006). In this respect, in order to evaluate and prevent deviations from the goal and to increase quality of result, supervision is required.

Supervision process covers processes such as programs, supports that are realized for efficiency of education and learning processes, raising, and provision of self-control, guidance and assessment efforts (Aydın 1993; Beach & Reinhartz, 2000; Calabrese & Zepeda, 1997; Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Sullivan & Glanz, 2009; Zepeda, 2006).

Supervisors transfer innovations that are in the system to the employee in charge, they determine weakness and strength of the institution and they evaluate education and management processes according to pre-specified criteria by observing as per relevant legislation (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB], 2001).

* The study was presented in the I8. National Education Sciences Congress (01-03 October 2009) in Ege University.

a PhD. Semiha ŞAHİN is currently an Assistant Professor at the Department of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration and Supervision. *Correspondence:* Dokuz Eylül University, School of Buca Education, 35150 Buca/İzmir/Turkey. E-mail: semiha.sahin@deu.edu.tr & ssahin66@gmail.com. Phone: +90 232 420 4882/1621 Fax: +90 232 420 4895.

Since 1991-1992 school years, branch teachers' supervision started to be realized by education supervisors because of high number of school and teacher while ministry inspectors' number was insufficient. Thus, mass that falls into education supervisor's remit has changed in terms of quality and quantity; supervisors' workload and problems have increased İstanbul Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü, (2002). However, increased workload of supervisor makes difficult for supervisor to collaborate with teacher, to observe and evaluate objectively (Can, 2004).

Supervisors more or less receive education on supervising. However, variety of supervision area, the problem of expertise and discontinuity in in-service education reduce effectiveness of supervisors (Can, 2004). Better education of supervisors than teachers and specific education they will take on their job will increase their professional competency as well as the positive perception of them by the teacher (Aydın, 1993; Başar, 1998).

One of the first researches carried out in this area was made by Karagözoğlu in 1977. The low number of supervisor that is determined during the research, the high number of male supervisor and many problems regarding quality of education preserve its validity. In the research, opinions of teachers regarding the system were taken rather to determine how much they benefit from education and a negative result was found).

In the Açıkgöz (1990), Atay (1996), and Memduhoğlu, Aydın, Yılmaz, Güngör ve Oğuz'a (2007) researches, difference between actions to be taken in inspection and actions that are taken, and suitability of actions to the contemporary supervision perception were analyzed. In a considerable part of researches, guidance role of supervisors in supervision system were analyzed (Açıkgöz, 1990; Atay, 1996; Cerit, 1996; Gökyer, 1997; Söbü, 2005).

In researches that are done with supervisors, the problems of supervision system and solution offers took part (for examples Açıkgöz, 1990; Akbaba ve Memişoğlu, 2010; Collins, 2004; Karagözoğlu, 1977; Kayıkçı, 2004; Söbü, 2005; Şahin, Zeytin-Akyürek, & Çek, 2009; Şenyüz, 2006; Taşar, 2000; Yavuz, 1995). In Kayıkçı (2004), Polat and Uğurlu (2009), Şahin, Zeytin-Aydoğdu et al. (2009), Tok (2004) and Tükel'in (1997) researches, education supervisors were handled in terms of job satisfaction, emotional intelligence, effeteness and organizational loyalty. On the other hand, Akbaba-Altun and Memişoğlu (2010), Akbaba-Altun (2009), Karakuş (1999), Sarpkaya (2004), Söbü (2005), Şahin, Aydoğdu & Yoldaş (2009), Taymaz (1995)

and Yılmaz (1994) handled with problems regarding supervision process in different dimensions.

When researches were analyzed, it was observed that similar problems were determined in researches that are conducted in long time frame and different periods. It is object of interest whether the problems that are determined after 1970s still continue after that kind of long term process; in other words, whether the goal of supervision system was achieved, evaluations of supervisors on in-service training and suggestions on the development of system are wondered. One of the points that make different this research is to ask persons who are realizing the supervision at first hand whether the system reached its goal with its reasons and to request solution offers. The other point is to acquire data with qualitative method. As a matter of fact, it was indicated that the interest is low on supervision field that is considered as important and that has problems in the meantime and it was also observed that research numbers regarding the field reduced slowly (Beycioğlu & Dönmez, 2009).

