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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to attempt to focus on the relationship between educational innovation and primary school supervision in Turkey. The main focus is on the innovative behaviours exhibited by the primary school supervisors. Thus, the experiences of primary school teachers, provincial directors of education and primary school supervisors about these behaviours are identified. The views of these groups on some on-going supervisory activities in primary education in general and its supervision in particular are also identified and compared with each other.

In addition, the views of these three groups of educationalists were sought on the barriers which could prevent the process of initiation and implementation of educational innovations and their recommendations for the improvement of the degree of implementing such innovations in primary schools.

Questionnaires were administered to a sample of 190 teachers, 50 supervisors and 10 directors, drawn from representative regions throughout Turkey. For the teachers and supervisors, information obtained and their personal characteristics made it possible to examine the relationship of their responses with, for example, sex, age, teaching experiences and region.

The findings of the study revealed that the vast majority of the pre-defined would-be innovative behaviours of supervisors had not been adequately exhibited both in quantity and quality, according to the responses of the vast majority of the teachers. However, a substantial proportion of the supervisors reported that they had exhibited those behaviours. The findings also suggested that the “quality control” or “assessment” aspect of the primary school supervision in Turkey was given more weight than the “support” and “advice” aspects of it. However, the results also highlighted that there was a need for shifting of the focus away from monitoring and inspection to support and advice in supervisory activities.

The results also suggested that the teachers revealed views distant from the supervisors and directors with regard to the items on some on-going supervisory activities. But, they reported nearly similar views about the pre-identified seventeen barriers and eleven recommendations. The barriers were acknowledged and the recommendations were ‘agreed’ with.
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CHAPTER I

LITERATURE ON EDUCATIONAL CHANGE AND SUPERVISION

Introduction

Primary education represents perhaps the most important organized attempt to educate pupils. It is the education which provides the child with basic knowledge about the group life into which he/she has been born and with skills to acquire, extend and, make use of that knowledge to become an active member of the society. However, lack of achievement during the period of primary schooling is an almost certain indication of future trouble for the individual. It is not only crucial to the individual but to society as well.

So, the improvement of the instructional effectiveness of primary schools becomes an important task assigned to all school staff, including administrators, teachers and supervisors. However, it seems that supervisors occupy a different, perhaps the most distinctive place in the educational setting since they can be regarded as mediators between teachers and staff in the administrative structure of the education system.

Turkish primary school supervisors have a range of roles and tasks to perform. These include inspecting teachers, school staff and schools, giving advice and helping them, assessing teachers' and other school staff's performance and even prosecuting criminal investigations of school personnel. Beside these, there is an aspect of their role which is vitally important in the improvement of the instructional effectiveness of primary schools. It is the implementation of educational innovations. Improving the instructional effectiveness of schools requires new adaptations to the changing needs of both individuals and society and this requires the initiation and implementation of educational innovations into practice in primary schools.

It is generally agreed that one of the most difficult activities of any kind of administration is introducing and implementing changes in an organisation. As Everard et al (1990, p.229) state, industry, like education, has faced this problem...
for many years, and not only is it now more clearly understood, but it is also one that has become the focus of a good deal of management training.

This is no less a difficulty in educational institutions than in industrial ones. Moreover, it may well be much more difficult and entail a higher responsibility in education than in industry, because the person himself is the product of education. Therefore, any major mistake in the education process may cause irreversible deficiencies, whereas mistakes in the production process of any other material goods can only cause some loss from its economical value which can be compensated in relatively easier ways.

Encouraging educational change and innovation is vital if we are to cope with the changes around us. Doing and insisting on the same old things, and using the same old ways and techniques will not be enough for a country to be successful for the improvement of her human resources.

This study is of the role of the supervisors in the Turkish primary education system, as described later in this chapter. The nearest equivalent in the British system is the Local Authority Inspectors or Advisers, but since there are some differences in their roles, the term "supervisor" as a direct translation of the Turkish "Mufettis", is preferred and generally used in this thesis.

It should also be noted here that although the customary practice does not fit, the inclination to use the term “supervision” instead of “inspection” in this study is because of the desire for having a system which stresses the advice and support dimension of the issue as well as its control function. Or, put it another way, this is a preference of having a system which ‘supervises’, rather than ‘inspects’. Although the topic is always open to debate, it can be concluded that the term ‘control’ is nearer to the term ‘inspection’ rather than ‘supervision’ in meaning.

THE MEANING OF CHANGE AND INNOVATION

In everyday usage, the words change and innovation are frequently used interchangeably, and this is the case in much of the related literature. But, Nicholls (1983) points out that there is a distinction between the two. Innovation is seen as something which is essentially new, while change may involve the reordering of something which already exists, into a new pattern. She further points out that there are three aspects of innovation: first, that it is fundamental in nature; secondly, that it is deliberate and planned; thirdly, that there is the intention of improvement.
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As Fullan stated (1982, p.13), the nature of educational and social change must first be understood in terms of its sources and purposes. For him, one does not have to be a historian to accept the fact that a number of major external and internal forces over time create pressures for change. Fullan mentions three broad ways in which pressures for educational policy change may arise (1) through natural disasters such as earthquakes, floods, famines, etc.; (2) through external forces such as imported technology and values, and immigration; and (3) through internal contradictions, such as when indigenous changes in technology lead to new social patterns and needs, or when one or more groups in a society perceive a discrepancy between educational values and outcomes affecting themselves or others in whom they have an interest.

According to Fullan (1986b), any change process involves three levels of transition: the use of new resources, the existence of appropriate practices or behaviours, and finally, fundamental shifts in beliefs and understanding. He goes on to stress that working with new resources is essentially superficial, in that it is external to the individual, whereas changes in behaviour and attitudes are internal and, therefore, concerned with learning.

As is known, not all types of change are of the same level. Golembiewski (1976), for example, distinguishes different levels of change in general, namely *Alpha*, *Beta* and *Gamma* changes. Alpha changes (first-order changes) are simple, routine and minor changes. In one’s home life, examples of this would be decorating a room, replanting the garden, etc. At work it might involve getting a new colleague or starting a new group. Beta changes (second-order changes) have more general implications and involve a shift in the framework within which alpha change happens. This might be a change in one’s job or house. At work it might involve a change in working practices. Gamma change (third-order change) is a radical change involving a fundamental shift of assumptions and values. In non-work life this might be having children, change in marital status, religious conversion or a serious illness. At work it might involve a major shift in the overall task of the organization, or a change in the organizational culture.

So, if we draw an analogy, the changes (or innovations) which are triggered and/or practised and implemented by primary school supervisors and therefore examined in this study are the *Alpha* and *Beta* types (first and second-order) of changes. Radical *Gamma* type changes are not included, in fact, this type of changes are very high calibre tasks which go beyond the supervisors’ duty and authority.
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However, for the practical purposes of this study, we can ignore the semantic differences between the words "innovation", and "change". Thus, innovation in this study is regarded as any newly developed operation which does represent a deviation from existing customary practices. Another aspect of the definition is that any newly developed operation that is innovatory is relative to its context, including the national context. Thus, what could be regarded as an innovation in primary education in Turkey might not necessarily be innovation elsewhere. In short, the term innovation in this study does not necessarily carry overtones of originality and creativity, but it does imply improvement.

PRIMARY SCHOOL SUPERVISORS' ROLES AND THEIR PLACE IN EDUCATION

In the literature, there are two main tendencies in perceptions of the place and the role of supervisors in educational systems. As Winkley (1985, p.180) states clearly, many senior administrative officers feel that the central activity of advisers ought to be what they frequently described as "quality control" and change should begin with a radical tightening up of the advisory branch as an instrument of control. Many administrators have wished to press advisers to concentrate on "assessment" as the spearhead of this task, whereas many advisers would prefer to spend time on what they describe as "innovation".

It is widely accepted in the literature that a supervisor is first an adviser to teachers. He/she is there to provide by every possible means concrete and constructive advice to teachers so that the quality of education is improved. He/she is not merely an inspector of schools but rather a person who helps the teachers to help the children via different courses, seminars, exhibitions and other available means. He/she has also the role of providing honest, accurate and definitive reports on the schools he/she supervises, on the teachers he/she observes and on the educational value obtained from the tax-payers money. In short, his/her first duty is to act as a guide and adviser to teachers.

Such perceptions are not new. As Brighouse (1984) states in his article "The Influence of Her Majesty's Inspectors", the first instructions for inspectors by Dr. Kay of the Poor Law Commission in 1839 read like a brief for a modern adviser in an enlightened authority:

"It is of the utmost consequence that you should bear in mind that this inspection is not intended as a means of exercising control, but of
affording assistance; that is not to be regarded as operating for the
restraint of local efforts, but for their encouragement and that its chief
objects will not be attained without the cooperation of the school
committees; the inspector having no power to interfere and being
instructed not to offer any advice or information excepting where it is
invited”.

On the other hand, the Coopers and Lybrand Report (HMSO, 1988), for example,
calls for a re-emphasising of the inspectoral aspect, as saying:

“Under LMS we think their role is likely to change in emphasis... There
will still need to be advisory task to be performed... But the monitoring
role will mean that the emphasis will shift more towards the inspectoral
end of the spectrum”

The Secretary of State for Education and Science said in 1988 (quoted by
Bambrough, 1992, p.129):

“The local inspectorate will need to monitor and evaluate school
performance. They will need to provide LEAs and the schools
themselves with trusted and informed professional advice, based on first
hand observation of what schools are actually doing. Doing all these
things well requires inspection in all its forms”.

Eric Bolton, Senior Chief Inspector of HMI between 1983-1992, stated in an
interview (TES, June 1991, p.4), that “Having people around you who are supposed
to be experts is one way of getting advice, but my experience is that it had better be
linked to inspection in some way if you want people to listen”

seemed to advocate the indivisibility of inspection and advice:

“Total separation of inspection and advice is a mistake. LEA inspection,
however professionally impartial, will not lead to improvement unless
inspection and its findings are in some way linked into advice and
support that should be based upon them. Similarly, effective advice and
support needs to be rooted in a first-hand knowledge of the schools’
existing strengths and weaknesses that is necessarily based, in part at
least, on inspection”.

20
Chapter 1: Literature on Educational Change and Supervision

Samuel (1991) argues that it is impossible to continue both roles. According to him, local authority inspectors are an integral part of the department which also provides education. And, like all other employees they owe loyalty to their employer. There is of course role conflict.

Bambrough (1992), in his article ‘Advisers - Can We Afford Them?’, examines the two aspects of the role of the LEA adviser and Inspector in England and Wales and concludes that Weber’s ‘rational-legal authority model (the acceptance by virtue of authority and position) may operate in business and other organisations, but would struggle to relate to schools.

On the other hand, some people argue that the dual procedures of inspection and advice are complementary aspects of the same process, and therefore they are indivisible. Beth (1992), for example, argues that there has been some debate concerning the title ‘critical friend’. For her, the question is posed by the sceptics as to whether it is possible to be a friend on the one hand and then to move into the challenging role of questioner. She continues:

“It has to be said that much will depend on the flexibility of the individual inspector but that it is perfectly possible to move from one to the other, particularly if there is a negotiated agenda, and sympathetic allocation of times set aside for clearly demarcated issues. In addition if the ‘critical friend’ model is to work then it is essential for the headteacher and the inspector to develop a professional relationship on the basis of mutual trust and respect”

Of course, the perception of the supervisory role in any educational system greatly depends on the social, political and economical conditions of the relevant country. But, it seems necessary to make a distinction between the kind of change that evolves from the organisation of "systems" and the kind of change that involves "ideas". As mentioned, many senior educational administrators want to see supervisors in a role which consists of setting up committees, gathering data, inspecting, promotion control and the like. In short, they want to maintain the status quo. It seems that this is an issue which arises more in relatively more centralised educational systems. But, on the other hand, the supervisory role must be extended beyond this level. It is necessary to address longer term change which involves attitudes and the rethinking of key issues.
There is no doubt that a supervisor must know the nature of the existing situation in detail. Obviously, we need to know much about what kind of activities are taking place in schools, especially in classrooms. As is frequently stated, we ought to know what is happening behind the closed doors. So, some kind of inspection seems inevitable in all school systems. The evaluation of educational programs and assessment of teachers and other school staff—to some extent "quality control"—is an inevitable task which needs to be performed by someone, most obviously by supervisors.