Goal of the Research

The goal of this research is to determine whether education supervisors reach the goal of supervision system, to determine their opinions on sufficiency of in-service training courses, and to determine their suggestions on re-structuring the supervision system.

Research Questions

1. What are the opinions of supervisors on whether education supervisors reach supervision goal?

2. What are the opinions of supervisors on in-service training courses conducted for education supervisors' career development?

3. What are education supervisors' opinions on re-structuring supervision system?

Method

The data of the research were obtained with qualitative research method, and semi-structured measuring tool was developed that is completely composed of open-ended questions to be answered by education supervisors.

Study Group: The population was composed of 800 education supervisors that work in 3 supervision areas in school year of 2007-2008. The re-

search sample was composed of 104 supervisors that voluntarily filled up the question form from 200 supervisors that attended 4th group of the In-Service Training Course that was organized in Aydın Kuşadası in June 2008.

Data Collection Tool

The semi-structured "Occupational Problems of Education Supervisors, Their Satisfactions, and Dissatisfactions Scale" was developed that is completely composed of 9 open-ended questions to be used in the research. The questions of the scale that related to this research were as follows: *1*) Do you think that supervision reaches its goal in primary schools? *2*) Do you think that in-service training courses conducted for education supervisors' career development and other activities are sufficient? *3*) What are your suggestions for developing supervision system? The questions were composed by detailing within itself (For exp. a. Reaches. Because…: b. Does not reach. Because…).

Data Collection

The required permissions were taken to start research data collection process. The researcher personally conducted distribution of research scale and made effort to make feel the importance of the research to supervisors.

Data Analyses and Explication

During the data analysis and estimation processes, two expert researchers were informed on the issue and they were trained on how to follow the process. The data were interpreted and evaluated with content analysis.

The researchers had tried to reach an undefined, unobtrusive concept and theme with content analysis that require a deeper process than descriptive analysis. It was conducted concordantly to general frame of qualitative analysis analyzed in three parts as data reduction which is determined by analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008), reasoning with case presentation and verification and to the processes of coding, finding themes, re-arrangement of data according to codes and themes, and interpretation of findings.

The researchers realized data analysis by following processes of coding, composing themes, clarify themes, and provision of validity and reliability. All responses of questions until validity and reliability processes were read and evaluated independently by two researchers. The researcher that execute all these processes worked together with other researchers at compelling points or when help was required and closely followed current situation of both researchers. On the other hand, in validity and reliability processes three researchers studied together and collaborated in developing themes in a most suitable way.

The data obtained by two researchers were compared with the participation of the third researcher and "coherence" and "consistency" of data were analyzed. Three researchers studied in coordination and in a harmony with collaboration.

Cohesiveness of two researchers' themes was analyzed by taking into account the principle arguing that qualitative data increases reliability (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008); the numbers of agreements and disagreements were determined and internal reliability of research was determined by using "reliability agreement/agreement + disagreement formula" (Miles & Huberman, 1994). As a result of reliability calculation, the item agreement percentage of the scale was determined as 0.88.

In short, qualitative data were firstly divided into themes by coding to be explained at connectional and relational level; the data were composed by arranging data in a logical and comprehensive way and by paying attention on themes' distinctiveness, objectivity, utility and integrity within itself (Bilgin, 2000; Yıldırım ve Şimşek, 2008).

Results

29.80% of education supervisors taught that supervision services reach its goal while 36.53% taught the contrary. The percentage of supervisors that taught the goal is reached in some respects is 33.65%.

25% of supervisors indicate that the number of teachers is too high and there is no sufficient time for guidance because of other private institutions' supervisions, and 21.15% of supervisors point out that supervision system does not reach its goal because of disregarding education supervision institution and the intention of abolishing the system.

11.53% of education supervisors consider in-service trainings as sufficient while 87.4% of supervisors find it insufficient. 25% of education supervisors accept "occupational insufficiency of trainers" as the reason of insufficiency of in-service training studies; 21.15% of supervisors accept unrealized requirement analysis as the reason.