But, an innovative supervisor must consider this level of the task as a starting point and should go beyond it. He/she can use this information about the existing situation as the basis for required educational changes. He/she should identify ways to overcome existing problems, and ways to initiate and to implement innovations which will lead to the improvement of the instructional effectiveness of the school. Primary school supervisors should be a group of professional educationalists rather than bureaucratic administrators. They must have an independence and they have to retain their autonomy and freedom from political interference. The success obviously will depend on how well he/she has researched the real need, how practical his/her ideas and attitudes towards the necessary changes are, and how well he/she has taken the support of the related staff, especially teachers, along with him/her.

SUPERVISION IN SOME OTHER COUNTRIES

Naturally, every country in the world has its own supervision system. It can be said that historical, cultural, economical and political factors play an important role to determine the system of educational supervision in a particular country. Some of the main characteristics of the educational systems of some countries and their systems of supervision are reviewed in the following paragraphs:

In France, for example, there are two bodies of supervisors; as was reported by Follain (TBS, 1992), one is the elite, all-powerful, chief supervisors ("les inspecteurs généraux") and local supervisors. It was reported that there were, approximately, 151 'chief inspectors', and 2,500 'local inspectors' in July 1992 in France (Follain, 1992). Follain reported that the whole supervision system and the distribution of the duties were reformed in 1989. Before 1989, the chief inspectors had worked entirely alone to inspect individual teachers. This type of inspection is now carried out by local inspectors, leaving chief inspectors, working in teams, free to evaluate whole schools, as well as a host of other aspects of the education system.
Follain states that the General Inspectorate is a powerful body. It is made up of 16 subject divisions. The 1989 Reform has made recruitment more open, and introduced a minimum requirement of five years teaching experience. Most are respected specialists but it is still possible for the minister to appoint a handful whose only requirement is a minimum age of 45. “The army of local inspectors includes the “inspecteurs d’académie” who are responsible for the distribution of primary teaching posts in their area. They also pay an active role in teacher training”, says Follain in her article (1992, p. 12).

On the other hand, in Germany, for example, there is not a national schools inspectorate, as each of its federal states has autonomy in education. Smith (1992) reports that the responsibility for inspection lies directly, or indirectly, with the regional education ministry, depending on the type of school in question. Primary schools and Hauptschulen (secondary moderns) are generally under the aegis of the local education authority, while grammar schools (Gymnasien) are supervised by ministry inspectors.

It is reported that, broadly speaking, the duties of the inspectorate do not differ significantly across the country (Smith, 1992). All teachers are appraised at regular intervals on the basis of demonstration lessons (in Bavaria, once every four years; in North-Rhine Westphalia, once every six years). Inspectors also assess teachers at the end of their probation and, in most cases, when a member of staff applies for promotion. Reports take into account a teacher’s subject knowledge, teaching methods and discipline standards. It is also argued by Smith that the difficulties of combining inspection and advice are evident, and many teachers think the system of appraisal is weighted too heavily in favour of inspection. Smith also quotes from a teacher in Kempen as saying “Advice, when it is given, is never prophylactic. It is only given with hindsight, once something serious has happened.”

Newbold reports that, as was the case in France, the Italian schools inspectorate, too, has recently been reorganised (1992, p. 12). For him, until 1989 there were two types of inspector - those based in Rome, and the rest, known as ispettori periferici. This distinction has now been dropped; today there are 696 inspectors (divided between primary and secondary) of equal status and similar duties. But most inspectors are still based in the provinces. The main role of an inspector is that of co-ordinator and adviser. All in-services training programmes promoted by the provveditorati (LEAs) are co-ordinated by inspectors, who also oversee experimental and research activities.
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“The bulk of the work, however, involves visiting schools and, in particular, consultation with heads. Inspectors probably spend less time in the classroom than their British counterparts; being observed on the job is an experience many teachers have never undergone” says Newbold (1992, p. 12). Work schedules are drawn up on a monthly basis, in collaboration with education chiefs and, frequently, on a regional basis (that is, with colleagues from neighbouring provinces). The inspectorate also has to produce an annual report on the school year.

In the USA, “there are inspections of schools and educational projects, which are carried out by a range of organisations”, says Hodges in his article in the TES (1992, p. 13). Schools which belong to a regional accrediting body are checked by that body, all schools are inspected by their states, and some schools are visited by the Education Department as it monitors central government programmes. According to the report by Hodges, the inspections by US states and the Education Department tend to be straightforward checks on whether schools are complying with rules and regulations - whether they have the correct class sizes, courses, and the number of hours devoted to a subject or whether they are carrying out a programme in the way they said they would. These are not checks on teaching quality. Teacher evaluation is a separate issue undertaken every year by school principals in most states.

Inspections by the Education Department are carried out to make sure that money given to statutory programmes is being spent in ways consistent with the grant applications. There are other inspections which are carried out by the Inspector General of the Education Department. As is stated by Hodges, although, historically, Inspector General’s reports have concentrated on accounting, recent reports have shown an increasing interest in education quality. However, the closest equivalent of HMI style reports are those produced by the regional accrediting bodies which operate in conjunction with states in some cases. Schools belong to them for a fee. “Each school receives one onsite visit every seven years carried out by a team of practising teachers from schools outside the immediate district. Such evaluations are advisory rather than inspectoral in tone”, says Hodges (1992, p. 13).

HER MAJESTY’S INSPECTORS OF SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND AND WALES

As an institution, Her Majesty’s Inspectors of Schools (HMI) in England and Wales is unique. Lawton and Gordon (1987, p.1) point out that no other country possesses a group of professional educational advisers who operate independently from the controlling central authority - the Department of Education and Science, DES, (now
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called Department for Education, DFE). They argue that HMI has a different status from the civil servants at the DFE, partly because Inspectors are professional educationists and partly because they are appointed, for historical reasons, by Order of the Queen in Council - on the recommendation of the Secretary of State. It is widely accepted that HM Inspectors are an extremely influential professional group in the education sector in England and Wales.

As Goodings & Dunford (1990, p.1) state, the exact date of the origin of H.M. Inspectorate is not easy to determine. On 13 April 1839, the Committee of Council on Education, which had been constituted three days earlier, issued its plans for the distribution of the public funds for education which Parliament had approved in the preceding February. The plans included the appointment of inspectors, and their duties were defined in the minutes of the same committee as follows:

“To carry on an inspection of schools which have been or may be hereafter aided by grants of public money, and to convey to conductors and teachers of private schools in different parts of the country, a knowledge of all improvements in the art of teaching, and likewise to report to this Committee the progress made in education from year to year”.

Goodings & Dunford (1990, p.3) report that the careers of those who became H.M.I.s between 1840 and 1870 exhibited a remarkable uniformity. Nearly all were graduates of Oxford and Cambridge and a high proportion had first or second class honours degrees. Their patrician background, which was essential if they were to deal on equal terms with the managers of schools, had two important consequences. First, although a surprisingly large number of the early H.M.I.s had had some contact with education outside the universities, they had no previous experience of teaching and learning in elementary schools and so there was no temptation to require conformity to their own classroom techniques. Secondly, this career pattern gave inspectors a large measure of intellectual and economic independence from the Department. This ability to stand above and apart from the elementary schools and the Department gave many of the inspectors a wide view of their role.

In the years since 1870 both the structure of the Inspectorate and the duties which have been assigned to it have undergone substantial alteration, reflecting the development of the national education service as a whole, according to Goodings & Dunford (1990). They are selected no longer by patronage but by public advertisement. Their background is overwhelmingly one of successful teaching
experience, collectively covering the whole spectrum of educational institutions. Appointment as an inspector is normally the culmination of a career and most hold this position until retirement. The workload of modern inspectors leave them no time to engage in literary or scholarly activities.

The Government's policy statement "The Work of HM Inspectorate in England and Wales", published by the Department of Education and Science in 1983 after the Rainer study, states that the Inspectorate:

- assesses standards and trends and advises the Secretary of State on the performance of the system nationally;
- identifies and makes known more widely good practice and promising developments and draws attention to weakness requiring attention;
- provides advice and assistance to those with responsibilities for or in the institutions in the system through its day-to-day contacts, its contributions to training and its publications.

Inspection visits of various kinds are the principal, though not the only means by which HMI perform these functions. They have the right in law to inspect all schools. Inspections are carried out by individual inspectors or by small groups of inspectors, and often confined to a single day. HMI discuss their observations with individual teachers, with heads of department and with the head of school, before they leave. No formal report is produced on these visits, but they contribute to the Inspectorate's collective knowledge of the educational system and to the evidence which is used as a basis for such publications as the annual report on the effects of local authority expenditure policies on education provision.

The formal inspections which lead to the writing and publication of an inspection report to the Secretary of State are undertaken for a variety of reasons. Some are designed to enable HMI to provide the Secretary of State with informed advice on the implementation and effects of particular policies; or they form part of a national sampling of the educational system to assess standards and trends and to provide basic bench-marks. Some are prompted by priorities identified in a particular part of the country, and are designed to identify and make more widely known good local practices and promising developments, draw attention to weakness. Others are concerned with a particular subject of the curriculum, or with an aspect such as health education (Department of Education and Science, 1986).
HMI's main concern is with standards of learning (Pearce, 1986). In judging these, along with the evidence of their own eyes about the work done and in progress, they make use of such measures as exist, including levels of attainment in literacy and numeracy and the proportion of pupils or students entering for, and successful in, public examinations. HMI have to judge whether or not what is taught is what pupils and students need to know; how well it increases their grasp of a subject; if it equips them for jobs and future careers; and whether it contributes to a better understanding of themselves and the world in which they live.

On the other hand, Rowan (TES, June 1991, p.4) argues that HMI's first task is to provide the government of the day with the advice and information it needs in the light of its intentions for education. After that comes advice and information to the people who need to act on it, and then informing parents and the world at large; and all that is based on inspections, on what inspectors have seen for themselves - reported, sifted, collated, discussed and channelled through their senior chief HMI.

HMI do not report on individual teachers, but they do assess the quality of teaching because of its direct influence upon standards of learning. They judge whether or not teaching methods and the books and materials made available are appropriate to the age, aptitudes and abilities of the pupils or students. But more than that, they look at how well the teaching stimulates interest, curiosity and enthusiasm, helps with the mastery of the subject matter, and fosters pupils' ability to organise their own studies.

Between January 1981 and July 1981, some studies were carried out within the DES. Known as the Rayner Report, the findings were published in March 1983. As quoted by Lawton and Gordon (1987, p.141-149), at the beginning of the study four basic questions were posed: first, the right balance between the role of HMI in giving advice to central government and its role in contributing to the development of the system; second, the effectiveness of HMI and the value that others place on their work; third, the structure, organization and management of HMI; and, finally, the possibility of reducing the manpower of HMI or allocating their duties to others.

Lawton and Gordon argued that (p.142) this analysis of HMI suggested the following working definitions of their role which was adopted by the writers of the Report:

a - to assess standards and trends throughout the education system and to advise central government on the state of the system nationally on the
basis of its independent professional judgement. This is its first and over­riding duty; and at the same time,

b - to contribute to the maintenance and improvements of standards in
the system by the identification and dissemination of good practice; by
bringing to notice weaknesses which require attention; and by advice to
those with a direct responsibility for the operation of the service
including teachers, heads and principals, governing bodies and LEAs.