38.46% of education supervisors desire education supervisors to be at equal status with ministry inspectors and integration under the name of "education supervisors" regarding re-structuring of the system. 28.84% of supervisors underlined the necessity of education supervisors' independence and tying with governorship, and 24.03% of supervisors underline the necessity of re-structuring supervision system with the help of experts.

30.76% of education supervisors suggest extension of authorization, enforcement of reports prepared by them and taking into consideration their suggestions, 25% of supervisors suggest limiting their assigned position; decreasing the number of supervisors in the groups, decreasing the number of teachers to be supervised, and dedicating time for guidance and supervision.

Discussion

The result of the research may reach the solution that there is significant problems in institutionalization of primary school supervision and in properly fulfilling this duty. Supervisors arguing that the goal is achieved do not exceed 1/3 of total number. Researches support this result and guidance service is not at required level (Akbaba & Memişoğlu, 2010; Atay, 1996; Korkmaz & Özdoğan, 2005; Söbü, 2005). Researches underline that it is not a new problem). One supervisor expresses the circles that supervision goes round with the following words: "*cannot break its habit (cannot be rescued from handcuff missing its keys)*"

Supervisors consider the high number of teacher that will be supervised and insufficient time for supervision guidance related to supervising process of private institutions besides primary school as the obstacles behind reaching the goal of supervision service. Similar process is also observed in researches that are conducted in long time span (Açıkgöz, 1990; Akbaba & Memişoğlu, 2010; Aydın, 1993; Karagözoğlu, 1977; Sarpkaya, 2004; Şahin, Zeytin-Akyürek et al., 2009; Taşar, 2000; Taymaz, 1995, 1997).

It can be argued that ignorance of primary school supervision importance by school administration, by top management and teachers, inequality in authorizations and responsibilities, not taking specialties into account; insufficiency of supervisors and their low job satisfaction, their reluctance and tiredness are significant factors for not reaching the goal of system. This finding shows consistency with Akbaba and Memişoğlu (2010), Terzi (1996), Taymaz (1995; 1997), Kayıkçı (2004) Tok (2004),

Şahin, Zeytin-Akyürek et al., (2009) and Tükel (1997) researches.

10% of education supervisor consider in-service training courses as sufficient while 87% consider it as insufficient. This situation indicates that the process of in-service training is not efficient for education supervisors. Occupational illiteracy of educators that participated in education supervisor in-service training courses, unrealized requirement analysis on the subject, insufficient number of in-service training and these trainings' inefficiency in skill getting that make education unplanned and unsystematic are shown as the major reason for insufficiency of in-service training courses. This finding is also supported by Akbaba and Memişoğlu (2010), Aydın (1997) and Burgaz (1992).

Supervisors had suggestions regarding system development in a way that would be suitable with the titles of Akbaba and Memişoğlu's (2010) researches with a consistent uniformity. In this research, suggestions on re-structuring in systematical level and re-structuring supervision services attract attention. Supervisors submitted their suggestions on re-structuring the system, on the other hand, several issues were underlined such as to make education supervisors' status equal with ministry inspectors, integration under the name of "education supervisors", independence of education supervisors and tying to governorship, re-structuring supervision system with the help of experts, amelioration of education supervisor's employee rights and development of regional supervision system. Besides, supervisors want development of Education Management and Supervision Departments, and they also want supervisors to study for master degree and installation of in-service training centrals.

Supervisors suggested reducing political power and objectivity of appointments on account of the fact that exposition to political pressure as determined by Akbaba and Memişoğlu (2010), Söbü (2005), Şahin, Zeytin-Akyürek et al., (2009) and Yılmaz (1994). It is thought that education supervisors are getting stressed while performing their duties with the impact of political pressure during supervisions and there is an increase in these kind of oppressions especially during government change, and that these problems cause exhaustion.

On the other hand, authorization extension of education supervisors, enforcement of reports prepared by supervisors and to take suggestions into considerations, and to limit assigned positions were requested for amelioration of education supervisor supervision service.

Suggestions

Two major problems regarding the system were determined in this research. The first is that supervision system did not sufficiently reach its goal and guidance services are not realizing in required quality. The second is that in-service training courses of supervisors are insufficient in terms of quality and quantity. On the other hand, re-structuring of system based and mission related services come up when supervisors' suggestions are considered.