At present Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) inspect some schools every year and
their reports are published. But they can not cover all schools regularly. The
government proposes to change the law so as to set up new national arrangements
proposals:

Every state school, including special schools, will have to be inspected
regularly. Those who do the inspection will have to be approved by a
national body, which will check to see that they do a thorough job.

All inspection teams will include at least one person not working in
education to give an outside view. In the course of their work, the
inspectors will hold an open meeting for parents to talk about the school.
They will also take other opportunities to find out parent's views.

When the inspection is finished, the report will be published. Parents will
be sent a summary of the report, prepared by the inspectors, which sets
out the school's strengths and weakness. Parents will also be sent the
governors' plans to tackle the problem areas. The school will have a duty
to act on the report.

HMI seem to be reviewed increasingly frequently in recent years in England and
Wales. Government has plans to privatise the inspection of schools. McGee (1992)
argues that HMI have to decide whether to do all the inspecting themselves or
whether to contract much of the work to LEAs or private inspectorate. If they
adopted the latter approach, then their major role would be in validating other
inspectorate and collating their findings.

As was mentioned earlier, Her Majesty's Inspectorate is a national body which is
responsible for inspection of and advice to schools (i.e. school staff) in England and
Wales. Beside this national body, there are a number of Local Education Authorities
Chapter 1: Literature on Educational Change and Supervision

(LEA) in each of which an advisory service exists. As Stillman & Grant (1989) mentioned, Education Act 1944 gave the then 154 local education authorities the right to inspect their schools and by implication, the right to set up and fund the necessary services. A small number of inspection and advisory services had existed before then and this legislation paved the way for all LEAs to provide the service:

> Any local education authority may cause an inspection to be made of any educational establishment maintained by the authority, and such inspections shall be made by officers appointed by the local education authority (Education Act 1944).

As Goodings & Dunford (1990, p.6) state, independence is one of the major differences between HMI and local authority inspectors. Normally HMI District Inspectors work closely with Chief Education Officers, but local politicians have been very critical of HMI in recent years. According to them, in 1984 for instance, after critical reports had been published on a number of LEAs and the annual expenditure survey had linked spending levels with educational standards, a group of Conservative Chairmen of Education Committees put pressure on the government to curtail the independence of the Inspectorate. Cllr Muffett, of Hereford and Worcester, said:

> “HMI strays into political, social and financial areas which are not within its province. It is not proper for the inspectors to serve political value judgements. Much of what they say is a matter for authorities themselves, on which HMI does not have the slightest competence to judge”.

According to Goodings and Dunford, the local politicians had failed to understand the difference in the relationship between HMI and the DES and that between local authority inspectors and their employing LEAs. Legally, the two types of inspectors have the same relationship with their respective employers; the difference lies in the traditions which have developed over the years. LEA inspectors are firmly under the control of the Chief Education Officer, whereas HMI have preserved a professional independence within the civil service.

The most recent Education Reform Act (1988) states that:

> “it shall be the duty of the local education authority and the governing body to exercise their function with a view to securing, and the duty of
the head teacher to secure - that the National Curriculum as subsisting at
the beginning of that year is implemented”.

As Dean (1990) suggests the Act also gives LEAs the right to suspend financial
delegation where the governing body have been guilty of a substantial or persistent
failure to comply with any requirements under the scheme.

These statements, and other pronouncements from the Secretary of State and DES,
suggest that the LEA needs to keep the work of its schools under continuous review,
including a review of the management. This must be a task for the advisory service,
who already maintain an overview of schools.

Dean (1990) points out that inspection is an extremely delicate task and all advisers
need to develop the skill of making critical comments in a supportive way,
particularly in reporting to governors where it may be difficult to report in a way
which is supportive to the head but still gives an honest view. The credibility of the
advisory service depends upon the ability to be honest but supportive. According to
him, an advisory service has the choice of several different ways of reviewing
schools. The pattern chosen depends upon the preferences of the chief education
officer, councillors and members of the service. It also depends upon the strength of
the service and the amount of time which can be devoted to this activity. The cost of
the different forms of inspection should also be taken into account, whether this is
calculated in terms of the time used by advisers and teachers or in actual cash terms.

For him, the following approaches are possible:

**Full inspection**: A visit by a group of advisers with the specific task of
inspecting the whole school.

**Specialist inspection**: Specialist advisers visit to look at work in their
particular field. This includes a study of the management of the school
by advisers with appropriate experience.

**Long-term inspection**: A full inspection carried out over the course of a
term or so as advisers are available.

**Collaborative inspection**: Inspection can be a shared process between
advisers and the school. There are various ways in which this can be
done. The school can be part of the process throughout, joining in the
planning, identifying the evidence and assessing it.
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Monitored self-evaluation: Many LEAs have self-evaluation schemes and these can contribute to the process of reviewing the schools of the LEA if there is an adequate scheme for letting advisers have reports and for making complementary studies of the schools to check on the validity of the self-evaluation.

Visit record: Some LEAs are using the normal visits of their advisers as a way of reviewing their schools. Each adviser has a detailed list of checks to make in the school and these reports are put together to make a total picture, which is set along-side work on performance indicators.

Review: There is a case time to time for looking at particular aspects of work across a sample of schools. It can be difficult to fit this in, but planning should include reviews of this kind which will provide information needed by administrators and committees as well as advisers.

In her article in School Governor on the role and responsibilities of HMI, Gibbons (1988, p.32) talks about significant changes that have taken place in recent times in education. The main change, she reports, is in the general accountability of HMIs, not only to LEAs and individual schools, but to the general public where there has been an enormous increase of national interest and discussion of educational matters.

Gibbons states that the categories of inspection range from a "survey" where one particular aspect, such as a subject or year-group is studied in depth across many schools, to a "full inspection" where a group of inspectors spend up to a week in one particular school looking at all aspects of the curriculum.

She also reports, in the same article, the experiences of an HMI, Mr Hollingsworth, who has been one of Her Majesty's Inspectors for 22 years and a staff inspector of primary schools for the last 14. "You look at a whole range of things: the equipment provided, the subjects taught, the provision of facilities. You do not report on individual teachers. The central focus is the work the children are being given, and the standards they are achieving. In every school there are strengths and weaknesses. Of course, every school has something that could be improved upon" says Mr Hollingsworth.
Gibbons, then, argues about how HMI see their advice implemented and the findings of a survey by the DES. "The report appears about six months after the inspection, and three months after its publication the DES send a letter to the LEA asking what action has been taken" says Mr Hollingsworth. What if nothing has happened? "Things usually happen, if not, it is up to the governors to want to know why." However the findings of the DES research revealed that, Gibbons reports (1988, p.33):

"The priority given to reports is not generally high. In only 20 per cent of LEAs are the reports read and debated by the Education Committee.

23 per cent of LEAs take no steps to endorse a formal debate by governors. As for long-term consideration, only 16 per cent of LEAs reported automatic follow-up action after the formal response to the DES.

Publicity surrounding the reports tends to be minimal. 37 per cent of LEAs issue a press notice of the report, and just one authority calls a press conference for all HMI reports in its area. Less than half the LEAs display copies of reports in libraries. Only two send copies of the report to all parents of pupils at the school concerned, and 4 per cent send copies to head teachers of schools other than those reported.

In spite of all this 76 per cent of all Authorities said the information received through HMI publications has some effect on their policies".

After the acceptance of the 1992 Schools Bill by the British Parliament, the efforts to privatise school inspections gathered pace in England and Wales. As reported by Hackett in TES, the Department for Education launched a £100,000 advertising campaign aimed at recruiting 200 inspectors who will lead the privatised teams which begin inspecting schools in 1993. Professor Stewart Sudherland, who, at the time of writing, was going to become chief inspector of schools in September 1992 stated that the inspectors to be recruited were likely to be drawn from existing HMI, local authority inspectors, teachers and others with a background in education (TES, 1992).

According to the framework document, as reported by Hackett in TES, June, 1992, the inspectors have a statutory duty to report schools they consider to be failing or likely to fail their pupils. The factors to take into account in reaching such a
judgement are poor exam results as compared with similar schools; disruptive behaviour and truancy; demoralisation and disenchantment among staff and ineffectiveness and insensitivity from the head and/or senior management. As well as inspecting the quality of education, inspectors will be expected to report on the extent to which parents are involved in the school and how regularly they attend school meetings.

The minimum time spent by inspectors in schools is likely to be less than the time currently spent by HMI on school inspections. The framework lays down a minimum of five inspector days for a nursery with fewer than 51 children. An inspection team of three would spend around six days in a primary school with between 200 and 300 pupils. Primary school inspector teams will have a balance of specialist and general inspectors.

In their report to school governors, the inspectors will be expected to provide information on the standards achieved; the quality and efficiency of the school and its ethos. According to the framework, judgement should be made on the basis of observation of lessons; inspection of pupils’ work; evidence of ability of pupils when they arrived at the school and national curriculum assessment.

The document says: “The quality of pupils’ learning is to be judged in terms of the progress made in lessons, reflected by gains in knowledge, understanding and the extent to which they show competence as learners, including ability in reading, writing and numeracy”. The registered inspector is encouraged to discuss the findings of the inspection with the school governors and separately with the head and senior management as soon as possible on the completion of the inspection.

According to the same document, the final report will include the following five sectors:

1. Information on the area from which pupils are drawn.
2. Standards and quality of education and key issues for action.
3. The efficiency of the school in its use of resources.
4. The wider issue of how the school operates as a community and how it deals with issues such as bullying and truancy.
5. The spiritual and moral development of pupils.
Other issues the inspectors are expected to note include a school's arrangements for equality of opportunity; provision for children with special needs and the management of teachers and support staff. Inspectors will be expected to note parents' views before the inspection begins and evaluate parents' involvement in the school, including attendance at meetings and support for school functions.

TEACHER APPRAISAL

As is very well known, the major duty of teachers is to help children to learn by assisting them in acquiring knowledge, skills and competencies. The quality of the service delivered to pupils depends, obviously, upon the knowledge and performances of teachers. So, it becomes quite an important issue to have accurate knowledge of each teacher's performance for the authorities in the countries. Therefore, every government establishes some sort of mechanisms to assess their teachers' performances. Although the type of the assessment can differ substantially from country to country, the assessment of teachers' performance is generally based on classroom visits. These visits, too, are performed by different groups of professionals in different countries. It can be said that the differentiation in the type of appraisers is bigger than the type of appraisal among the countries. Thus, for instance, the appraisal of teachers is, generally, the duty of a teacher's head or head of department in England and Wales whilst, it is the one of the major duties of primary school supervisors in Turkey.

As quoted by Goddard and Emerson (1992, p.11), from the Appraisal and Training Working Group, appraisal can be seen as “a continuous and systematic process intended to help individual teachers with their professional development and career planning, and to help ensure that the in-service training and deployment of teachers matches the complementary needs of individual teachers and the schools”.

Goddard and Emerson argue that appraisal for teachers came on to the agenda as part of the ‘accountability in education’ movement, after the Ruskin College Speech of Prime Minister James Callaghan in October 1976 (1992, p.6). Previously, the role of central government had been to resource the service and to determine its general shape. The authors point out that after 1977, influence started to be exerted from the centre, but gently at first. And, the move was continued in the 1985 White Paper, Better Schools:

“...regular and formal appraisal of the performance of all teachers is necessary if LEAs are to have reliable, comprehensive and up-to-date
information necessary for the systematic and effective provision of professional support and development and the development of staff to best advantage”.

Goddard and Emerson mention two different models of appraisal. One is the staff development model and the other one is the accountability model (1992, p.10). They point out that in the staff development model appraisal scheme starts from the assumption that teachers can improve their performance. But, this, however, is not seen as a criticism of teachers. Because, they continue to argue, trainee teachers receive between one and four years of initial teacher education (in England and Wales) at the beginning of their career. So, in no way will that training be adequate for a lifetime in teaching. In all professions, in all walks of life, there needs to be a constant upgrading and updating of knowledge and skills. Then, they list the features of a staff development model of appraisal (1992, p.11):

1. It celebrates what the teacher is doing well.
2. It identifies areas where the teacher may be able to improve.
3. It assists the career development of the teacher.
4. It integrates the school and the individual teacher and identifies areas of mutual interest.
5. It identifies the support and in-service training which the teacher requires in order to progress.
6. It provides the basis for school audit and review.

In this model, appraisal is a genuine two-way process between the appraiser and teacher, Goddard and Emerson expand their argument. “It takes place in an atmosphere of trust and confidentiality, and self-appraisal is at its heart”. If this model is to succeed, they maintain, it requires that teachers should be open, honest, self-critical during the process, willing to comment frankly on their perceptions of their own strengths and weaknesses and those of the management, open to constructive criticism and to advice for self-improvement.

On the other hand, in its purest form, an accountability model of appraisal would be interested in matters such as those below:

1. It identifies incompetent teachers.
2. It identifies weaknesses in a teacher’s performance.
3. It assesses performance for purposes of pay and promotion.
4. It provides evidence for any disciplinary procedures.
According to Goddard and Emerson (1992, p.18), this model fosters defensiveness. It implicitly encourages teachers to defend their own position, to hide any weaknesses, and to blame management or others for any deficiencies in their performance. In setting targets, teachers will be looking to their own interests rather than those of the school or their pupils, and they will try to negotiate targets which are as unchallenging as possible. In commenting on their own performance, teachers will tend to inflate their actual achievements. Goddard and Emerson sum up the situation by stating “the first model (the staff development model) supports teachers in doing their job as well as possible; the second model (the accountability model) checks that teachers are doing their job properly.

It can be concluded that if implemented through emphasising its positive aspects, i.e. more help, guidance and advice to teachers with better job satisfaction prospects, the appraisal of teachers can be beneficial for everybody in the education sector (teachers themselves, pupils, parents and government), especially at the time of rapid changes.

EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, INNOVATION AND SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

It can be said that the concept of innovation or change in education has always been a controversial issue in history, and it is likely to stay so. As Fullan (1991, p.3) states "one person claims that schools are being bombarded by change: another observes that there is nothing new under the sun". Or, a policy-maker can claim that teachers are resistant to change; a teacher complains that administrators introduce change for their own personal interests and that they neither know what is needed nor understand the classroom. Similarly, Fullan enlarges the argument, "one university professor is convinced that schools are only a reflection of society and cannot be expected to bring about change; another professor is equally convinced that schools would be all right if only superintendents and principals had more 'vision' as educational leaders, and teachers were more motivated to learn new approaches to improving the curriculum".

West-Burnham (1991, p.96) argues that organisations only have reality through the experiences of the individuals working in them and so managing change comes down to enhancing the ability of individuals to learn and communicate that learning within the context of the organisation as a whole. For him, the implication of this is that managing change may be about a fundamental cultural shift which moves individuals and schools away from being victims to being in control of themselves.
and so able to respond in a positive and creative way rather than to react against it. Effective development in any organisation depends upon how people are prepared for, and in consequence respond to, change (Lowe, 1992).

School improvement, as Jonathan (1987, p.568) states, is not merely a matter of 'rapid response to changing market forces through a trivialised curriculum', but a question of dealing with the deep structures of school organization and the habits and values they embody. The way forward is not to programme 'in a certain direction so that they will behave in set ways' (Aronowitz and Giroux, 1986, p.9), but to help them towards a reasoned and responsible autonomy.

On the other hand, organisation development is concerned with the diagnosis of organisational health and performance, and the ability of the organisation to adapt the change. As is stated in Management and Organisational Behaviour, edited by Mullins (1991, p. 484), organisation development embraces a wide range of "intervention strategies" into the social processes of an organisation. These intervention strategies are aimed at the development of individuals, groups and the organisation as a total system. He concludes that most planned organisational change is provoked by the need to respond to new challenges or opportunities presented by the external environment, or in anticipation of the need to cope with potential future problems. Resistance to change can take many forms and it is often difficult to pin-point the exact reason for the resistance. The forces against change in work organisations include: ignoring the needs and expectations of members; when members have insufficient information about the nature of the change; or if they do not perceive the need for change.

As Everard et al (1990, p.242) state, observation of people who are more successful than others at managing complex organizations in which major changes have to be implemented shows that they tend to have a distinctive mix of knowledge, skills, personal attitudes and values. They have the capacity to organize and orchestrate these characteristics to take right decisions. Stewart (1983), a British psychologist and business consultant, has listed certain characteristics of people who are good at managing change. Some of them are as follows:

1. They know clearly what they want to achieve.
2. They can translate desires into practical action.
3. They can see proposed changes not only from their own viewpoint but also from that of others.
4. They show irreverence for tradition but respect for experience.
(5) They are not discouraged by set-backs.
(6) They harness circumstances to enable change to be implemented.
(7) They clearly explain change.
(8) They involve their staff in the management of change and protect their security.
(9) They don’t pile on change on top of another, but await assimilation.
(10) They present change as a rational decision.
(11) They make change personally rewarding for people, wherever possible.
(12) They share maximum information about possible outcomes.

Similarly, Everard et al. (1990, p.263), state that the manager initiating change brings several things to the change effort. For them, his/her qualities such as knowledge, skills, personality characteristics, situational awareness, style, etc. are quite important and practical experience and success or failure in past change efforts are relevant. Position held in the organization brings some influence and motivation is of key importance. They also suggest a number of questions to be asked. These are:

1. Do I need to seek additional training to help me make the change?
2. Which key people have I the power to influence directly?
3. Can I influence others through indirect leverage, e.g. through the chair of governors?
4. Have I any control over the reward system (e.g. career opportunities)?
5. What can I offer in return for support?
6. What are my real reasons for wanting change:
   a. Organizational
      to improve effectiveness?
      to reduce cost?
      to improve the teachers’ lot?
      to educate the pupils better?
   b. Personal
      to impress others?
      to advance my career?
      to foster my professional interests?

The balance between these last two sets of motives, (a) and (b), is always assessed by others and if it is perceived (however unfairly) as tilted towards personal interests, it can lead to a rejection of the change. And the final question comes:
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(7) Am I really determined to bring about the change, irrespective of other demands on my time? If not, why not? What would clinch my determination? If not me, who else would take the lead?

Hargreaves and Hopkins, in their book The Empowered School (1991, p.117), state that school improvement studies tend to be more action-oriented than the effective schools research and they embody the long-term goal of moving towards the vision of the problem solving or thinking school, as of the results of the OECD-sponsored International School Improvement Project (ISIP). The authors also report that school improvement is defined in the ISIP by Van Velzen et al. as:

A systematic, sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal conditions in one or more schools, with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.

Hargreaves and Hopkins, then, maintain that school improvement is therefore about developing strategies for educational change that strengthen the school’s organization, as well as implementing curriculum reforms. They stress that this obviously implies a very different way of thinking about change than "top-down" approach which is so popular with policy-makers (1991, p.117). So, when the school is regarded as the ‘centre’ of change, then strategies for change need to take this new perspective into account. Hargreaves and Hopkins concluded that the ISIP served to popularize a school improvement approach to educational change and, they summarised so-called ISIP knowledge. They conclude that the approach to school improvement taken by the ISIP rests on a number of assumptions (p.118), these are:

1. The school as the centre of change. This means that external reforms need to be sensitive to the situation in individual schools, rather than assuming that all schools are the same.

2. A systematic approach to change. School improvement is a carefully planned and managed process that takes place over a period of several years.

3. A key focus for change is the internal conditions of schools. These include not only the teaching-learning activities used in the school, but also the school’s procedures, role allocation and resource use that support the teaching learning process.
4. Accomplishing educational goals more effectively. Generally speaking, educational goals are what a school is supposed to be doing for its students and society. This suggests a broader definition of outcome than student scores on achievement tests, even though for some schools these may be pre-eminent. Schools also serve the more general developmental needs of students, the professional development of teachers and the needs of its community.

5. A multi-level perspective. Although the school is the centre of change it does not act alone. So that the roles of teachers, heads, governors, parents, support people (advisers, higher education, consultants, etc.), and local authorities should be defined and benefited.

6. Integrative implementation strategies. This implies a linkage between 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' approaches. As both approaches can apply at a number of different levels in the system, both approaches should be benefited.

7. The drive towards institutionalisation. Change is only successful when it has become part of the natural behaviour of all those in the school. Implementation by itself is not enough.

It can be said that 1960's were the period of the large-scale education development projects, particularly in the United States. On the other hand, the approaches towards educational development in Europe were substantially different. As Galton points out in Handbook of Primary Education in Europe (Galton and Blyth, 1989, p.461.), much of the curriculum development in this period centred around the growth of secondary education, in particular the development of a comprehensive system. Approaches to educational change related to the needs of primary education in 1970's and 1980's in Europe were, naturally, not the same in different countries. Governments of the Council of Europe's countries began to look for ways in which national policy might be implemented within the primary school. Member states considered innovation as an interactive process that requires links to be developed between those responsible for policy and those who have to put that policy into practice.

In 1970's the approach to the innovation process was mainly rationalistic. It was assumed that, if the need for change could be presented in a logical way, those who were asked to adopt new practices would do so. One of the strategies of this type, as
identified by R. G. Havelock (1982), is known as 'The Research, Development and Diffusion' model where an innovation is conceived at the head or centre, for example at a central planning unit, and then fed into the system. This approach assumed a diffusion of a well-researched and developed innovation by a small, expert and well-resourced central team. As Schon calls it, it is a centre-to-periphery approach (in Galton, 1989, p.462). As Bishop stated, this approach is a highly organised, systematic and rational approach to innovation, founded on the following logical sequence of activities (Bishop, 1986, p.17):

a)- Basic research (as in industry) by a central team which plans and develops the innovation
b)- Trials of the innovation in the field
c)- Planned mass dissemination of diffusion of the innovation, by conferences, workshops, courses, etc.
d)- Implementation of the innovation by the users.

Bishop argues that one advantage of such strategy is that the more talented and experienced teachers and experts are more likely to be found at the 'centre' of an educational system, and this expertise can then be utilised for the benefit of the whole system. On the other hand, there are some disadvantages; Users (teachers for example) are involved in the development process only to a limited extent. They are the passive recipients of changes proposed for them by some distant agency. And, because of the high degree of centralisation, local needs and variations can often be neglected.

Galton (1989) points out that such models achieved less than expected because of some deficiencies in their main assumptions. He lists three; first, there was a general lack of psychological insight, particularly the failure to understand that change calls for an emotional as well as a rational commitment on the part of the participant. Second, the role of the facilitator was poorly defined and often exaggerated. Third, the model took no account of the social and cultural impact of new innovatory programmes, particularly in such contentious areas as race, where there was likely to be a plurality of values among those being asked to adopt the innovation.

Other than the above model, Havelock identifies three different patterns or models of how change or innovation come about. In the 'Social Interaction Model' users themselves are involved in conceiving, initiating and developing innovation at the local level. Social interaction is perceived as the usual way by which ideas and practices are diffused through society by informal contacts between interested
individuals and groups. As Bishop (1986) states, this strategy usually takes the form of convincing people of the value and usefulness of an innovation and then enabling them to see for themselves the innovation in action.

The most advantageous aspect of this method is that it is a kind of natural process. But, on the other hand, it can be unsystematic, unplanned and slow.

Another approach can be identified as the 'Problem Solving Model' (Havelock, 1982; Bishop, 1986). In his book, The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education (1982), Havelock states that there are two ways to look at stages of innovation. One way is to see it from the point of view of the people who are being changed, and the other is to see it from the point of view of someone who is trying to change someone else. Every person, every group, and every social organization necessarily has some sort of problem-solving process in order to survive in a changing world. He argues that this does not mean that everyone is an expert problem-solver, and it does not mean that everyone finds innovative solutions when he or she has a problem. But, everyone does develop some sort of procedure for coping with change.