All supervisors can be united in ministry in "education supervision directorate". They can also be arranged under 4 different institutions as ministry central and city national education organizations' supervision, secondary school supervision, primary school supervision and private institutions' supervision. The Ministry can appoint ministry supervisors by selecting between supervisors of these three supervision groups that meet determined criteria. *(ii)* Secondly, "city directorate of education supervision" can directly be dependent on governorship in cities. Concordance of employee personal rights and level of income of supervisors in each unit had to be taken into account. Coordinative working unity in terms of working relations must be provided between directorate of national education and "education supervision directorate". This is important in term of provision of concordance of internal and external supervision and efficiency. *(iii)* Task related precautions must be taken in primary schools for the functionality of supervision. It is taught that supervision service shall not be given more than a certain number and specializing had to be supported. *(iv)* Internal supervision should be dominant in schools that principals undertake instructional supervision (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Calabrese & Zepeda, 1997; Holland & Adams, 2002; Oliva & Pawlas, 2004; Zepeda, 2006). However, the importance of the external supervision should be protected by new regulations (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). *(v)* Besides these kinds of major arrangements, education problems had to be resolved as indicated by supervisors. It had to be realized, as underlined by supervisors, by acquiring advance degree in the area and by increasing quality and quantity of in-service training courses. *(vi)* A research can be composed that how supervisors' professional development can be improved efficiently.

References/Kaynakça

Açıkgöz, K. (1990). Malatya, Mardin, Diyarbakır illerinde görevli ilköğretim müfettişlerinin çağdaş denetim etkinliklerini uygulama dereceleri ve denetim sürecinde karşılaşılan güçlükler. *İnönü Üniversitesi Araştırma Raporu,* Malatya. Proje no: İ.Ü. AF.89/07.

Akbaba-Altun, S. (2009, Mayıs). *İlköğretim ve bakanlık müfettişlerinin denetimin birleştirilmesine yönelik görüşleri.* IV. Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri. Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli.

Akbaba-Altun S. ve Memişoğlu S. P. (2010). İlköğretim müfettişlerinin denetimin yeniden yapılandırılmasına ilişkin görüşleri. *İlköğretim Online Dergisi, 9* (2), 643–657.

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

Aydın, B. (1997). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin mesleksel gelişimlerine ilişkin algı ve beklentileri.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

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

Başar, H. (1998). *Eğitim denetçisi: Rolleri, yeterlilikleri, seçilmesi, yetiştirilmesi* (2. bs.). Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Beach, D. M., & Reinhartz, J. (2000). *Supervisory leadership: Focus on instruction.* Massachusetts: Allynand Bacon.

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

Bilgin, N. (2000). *İçerik çözümlemesi.* İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayını:109.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (2004). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How successful principals promote teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Burgaz, B. (1992). *Türk eğitim sisteminde denetmenlerin başarılarını etkileyen nedenler/ Ankara ili örneği.* Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1982). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış* (6.bs.). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları.

Calabrese, R. L., & Zepeda, S. J. (1997). *The reflective supervisor: A practical guide for educators.* New York: Eye on Education.

Can, N. (2004). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin denetimi ve sorunları. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 31* (161), 112-122.

Cerit, Y. (1996). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin eğitim öğretim faaliyetlerini geliştirme etkinlikleri.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

Collins, B. A. (2004). Teacher performance evaluation: A stressful experience from a private secondary school. *Educational Results, 46* (1), 43-54.

Garubo, R. C., & Rothstein, S. W. (1998). *Supportive supervision in schools.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2005). *The basic guide to supervision and teaching leadership.* Boston: Allyn-Bacon.

Gökyer, N. (1997). *İlköğretim okulları II: kademe öğretmenlerinin ilköğretim müfettişlerinin yeterlik alanlarına ilişkin algıları (İstanbul örneği).* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Holland, P. E., & Adams, P. (2002). Through the horns of a dilemma between instructional supervision and the summative evaluation of teaching. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *5* (3), 227-247.

Hoy, W. K., & Forsyth, P. B. (1986). *Effective supervision: Theory into Practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

İstanbul Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü İlköğretim Müfettişleri Başkanlığı. (2002). *Etkili teftiş ve rehberlik. İyileştirme Takımı Raporu*. İstanbul: Yazar.