As is reported by Bishop (1986), Chin and Benne's category of 'normative re-educative' model of innovation is similar to the above approach. But, as was reported, they added a new category which they called 'power-coercive' based on the application of power in some form. In this model, after the innovation is devised, the consent of the users is obtained by effective means of persuasion. Bishop calls this method as 'Power Coercive Strategies' (Bishop, 1986, p.20). These strategies can be used by persons or groups who have power to enforce innovations, e.g. governments, national or local education authorities, inspectors, headmasters, teachers, that is, people who have political, legal, administrative and economic power and resources to impose innovation.

As can easily be concluded these strategies are a kind of 'top-down' approach. So, their effectiveness is in doubt. Because, as Bishop put it 'one can take a horse to water but one cannot make it drink'(1986, p.21). It is important that the relationship between the people who impose the innovation and the people who implement it must be characterized by respect and co-operation rather than by coercion and compliance. Bishop concludes the situation as saying;

"To instruct the staff of a school to change to a new and unfamiliar method of teaching often results only in a limited mechanical or
superficial conformity with the directive, only in compliance with the letter of the law; at worst it can inveigle teachers to ignore the directive altogether or even defy it".

He then gives examples of this kind of failed project. In Cameroon, for example, he adds, the administrative hierarchy dictated new behaviours required of the teachers and inspectors implementing the reform. No allowance was made for the fact that the inspectors had a traditional attitude opposed to the spirit of the reform and that time was required to change such attitudes regardless of rules or laws. The project naturally suffered. According to him, much the same thing happened in Indonesia when a radically new kind of education in which teachers ‘don’t really teach’ and children appear to ‘play’ at learning was being introduced. There was mistrust, misgivings and even opposition (1986, p.21).

Finally, it is worth mentioning yet another method of innovation, which Havelock (1982) calls the ‘Open input Strategy’. As Bishop quoted (1986, p.22), it is a very wide, open, flexible, pragmatic and even opportunistic approach to innovation. The underlying philosophy seems to be ‘let’s try anything and everything, being as open and pragmatic as possible, using power and the law where need be, and informal influence and persuasion where they can be used’.

In his book, The New Meaning of Educational Change Fullan (1991) reviews a substantial number of studies on educational change and practice. He identifies a number of assumptions about change which are important determinants of whether the realities of change get confronted or ignored. These assumptions can be summarised as follows (p.105-107):

1. Do not assume that your version of what the change should be is the one that should or could be implemented. On the contrary, assume that one of the main purposes of the process of implementation is to exchange your reality of what should be through interaction with implementers and others concerned.

2. Assume that any significant innovation, if it is to result in change, requires individuals to work out their own meaning. Significant change involves a certain amount of ambiguity, ambivalence and uncertainty for the individual about the meaning of change.
3. Assume that conflict and disagreement are not only inevitable but fundamental to successful change. Since any group of people possess multiple realities, any collective change attempt will necessarily involve conflict.

4. Assume that people need pressure to change, but it will only be effective under conditions which allow them to react, to form their own position, to interact with others and to obtain support.

5. Assume that effective change takes time and persistence is a critical attribute of successful change.

6. Do not expect all or even most people or groups to change. The complexity of change is such that it is totally impossible to bring about widespread reform in any large social system. Progress occurs when we take steps which increase the number of people affected.

7. Assume that you will need a plan which is based on the above assumptions and which addresses the factors known to affect implementation. Evolutionary planning and problem-coping models based on knowledge of the change process are essential.

8. Assume that changing the culture of institutions is the real agenda, not implementing single innovations. Putting it another way: when implementing particular innovations, always pay attention to how the institution is developing or not.

Reynolds, in his detailed article *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An Updated Review of the British Literature* (1992, p.11), after reviewing the related literature on school effectiveness, reports the characteristics of effective primary school organizations identified by Mortimore et al. The characteristics possessed by both academically and socially effective schools can be summarised as follows:

1. Purposeful leadership of the staff by the head. He/she understands the needs of the school, is actively involved in the school but good at sharing power with the staff, does not exert total control over teachers but consults them.

2. Involvement of the deputy head. Where the deputy was usually involved in policy decisions, pupils progress increased.
3. In successful schools, the teachers were involved in curriculum planning and played a major role in developing their own curriculum guidelines.

4. Pupils performed better when continuity of staffing and consistent approach to teaching existed.

5. Children performed better when their school day was structured in some way. Schools were effective when pupils' work was organized by the teacher, and children were allowed some freedom within the structure. However, just the opposite observed when children were given unlimited responsibility for a long list of tasks.

6. Pupil progress was greater where teachers were stimulating and enthusiastic, and where teachers frequently made children use powers of problem-solving.

7. Effective schools had a work-centred environment in which children enjoyed their work and were eager to start new tasks, a low level of noise and only work-related movement but not excessive.

8. Children progressed better when teachers devoted their energies to only one or sometimes two subject areas simultaneously in the classroom, but not three or more.

9. Children performed better when they had more communication with their teacher about the content of their work. So, teachers who used opportunities to talk to the whole class rather than individuals were more effective.

10. Monitoring pupils' progress by teachers, as well as by heads, was seen an important aspect of teachers' planning and assessment.

11. Parental involvement in reading at home, helping in the classroom and on educational visits was proved to be more effective.

12. Effective schools appeared in a positive, pleasant atmosphere.

In the same article, Reynolds also states the findings of HM Inspectors' assessments of a sample of 185 secondary schools, as reported in a DES press release in 1988.
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(Reynolds, 1992, p.14). The report sets out the characteristics of effective schools. These characteristics can be summarised as follows:

1. These were schools well-led by heads with the capacity to stimulate others and who had a breadth of vision about education together with practical ability to translate this into classroom practice for their pupils.

2. In such schools effective communication and confident relationships enabled teachers to contribute to the formulation and implementation of school policies.

3. Effective schools seemed to have clear goals and objectives, and the production of them had been the result of discussion by all staff.

4. Effective schools felt it important to help all pupils to reach the highest academic standards of which they were capable.

5. Most lessons in these schools took place in a relaxed but orderly and firm atmosphere.

6. Effective schools encouraged their pupils to express their views and develop their ideas in talking with each other and with the teachers.

7. Effective schools had well qualified staff with an appropriate blend of experience and expertise who were well deployed within the school.

In their conclusive study of School Effectiveness and School Improvement in the 1990s, Reynolds and Packer (1992) persuade the reader, through the findings of school effectiveness studies carried out in a wide range of countries, that a number of early assumptions are now no longer tenable. Their conclusive findings can be summarised as follows:

1. The early belief that school influence on pupils might be as large as family or community seems to be misplaced, since studies in the past five years show only 8-15 per cent are due to between school differences.

2. The early belief that causes of school influences on pupils were distinct from teacher or classroom influences were misplaced, since these studies show that the great majority of variation between schools is in fact due to classroom variation.
3. The early belief that the consistency of effective or ineffective schools stayed so over quite considerable time periods of five to seven years were invalid, since it now appears that this period can well be two or three years.

4. The early belief in the existence of consistency in the academic and social performances of schools was misplaced, since findings are now suggesting that academic effectiveness is not necessarily associated with social or ‘affective’ effectiveness.

5. The traditional belief that schools are effective or ineffective for all sub-groups of pupils within them is no longer tenable, since new evidence suggests that there can be different school effects for children of different ethnic groups, ability ranges and socio-economic status within the same school.

6. On the question of what factors make schools more or less effective, the traditional belief that there was a blueprint or ‘recipe’ independent of school history, context or personnel is no longer tenable, since what is effective may vary in accordance with the context of the social environment of the school’s catchment area, with the stage of development of the school itself, and with the particular outcome measure being considered. As is suggested in some studies, even if the characteristics of effective schools are found to be similar across contexts, the actual generation of these characteristics at the level of day-to-day school management may be different.

7. Finally, it is perfectly clear that there is no cross-cultural agreement on what makes schools effective. As an example, although frequent monitoring of pupil performance is a characteristic of some American ‘effective’ schools, this is not found in British primary schools, in fact, as was stated in one study, it was a characteristic of ‘ineffective’ schools.

Reynolds and Packer are of the opinion that the 1990s will provide an even more difficult agenda for school effectiveness researchers and practitioners than the past. They mention two further factors, in addition to those of the 1980s (1992, p.176), and the first one reads as follows:
"The range of outcomes expected from schools is likely to be significantly enlarged by the addition of various competencies perceived as needed by the world of work and by the addition of further competencies required by an increasingly information-oriented society. If the future society needs 'active' individuals who have acquired learning-to-learn skills, an ability to work co-operatively and a more active, learner-directed mode of operation, then very new instructional methods will be required, which turn passive learning into active learning, which entail putting more responsibility upon the student and which entail putting the teacher consciously in the role of helping students to learn how to learn. These may be not the sort of skills which would be likely to emanate from the classic models of the effective school, especially in the American formulation, with its ordered climate, assertive headteacher leadership, concentration upon basic skill acquisition, collegial/consensual mentality and concern with conventional academic outcomes".

Reynolds and Packer, then, maintain their argument that the second factor which creates difficulty for school effectiveness researchers and practitioners of the 1990s could be the further complication of the nature of the leadership and management tasks for teachers and particularly for senior teachers in their schools. They expand the idea (p.177):

"These changes [of the leadership and management tasks] are produced by the effects upon management styles of the ways in which schools are increasingly having to compete against each other in forms of educational 'markets' changes. The result of this process of market competition between schools is to change vastly what is necessary for effective leadership at school level, because it changes the managerial qualities necessary to create an effective school. New managerial skills will be needed: [These are] 'a heightened public relations or marketing orientation and an ability to 'sell' the product', 'the capacity to relate to parents', 'the capacity to find sources of support in local communities', 'the capacity to manage rapid change, not to manage a steady state', 'the capacity to motivate staff in times when instrumental rewards like promotion or advancement are rare', and 'the capacity to relate to pupils, since the wave of future consumerism will increasingly involve consumer opinion surveys with pupils'.
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Reynolds and Packer (1992, p.178-179) continue the argument that the difficulty of the task of school effectiveness researchers and practitioners of 1990s is increased in its magnitude and its effects because of the isolation of the discipline from other related disciplines, such as educational sociology, the sociology of the school, criminology, psychiatry and psychology (particularly abnormal psychology). They argue that we have concentrated upon the first dimension of schooling, the formal, organizational structure without looking in enough detail at the second, cultural and informal world of values, attitudes and perceptions, and the third, the complicated web of personal relationships. They conclude that these dimensions will determine a school’s effectiveness or ineffectiveness in the future.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Dr. Kopmels explains and argues the application and possible implications of some styles of innovation programs which were applied to 12 different primary schools in 12 different European countries. Kopmels and his colleagues named it The Contact School Plan. It was a network of those mentioned schools providing exchange of views and ideas among primary schools engaged in innovation and was a part of Project No:8 "Innovation in Primary Education" of the Council for Cultural Cooperation of the Council of Europe during the period 1982-7(1989, p.475).

Kopmels argues that from the case studies which were carried out during the project, a number of different styles of innovation were identified. Most of them were different versions of the traditional "centre-to-periphery" model of curriculum change. Although it is extremely cost effective, this model has been criticised because of the failure to understand the concerns of those who have to implement the innovation. On the other hand, the alternative school-focused innovation model has been criticised as being too one-sided and failing to provide sufficient continuity between schools.

Dr. Kopmels, then, explains his five-zones model which is developed on the basis of the mentioned contact school experiences. He argues that it proved a very helpful instrument for teachers, consultants and authorities. It draws attention to the specific zones of education that must not be neglected if real change is to take place.

Zone 1 is concerned with the educational goals and principles guiding the work of the teaching staff (not only the didactic approach and organization, but also pedagogy). In this zone, as Kopmels reports, all the contact schools identified three
important principles governing their approach to school improvement: 1) active individualisation of the learning process, 2) the recognition of the importance of pupil autonomy and cooperation and, 3) the nature of the relationship between the child and the teacher, which could promote learning.

Zone 2 covers the circumstances under which the teaching staff can work, in other words, ways of organising teaching are considered. How children are divided among teachers, whether groups are formed according to an age standard or a performance grade, the length of time that children stay in a particular group, the forms of reporting and the use of space in school, are among the issues considered. In the contact schools some questions were raised about three issues: 1) the methods used for monitoring progress and development, 2) the arrangement of time and the choice of didactic working methods and 3) the problems associated with mixed age groups.

Zone 3 of the model is related to the content of education and the ways of presenting the subject matter. Choice of activities, observations and evaluation. Zone 4 and 5 indicate how good organisation and good external contacts can enhance the success of the programme. While zone 4 deals with how the school is managed and concerns such issues as the organisational structure, the leadership style and the support and friendship between colleagues, Zone 5 of the model is related to relations and links with external bodies.

After all, Kopmels concludes that from the reports of staff in the contact schools it is claimed that greatest improvement has already taken place in the arrangements of time, working methods and relationship with parents. It is also observed that most schools felt that further development work is needed, especially in the areas of cooperation, monitoring progress and development and the organisational structure of the schools (p. 492).

It must be stressed that although it is important to initiate a change or innovation, only initiation of it does not guarantee its accomplishment. Hall et al (1975, p.52), for example, stated that based on their experiences in the field as practitioners and adoption agents and also their past research efforts, they have found that change or innovation adoption is not accomplished just because a decision maker has announced it. Instead, the various members of a system demonstrate a wide variation in the type and degree of their use of an innovation.

They give reasons for this variation. One reason is that innovation adoption is a process rather than a decision point - a process that each innovation user experiences
individually. They state that they have recognised other variables which need to be considered, such as organizational climate, intervention strategies, and characteristics of decision makers. But they stress that regardless of the character of the outside variables what actually happens in the individual application of an innovation is open to tremendous variation.

Because of that Hall and his colleagues introduced the concept of Levels of Use of the Innovation. They proposed eight discrete levels of use of an innovation that an individual may demonstrate. These levels range from lack of knowing that the innovation exists to an active, sophisticated and effective use of it and even further to develop, modify and propose alternatives to it. They believe that in the future it will be possible to assess individuals in terms of their Levels of Use of Innovation and to facilitate their growth in use of the innovation via appropriate intervention strategies while minimising the trauma of change.

Harris (1989), in his paper The Role of the Inspector as an External Agent in Supporting School Improvement in which he outlines some ways in which a specific external support role might function for curriculum development, analyses a curriculum development programme for 11-16 year olds. He observes that teachers generally do not work closely with inspectors and advisors, whose normal role is usually that of inspection and report writing.

The role should be one of persuading rather than recommending; discussing rather than stating and of drawing out perceptions from teachers rather than doing all the thinking for them. Perhaps, in some ways, it is identical with the role of a good teacher who guides rather than directs; who provides opportunities for discovery rather than dictates the outcomes and yet manages to assist pupils to reflect on and learn from what has taken place. Harris argues further that in terms of developing professional links it is also essential that the inspector assigned to this supporting role should remain with the programme for a substantial period of time.

Harris, then, draws a clear picture of the role for an inspector. For him, a feature of the external agent's role must be to promote dialogue between schools engaged in similar analysis. This can take the form of visits, guest speakers, liaison between teachers over units of work or forms of organisation, mutual classroom observation, specific pupil exchange, joint residential experiences, joint extra curricular activities or working groups established at a neutral venue such as a Teachers' Centre. An inspector can begin this dialogue, can structure the first meeting and then support its development without continuing to play the central role (1989, p.66).
This inter school dialogue can be part of the external agent's role as a facilitator. The inspector can develop discussion on matters such as assessment and marking procedures, homework policy, teaching approaches, the use of small groups in classrooms. Another aspect of an inspector's role is that of a continuous provider of in-service training which involves working with principals on school organisation and management structures, timetabling, analysing and devising syllabuses, content, methodology and resources, working with teachers to assess how effectively units of work have been taught, received and learned.

On the other hand, classroom observation is one of an inspector's major skills and is a central resource in effecting development. Harris, concludes that it is this work with individual teachers who wish to initiate changes in how they teach and how they assess learning, which is at the core of supporting school improvement. It requires time, courage, involves considerable professional and personal risk for inspectors as well as teachers and is dependent upon professional credibility being recognised on both sides (1989, p.67).

If we conclude the arguments about the methods or strategies of educational innovations or educational changes mentioned so far, it can be said that since these mentioned methods cannot be seen in their pure forms, and they often merge into one another, one does not need to follow only one single method of innovation at a time in practice. Often several different strategies are used effectively at the same time. What strategy or strategies are used depends on the existing conditions. As Bishop (1986, p.23) stated, whatever strategy a change agent uses he should make use of all the resources available to him e.g. the spoken word, print, radio, and television for communication; micro-teaching and other techniques for training; observation, evaluative research etc. for feedback. It is these that often decide the fate of an innovation.

In the lights of the arguments mentioned so far, if we consider the place and roles of primary school supervisors in the Turkish educational system, it seems that primary school supervisors occupy perhaps the most suitable position to be a change agent who can initiate and implement educational innovations. Most Turkish primary schools, especially the ones in rural areas, are not in close touch with the outside world, lack appropriate change agents and have a weak knowledge base about educational innovations. So, in terms of the place they occupy in the hierarchical structure, their roles and duties and with their influences on teachers, innovative
primary school supervisors in Turkey can advocate, introduce and implement educational innovations into practice.

Landy, in her article 'The Developmental needs of the Advisory Service' (1992), after discussing the importance of the innovation and therefore the need for adviser development in education concludes the topic brilliantly:

"It is important to be able to look (with knowing eyes), to communicate effectively (with warmth, realism and sensitivity,) to be constructive, supportive and positive in feedback (whilst challenging actual practice) and pushing (nudging) developments and thoughts (attitudes) forward. This requires a high degree of credibility and inter-personal skills. As an adviser I sit in classrooms and walk down corridors in schools and colleges and ask would I like to work here, would I like my son or daughter, niece or nephew in this classroom? The feel of the place, the value on individuals and the management and structural organisations set up to deliver a quality education should all be merged into opportunities for the encouragement and enrichment of the individual".
CHAPTER 2

TURKISH EDUCATION SYSTEM

Before examining the education system as a whole in Turkey, it might be useful to single out some essential features of modern Turkey that affect the provision of education, and to which the system is having to respond. These features include Turkey's unique geographic situation, its continuing devotion to the ideals and principles of Ataturk, its rapidly expanding economy but continuing heavy reliance on agriculture, its high birth rate, and its increasing urbanisation.

Its unique geographic situation at the intersection between Western Europe, Eastern bloc countries with their rapidly changing and unstable situations, the Arab world and Mediterranean Sea contributes to the political as well as the growing economic importance of the country. In an area of 776,000 sq. km that is three times larger than the UK lives a population of approximately 57 millions (1990) with an annual birth rate of about 2.2% the highest among OECD countries. That is, more than one million children are born each year giving Turkish society a youthful character contrary to the ageing trend in most other OECD countries.

As the founder of the Republic of Turkey, Mustafa Kemal, later on named "Ataturk", meaning "Father of the Turks", had freed the Turkish heart land from the occupying powers, removed the Sultan and Calif after the fall of the Ottoman Empire as a consequence of World War I, and founded the Republic of Turkey in 1923.

As was stated in a study Reviews of National Policies for Education: Turkey (OECD, 1989), as a modern nation state, the Republic of Turkey is a relatively young entity, though it could build upon the long and prestigious history of the Ottoman Empire which had comprehended many nations and peoples. But the failure of the Ottomans to modernize and to democratize the Empire, to invest in its infrastructure and in the education of its people, and to develop the heartland of the Turks has left behind continuing problems.

The opening to the West which the Republic pursued from the 1920's onwards and Ataturk's radical social and political reforms are still determinants for Turkey today. He made Turkey a secular republic. The separation of state affairs and religious affairs, the replacement of Islamic laws by a civil code and a penal law according to
European models (mainly the Swiss model), the introduction of the western alphabet, the establishment of civil rights corresponding to Western democracies, the introduction of equal rights for women are among the reforms introduced by Atatürk for the modernisation of Turkey.

It can be concluded that as a country in the process of development and at the threshold of becoming an industrial and service society, Turkey is trying to maintain its hopeful aims for the future. The World Bank ranked Turkey among the "half industrialized developing countries with average income". According to The World Bank sources per capita income was 1,071 US Dollars in 1986 (OECD, 1989). Per capita income is amounting to 2,500 $ in 1990, according to government sources. That is, it is still the lowest among the OECD countries.

In 1980s, the urban population had already exceeded that living in rural areas. It is estimated that in the beginning of 1990s at least 60% of population are living in urban areas in Turkey. Migration from rural areas to urban areas is still continuing. In spite of increasing urbanization, however, social life and the division of roles within families are still strongly influenced by traditional values and attitudes. But, there is a significant trend away from the large to the smaller family, which, combined with increasing employment of women outside their homes and the growing influence of television and other mass media, puts traditional role perceptions into question and gradually changes life styles and habits.

In 1990's, Turkey's economic and social structure are still largely determined by its agricultural nature. Thus, about 54% of the work force belonged to the agricultural sector while only 14% were employed in industry and 32% in the service sector in 1989 (OECD, 1989). On the other hand, it is planned and estimated that 46.2% of work force will be employed in agriculture, whilst 17.5% of it in industry and 36.3% in the service sector at the end of Sixth Five Year Development Plan Era, or put it another way, in 1994 (State Planning Organisation, 1989). However, although it is occurring gradually, structural shifts from agriculture to industry and service sectors are continuing. But, it can be concluded that this shift is not occurring in a desired context. Thus, because there is not sufficient industrial investments in rural areas a massive migration is taking place from the country, mainly of young villagers. These migrants move, first, to regional centres and then on to the large industrial areas around Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir and Adana.

This population shift leads to new economic, social and educational problems for Turkey. Many experts, today, consider the schooling situation in the large
industrialized centres and their gecekondus (squatter settlements growing overnight at the margins of the big cities) as being more critical than that in the countryside where the aim of "each village its school" has been realized for the most part.

Beside these unfavourable conditions, the Turkish governments have laid great emphasis on improving and expanding education and training within their strategies for economic adjustment and national development. In five-year plans it is quoted that "our human resources are our most valuable national asset and the most important driving factor of development. It is essential that this potential be exploited to the maximum extent through education, and utilised for development (State Planning Organisation, 1989).

In order to understand the true nature of this "most valuable national asset" and where Turkey stands today in education, it is necessary to scan the major changes and reforms realized within the last three quarters of this century. In Turkey, today, most people agree that innovations in the field of education had been among the most important reforms of the twenties after the foundation of the Republic. The aim to secularize Turkey and to modernize the social and economic structure of the country could only be pursued on condition that the educational level of the population should be raised significantly.

Under the Ottoman regime only 10% of the people were able to read and write (OECD, 1989, p.13). A school system for the majority of the population had not really existed. The elite schools for training especially military personnel, administrators and other skilled man power needed to serve the Empire were open only to people from those social strata which could afford private education and mostly from those belong to non-moslem minority groups. Only from the establishment of the Republic onwards has there been a systematic education policy addressed to the needs of the people. An alphabet adapted to the conditions of the Turkish language was developed and Ataturk himself promoted the literacy campaign, which won for him the title "Headmaster of the School of the Nation". The religious schools were closed down and a public system of primary and middle schools built up with a new teaching force instructing according to lay guide-lines. Primary schooling was made compulsory in 1924, just after the proclamation of the new Republic.