Karagözoğlu, G. (1977). *İlköğretimde teftiş uygulamaları*. Yayımlanmamış araştırma. Ankara.

Karakuş, A. (1999). *Etkili eğitim denetimi*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya.

Kaya, Y. K. (1993). *Eğitim yönetimi*. Ankara: Set Ofset Matbaacılık, Ltd. Şti.

Kayıkçı, K. (2004). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı denetmenlerinin denetim alt sisteminin yapısal sorunlarına ilişkin algıları ve iş doyum düzeyleri*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.

Korkmaz, M. ve Özdoğan, O. (2005). İlköğretim müfettişlerinin rehberlik görevlerini gerçekleştirme düzeyleri. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *3* (4), 431-443.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB]. (1999). İlköğretim Müfettişleri Başkanlıkları Yönetmeliği. *Resmi Gazete* (13.08.1999, 23785 sayılı). http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/55.html adresinden 4 nisan 2010 tarihinde edinilmiştir.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB]. (2001). İlköğretim Müfettişliği Başkanlıkları Rehberlik ve Teftiş Yönergesi. *Tebliğler Dergisi* (Şubat 2001, 2521), http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/54.html adresinden 4 Nisan 2010 tarihinde edinilmiştir.

Memduhoğlu, H. B., Aydın, İ., Yılmaz, K., Güngör. S., & Oğuz, E. (2007). The process of supervision in the Turkish educational system: Purpose, structure, operation. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *8* (1), 56-70.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. CA: Sage Thousand Oaks.

Oliva, P. F., & Pawlas, G. E. (2004). *Supervision for today's schools*. New York: John Wiley Sons, İnc.

Pajak, E. (2010, Haziran). *The history and future of instructional supervision in the United States*. 2. Uluslararası Katılımlı Eğitim Denetimi Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Kütahya.

Polat, S. ve Uğurlu, C. T. (2009). İlköğretim müfettişlerinin mesleki tükenmişlik düzeyleri. *I. Uluslararası Katılımlı Eğitim Denetimi Kongresi* içinde (s. 101-109). Ankara: TEM-SEN.

Sarpkaya, R. (2004). İlköğretim denetmenlerinin denetim süresince karşılaştıkları sorunlar. *Burdur Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Burdur, *5* (8), 114–129.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starrat, R. J. (1993). *Supervision a redefinition*. New York: McGrow Hill.

Söbü A. (2005). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin sorunları (IV. Hizmet Bölgesi Örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sivas.

Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2009). *Supervision that improvements teaching and learning: Strategies and techniques*. CA: Corwin A Sage Company.

Şahin, S., Aydoğdu, B. ve Yoldaş, C. (2009, Mayıs). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin duygusal zekâ ve iş doyumu düzeyleri*. IV Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, Denizli.

Şahin, S., Zeytin-Akyürek, N. ve Çek, F. (2009). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin memnuniyet ve memnuniyetsizlikleri*. IV Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, Denizli.

Şenyüz, H. (2006). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin görevleri ile ilgili hizmetlerinin yürütülmesinde karşılaştıkları sorunlar*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Taşar, H. H. (2000). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin rehberlik görevlerine ilişkin sorunlar (Gaziantep ve Adıyaman illeri örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.

Taymaz, H. (1995). Teftişte karşılaşılan sorunlar ve öneriler. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 1*, 109-112.

Taymaz, H. (1997). *Eğitim sisteminde teftiş*. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası.

Terzi, A. R. (1996). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin eğitim sorunları*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Tükel, H. (1997). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin iş doyumu*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Tok, N. T. (2004). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin iş doyumu ve örgütsel bağlılıkları*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Yavuz, Y. (1995). *Öğretmenlerin denetim etkinliklerini klinik denetim ilkeleri açısından değerlendirmeleri*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.

Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (7. bs.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yılmaz, S. (1994). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretimde denetim uygulamaları. *Çağdaş Eğitim*, *19* (205), 44–45.

Waite, D. (1995). *Rethinking instructional supervision: Notes its language and culture*. Bristol: The Falmer Press.

Zepeda, S. J. (2006). High stakes supervision: We must do more. *The International Journal of Leadership in Education, 9* (1), 61-73.