During subsequent decades Turkey proved successful in raising the literacy rate, which in 1990 was officially estimated at having reached 85%. Illiteracy still
remains higher in the rural areas of the East than in the urban areas, and higher among women than among men.

It should be noted that the most comprehensive development of the recent years in education is the introduction of the 8-year compulsory primary education. The term "primary education" is now preferred to the term "basic education" because of practical and technical reasons. In this new context, primary education covers the education of children of 6-14 years of age. As a result of this new labelling and the organisation that followed, the school starting age has been lowered one year to the age of 6. Furthermore, it was decided that primary education, with its new coverage, should be made compulsory for all citizens, male and female, and be free of charge in state schools. Hence, the period of compulsory education, which was 5 years previously, was increased to 8 years. However, because of certain factors and budgetary limitations, it was decided that the implementation of the new system be made gradually and completed by the year 2005.

It can be said that the developments which took place in Turkish Education during the Republic era are quite radical and impressive. Thus, for example, as a figure, in 1923 there were only 2345 primary and secondary schools and 2861 teachers working in these schools. In 1988, these numbers were a total of 58,651 primary and secondary school and 314,999 teachers. And a total of 10,374,714 primary and secondary school students were attending these schools in 1988. Nevertheless, despite the great progress made within a relatively short space of time, it has to be stated that educational development in Turkey has still a long way to go in order to meet the rising learning needs of the people as well as the qualified manpower needs of the economy.

**PRINCIPLES OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION**

For the purpose of giving some ideas to the reader about the basic features of the Turkish National Education, some articles of The principles of the Basic Law of National Education, accepted originally in 1924, may be summarised as follows:

A) **Universality and equality**
Educational institutions are open to every individual, regardless of language, race, sex and religion. No individual, family, group or class will be accorded any privilege in the education system.
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B) Individual and social needs
The structure of the educational system will be organised in such a way that Turkish citizens in formal and non-formal educational institutions will be trained in accordance with needs of society, individual interests and ability, the principle of equality of educational opportunity to further their education...

C) Orientation
"Individuals are directed into various programmes or schools in accordance with their interests, aptitudes and abilities throughout their education. The national education system is to be organised to realise this orientation fully. Guidance services and objective testing and measurement methods are used in the orientation of students and in evaluating their success."

D) Right to education
"It is the right of every Turkish citizen to receive a basic education. Citizens can take advantage of post-basic educational institutions commensurate with their interests, aptitudes and abilities."

E) Equality of Opportunity
All citizens, male and female, are assured equal educational opportunity. Necessary assistance in the form of free boarding facilities, scholarships, loans, etc. is given to successful students who lack the financial resources to enable them to pursue their education to the highest level. Special measures are taken to those children who are in need of special education and protection.

F) Continuity in Education
It is essential that general and vocational education of individuals should continue throughout life. In addition to the education of younger generations, necessary measures will be taken to provide adults continuing education to help them achieve constructive and productive adjustment to life and to their work environment.

G) Atatürk's Reforms and Principles and Atatürk's Nationalism.
Atatürk's Reforms and Principles and Atatürk's Nationalism as expressed in the Constitution are taken as a basis for the preparation and application of the curricula connected with all levels and types of our education system, and in all aspects of educational activity. Emphasis is placed upon protection, promotion and teaching of national morals and national culture within the framework of universal culture, to prevent them from becoming degenerate and perverted. Emphasis is placed upon the
teaching of the Turkish language, one of the basic elements of our national unity, at all levels of education, without debasing its qualities or going to extremes.

H) Education for democracy

"Efforts are made in all education activities to help students to develop the necessary awareness of democracy and to acquire information about and misunderstanding of the government of the country, and a sense of responsibility and respect for moral values which are essential for the realisation and continuation of a free, strong, and stable democratic social order; but political and ideological propaganda and involvement in daily political events and discussions that are contrary to Ataturk's nationalism as described in the Constitution will not be tolerated in educational institutions under any circumstances."

J) Secularism

"In Turkish national education secularism is a fundamental principle. Instruction in religious culture and ethics is among the compulsory subjects taught in primary and middle schools lycees and equivalent schools."

K) Scientific Approach

"The curriculum for each level and type of school, as well as sound educational methods and training aids and materials, are continually developed and updated in line with recent scientific and technological developments and adapted to the needs of the environment and country. Increased productivity in education and its continuous development and renewal are to be based on scientific research and evaluation. Educational institutions responsible for producing knowledge and technology and developing our culture are to be equipped and strengthened. Work in this direction is to be encouraged and supported morally and financially."

L) Planned education

National education will be planned in order to meet socio-economic and cultural needs of the individuals and society; and this system of education will be so restructured as to be able to renew itself and to conform... to changes taking place in these needs and targets...

M) Co-education

"In schools, co-education is a basic principle. However, dependent upon the type of education, facilities and requirements, some schools are allocated only to girls or to boys."
N) School-Parent cooperation

"Close cooperation is maintained between parents and schools to assist in the realisation of the objectives of the educational institutions. Parent-Teacher Associations are established in school for this purpose. The principles and procedures for setting up and managing Parent-Teacher Associations are specified in a regulation to be issued by the Ministry of National Education."

O) Education everywhere

National education objectives will be pursued not only educational institutions but also at home, in the environment, on the job, everywhere and every opportunity...
The educational activities of each institutions, public, private and voluntary, are subject to supervision by the Ministry of National Education, to ensure conformity to the objectives of national education.

It can be said that the general principles and objectives of national education, in summary, is to train "good people", "good citizens", and "qualified manpower".

ORGANISATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM

Turkey is subdivided into 67 provinces, which in turn are subdivided into approximately 800 administrative districts. Governors of the provinces and districts are appointed by the central government, and the regional departments correspond to the Ministries in Ankara. The municipalities with their elected mayors exercise considerable powers, especially in recent years.

There is a highly centralized state administrative system in Turkey. As was stated, in terms of the central administrative structure, it is divided into provinces on the basis of geographical considerations, economic conditions and public service requirements, provinces are further divided into lower level administrative districts.

The executive function of the State is carried out by the Ministries. The Ministry of National Education is responsible for the performance, supervision and control of all educational services on behalf of the State, in conformity with the provisions of the Basic Law of National Education.

The present education system in Turkey includes both formal and non-formal education. Essentially formal education comprises basic (elementary school and junior high school), secondary and higher education. Non-formal education covers learning activities organised within and outside formal education institutions.
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Educational administration is centralised under the control of the Ministry of Education. The Ministry is responsible for drawing up curricula, coordinating the work of official, private and voluntary organisations, designing and building schools, developing educational materials, etc.

There are two "advisory bodies" in the central system. One of these, the National Convention of Education, is convened every year by the Minister of Education and makes suggestions on almost all matters related to education. The convention is a legal entity. The usual procedure is that public institutions and some private institutions are represented in the convention.

The second advisory body is the Board of Education. It is a permanent organisation. The members of the Board are appointed by the Minister. The functions of the Board are various: design of curricula, examinations, approval of textbooks, etc. However its decisions can only be finalised after the Minister himself has approved.

For the supervision of schools, there are two groups of supervisors in the system both answerable to the Board of Inspection. The group of Ministerial Supervisors supervise secondary schools. On the other hand, Primary schools are supervised by the Primary School Supervisors.

Local Organisations

Educational affairs in the provinces are organised by the Directors of National Education, who are appointed by the Minister; however, they work under the direction of the provincial governor. As was mentioned, there are 67 provinces in Turkey, each headed by an appointed governor.

Provincial offices of education, however, are relatively powerless in determining general educational policies, but they take care of the other issues of the provinces. Primary school supervisors are attached to the provincial directorates of education, though they are answerable to the aforementioned Board of Supervision. They are responsible not only for the supervision of pre-primary and primary schools but also adult education institutions, children libraries, and all kinds of privately organised schools and courses.

Since this research is mainly concentrated on the supervision of primary schools and primary school supervisors, the place of primary school supervision and its supervisors within the whole education system will be examined in detail in the following paragraphs.
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THE REGULATION FOR MINISTRY OF EDUCATION PRIMARY SCHOOL SUPERVISORS’ COUNCIL (OCTOBER 1990)

The latest comprehensive formal document - namely The Regulation for Ministry of Education Primary School Supervisors’ Council aimed at regulating and organising the supervisory activities in Turkish primary education has been accepted and published by the Ministry of National Education in October 1990. The Regulation comprises the most basic requirements of supervision provision in primary schools. It basically consists of the requirement, appointment, training and employment procedures for primary school supervisors. It also includes basic supervisory duties, responsibilities and authorities. The regulation may be summarised as follows:

DETERMINING THE NECESSITY OF SUPERVISORS

Article 5. The need for supervisors in the provinces is determined as being at least one supervisor; to a maximum of 100 teachers for those provinces that are in the 1st and 2nd service regions, to a maximum of 90 teachers for those provinces that are in the 3rd service region and to a maximum of 80 teachers for those provinces that are in the 4th and 5th service regions. In addition to this, the need of private education institutions is also considered.

REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICATION

Article 6. The following conditions are required for those who wish to apply to become an assistant primary school supervisor.

a. Applicants are required to have a graduate diploma in one of the following areas; child development and training, classroom teaching, field teaching, special education, psychological counselling and guidance in education and educational administration, supervision and planning.

b. Applicants are required to have at least 5 years of teaching or administration experience, or both, in primary education institutions.

c. Applicants are required to have finished their military service.

d. Applicants must be currently working either in the central or provincial organisation of the Ministry.
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e. Applicants must not be older than 40 years of age by the last day of the application.

f. Applicants must have a satisfactory assessment record for the last five years and average grades for the last three years should not be below "good".

g. Applicants must not have committed any disciplinary offence other than a salary cut.

h. Applicants must not have been found guilty of committing any crime against the state of Turkish Republic, such as boycott, illegal meetings, illegal occupations or being caught with illegal documents in the workplace.

i. Applicants are required to confirm that they are fit to work in any kind of climate and to travel.

j. Applicants must have no convictions for drinking, gambling or promiscuity either by any administrative interrogation or by court of law.

THE NATURE OF THE EXAMINATION

Article 8. The examination for assistant primary school supervisors consists of a set of multiple-choice questions (a test) and an oral examination.

The test booklet comprises at least 100 questions and is prepared by the area specialists. 20 per cent of the questions is related to general knowledge, 30 per cent to subject knowledge, 30 per cent to professional knowledge and 20 per cent to administration knowledge.

Tests are applied and assessed by the Assessment, Evaluation and Placement Centre of the Ministry.

The applicants are ranked on a list according to their test results from the maximum possible of 100 points and than downwards. The results are sent to the General Directorate of Primary Education.

The Directorate then decides which the candidates are eligible for the oral examination. It is the authority of the directorate to give oral examination to all or only to those who attain higher marks on the test.
EVALUATION IN THE ORAL EXAMINATION

Article 10. Evaluation is out of 100 points based on the criteria set by the Oral Examination Commission and on the information gathered and marked onto the Oral Examination Form during the oral examination of each candidate.

The results are then to be delivered to the General Directorate of Primary Education by the Examination Commission.

Article 11. The points of each applicant are calculated according to the average of his/her test and oral examination scores and then are ranked by the General Directorate of Primary Education.

The Directorate then decides on and appoints the required numbers of successful candidates as Assistant Primary School Supervisors, grading them from 100 downwards. However, at least 70 point must be gained to be appointed.

APPOINTMENT AND TRAINING

Application:

Article 14. those who gain the right to be appointed as Assistant Primary School Supervisor apply to the Ministry by filling a form application form.

Article 15. The workplace (province) to which the new Assistant Supervisor will go is determined by a random draw for the first time appointments

TRAINING

Article 16. The period for assistantship is one calendar year. In this period of time, the Province Supervision Council will prepare a training programme for assistant primary school supervisors. This programme is implemented after the consent of the Provincial Director of Education.

The following topics are included in this programme. These are; the central and provincial organisation of the Ministry and their functions and duties, advice and guidance, supervision and assessment, examination, investigation, the institutional laws and regulations regarding the establishment and administration of the primary education institutions, methods and techniques and practical means of teaching. Every assistant supervisor must prepare a file on these topics.
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On-the-job training of these assistant supervisors, the supervision group leader must guide these supervisors during training and supervise him/her.

EVALUATION OF THE TRAINING

Article 17. The activities performed by the Assistant Supervisors are evaluated by the group leader. He is to write and submit his evaluation to the Head of the Supervision Council of the Province. The Head of the Council is to submit a report on the assistant supervisor to the Provincial Director of Education. The Director must send it to the Ministry via the governor of the province, adding his conclusions.

APPOINTMENT

Article 18. Potential primary school supervisors are recommended to the Education Secretary by the General Director of Primary Education together with the General Director of Personnel. Finally, they are appointed as primary school supervisors by the approval of the Education Secretary.

EMPLOYMENT

Article 20. Supervisors and Assistant Supervisors are sent to the provinces where they have to work under the authority of the Governor of the Province. They are provided with an identification card approved by the Governance of the Province.

SUPERVISION AREAS WITHIN PROVINCES

Article 21. Each province is divided into supervision areas. In this division, the numbers of courses and classrooms at primary education level, the numbers of their administrators and teachers and geographical, administrative and economic situation of the province are considered and evaluated as a whole.

SUPERVISION GROUPS

Article 22. Supervision groups are assigned to each one of the supervision areas. These groups comprise the required number of supervisors and assistant supervisors. Supervision areas are announced before the start of each education year by the Supervision Council of the Province.

It is compulsory to work at least two years in each one of the supervision areas.
Article 34. Supervision groups comprise supervisors and assistant supervisors. Each group has a group leader.

Supervisory responsibilities and authorities of the supervisors and assistant supervisors are as follows:

a. Advice, guidance and on-the-job training
b. Inspection and assessment
c. Examination
d. Investigation
THE MAIN AIMS OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH PROBLEMS

Arising from the general review presented in chapter 1, and the particular situation in Turkey, the main aims of the study and the relevant research problems which this study sets out to explain as follows;

1. to find out the qualitative and/or quantitative amount of some specific innovative behaviours shown by supervisors in practice in their job and to identify the similarities and differences among the views of teachers, supervisors and provincial directors on these behaviours and if there are significant differences among them.

2. to identify the similarities and differences among the views of teachers, supervisors and provincial directors on some on-going supervisory activities in primary education and if there are significant differences among these views.

3. to find out the views of teachers, supervisors and provincial directors on the barriers which prevent the process of implementing educational innovations in primary schools and to identify the similarities and differences among these views and if there are significant differences among them.

4. to find out the recommendations of teachers, supervisors and provincial directors for the improvement of the degree of implementing educational innovations in primary schools and to identify the similarities and differences among the views of these three groups on the recommendations and if there are significant differences among them.

5. to identify the personal characteristics of teachers, supervisors and provincial directors in order to obtain a general profile of primary school staff and to relate these characteristics to the process of implementing educational innovations in primary schools.

6. to arrive at recommendations to improve the implementation of educational innovations in primary schools resulting from and compatible with the findings of the research.
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RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter concerns the methodology of the research. As the initial step to the research, the sample of the study was drawn through a number of sequential steps. First of all, ten sample provinces, twenty sample districts and twenty villages were assigned. So, fifty localities were assigned as of the basis for the sampling procedure. Afterwards one primary school for each locality (fifty in total) was named. As of different number of teachers from the three different kind of localities 190 teachers were assigned as the teachers sample of the study.

The supervisors sample of the study was drawn on the basis of the provinces, as of five supervisors for each province. So, fifty supervisors were assigned as the supervisors sample of the study. The assignment of the directors was a relatively easy task, as each of the ten province could be represented by their only director.

After the assignment of the sample, questionnaires were prepared and a pilot study was conducted. After the piloting necessary changes were made to them, and finally the questionnaires were applied to the sample respondents of the study.

SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

The basic sampling technique which was used in this study is that of random sampling. The respondents of the study namely primary school teachers, primary education supervisors and provincial directors of education were assigned by considering certain criteria and by following a number of sequential steps.

As a basic and initial step in choosing the respondents, a chart called "Service Regions Chart for Teachers" was used. The chart has been arranged by The Ministry of National Education for the purpose of categorising provinces in terms of their socio-economic development levels. At the time of the application of the questionnaires to the respondents (April-May 1991), the total number of provinces of Turkey was 67. The Ministry of National Education has divided these provinces into five service regions. Sequential steps which were followed for the assignment of the respondents are explained in detail with the criteria considered in the following paragraphs.
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Assignment of Sample Provinces:

As was stated, a total of 67 provinces were classified into five service regions, ranking from one to five. Generally speaking, the lower ranked regions (e.g. 1st. region) can be associated with relatively better economic and social conditions than the higher ranked regions (e.g. 5th. region).

Although there is not enough statistical data on regional disparities, significant empirical information shows decisive regional imbalances, especially when the wealthier Western areas are contrasted with the underprivileged East. In the latter, the teacher shortage, for example, amounts to 40,000, while there is a registered surplus of 60,000 teachers in the former, according to a survey (OECD, 1989, p.24).

Meanwhile, the authorities have adopted a deliberate policy of favouring isolated or hardship rural areas for the placement of teachers. Thus, 60 percent of newly qualified teachers must serve at least the first three years of their careers in one of the Eastern provinces against the former percentage of 30. Although enough statistical data is not available and the number of the provinces differs significantly from region to region, this becomes much less significant when population, number of primary schools, teachers and students are considered, as these latter mentioned characteristics are more or less the same for each region. For the 1988-89 school year, the official numbers for primary school teachers and pupils in Turkey, are 220,947 and 6,766,829 respectively.

Considering these characteristics, it is thought that two provinces for each service region (ten provinces in total) can represent the population of the study. So, two provinces for each one of the five regions were randomly assigned. The service regions and their representative provinces are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE REGIONS</th>
<th>SAMPLE PROVINCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st region</td>
<td>Ankara - İzmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd region</td>
<td>Denizli - Tekirdag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd region</td>
<td>Trabzon - Usak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th region</td>
<td>Amasya - Tokat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th region</td>
<td>Kars - Santiurfa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment of Sample District Centres

After the assignment of 10 sample provinces, again, 2 district centres from each one of these provinces were randomly selected to give a fair representation of each province. The names of these randomly assigned district centres in each province are shown in Table 2. Thus, in total 20 district centres (towns) were named at the end of this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCES</th>
<th>DISTRICT CENTRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANKARA</td>
<td>Polatlı - Çubuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td>Ödemis - Karaburun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENİZLİ</td>
<td>Sarayköy - Honaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEKİRĐAG</td>
<td>Çorlu - Muratlı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRABZON</td>
<td>Akçaahat - Çaykara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAK</td>
<td>Banaz - Ulubey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMASYA</td>
<td>Merzifon - Göynücekk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOKAT</td>
<td>Turhal - Artova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARS</td>
<td>Igdir - Çıldır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANLIURFA</td>
<td>Siverek - Halfeti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignment of Sample Villages

After the assignment of 20 town centres, it was decided to select one village from each one of these district centres. So, in total 20 villages were randomly selected and included in the sample of the study. The names of these villages will not be mentioned to ensure confidentiality as most of them have only one primary school. As will be seen later, the ultimate base for the assignment of teachers' sample, actually, is the assignment of primary schools.

Assignment of Primary Schools and Primary School Teachers

As was stated, in total 50 localities (ten city centres, 20 town centres and 20 villages) were randomly selected through the previous steps. In this step, it was decided to select one primary school from each one of these 50 localities. So, 50 primary schools were named and included in the sample. At the beginning of the
process, it was decided to include different numbers of teachers for different localities for the purpose of having a fair proportional representation of the localities. Thus, five teachers from each one of the city centre primary schools, four teachers from each one of the town centre primary schools and three teachers from each one of the village primary schools could result in a fair representation of the teacher population. So, it was necessary to list primary schools that employ more than five teachers for each one of ten sample city centres, schools employing at least four teachers for town centres and schools employing at least three teachers for villages. This was done and 50 primary schools were randomly assigned among these listed schools for each locality accordingly.

Then, in the alphabetical order of surnames of the teachers, the first five names of the lists of each city centre (capital of province) school, the first four names of the lists of each district centre school and the first three names of the lists of each town or village school were assigned as the teachers' sample of the study. As the final figure, 190 primary school teachers were included in the sample of the study. Table 3 shows the configuration of the teachers' sample by locality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCALITY</th>
<th>No. of School</th>
<th>No. of Teachers Per School</th>
<th>Total No. of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP. OF PROVINCE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT CENTRE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OR VILLAGE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignment of Supervisors

Approximately 1700 primary school supervisors were working in the 1990-91 school year in which the questionnaires of this study were applied to the respondents in Turkey. Yet again, approximately 350 of these supervisors were working in ten of the 67 provinces which were assigned as the representative sample of the study. It was decided that 50 supervisors could fairly represent the population. Thus, five supervisors for each one of the ten sample provinces were selected as the sample of the study. As in the teachers sample, according to the alphabetical order of surnames
of the supervisors, the first five names of the lists of each province (in total 50 supervisors) were assigned as the supervisors' sample of the study.

Assignment of Provincial Directors of Education

The total number of provinces was 67 in 1991 when this study was carried out as each province with one provincial director of education. As was stated in previous steps 10 provinces were selected as the sample provinces of this study. It was decided to assign these 10 provincial directors of education as the representative sample of 67 provincial directors of education population.

In summary, in total 250 respondents (primary school teachers, primary school supervisors and provincial directors of education) were assigned as the sample of the study and were given the questionnaires in April - May of 1991 education year. The composition of the sample of the study by respondents groups is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Sample of the study by respondents groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISORS</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTORS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CONTENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

In this study, three groups of questionnaires were prepared to apply to three groups of respondents. As was stated, these groups were primary education supervisors, primary school teachers and provincial directors of education. Three different questionnaires were prepared for those three different groups of educators. Having said that, however, it can generally be said that their contents, particularly the teachers' and the supervisors' ones, were almost the same.

However, the questionnaires were in four sections. The first section of each questionnaire comprised two sub-sections, one included questions asking respondents' personal characteristics and some statistical information about some supervisory activities, and the other included ten general proposition about the
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The second sections of the questionnaires comprised the questions about supervisors' practical involvement in certain pre-identified innovative behaviours and practices. Although the formulation of the questions in teachers' and supervisors' questionnaires was different, the contents were identical. For the directors part, although the content of the questions were different from the other two, the purpose of the questions was the same, as of these were also arranged to obtain information about supervisors' practical involvement in certain innovative behaviors and practices.

The third and fourth sections of the all questionnaires were exactly the same. The third sections comprised pre-designed items which could be barriers to the implementation of innovations in primary schools, requesting respondents to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with them. Similarly, the fourth sections included items which could be recommendations to improve the degree of implementation of innovations in primary schools and requests respondents to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with them.

PILOT STUDY

It was decided to conduct a pilot study to check if the questionnaires were reliable and valid enough to apply them to the respondents of the study. Piloting was carried out by following certain steps. These steps are explained in the following paragraphs.

In the initial process of piloting, after the translation of the questionnaires to Turkish, they were given to subject specialists (i.e. academicians and researchers who are working in the field of educational administration and supervision) to check if they were consistent with the area and with the purposes of the study.

They were requested to examine and make required corrections on the items of the questionnaires. They were especially requested to simplify the language of the questionnaires to make them easier to understand. They were also requested to recommend new items, if somehow omitted, to increase the content validity of the questionnaires.

Three subject specialists took part in this initial phase of the piloting. The researcher conducted interviews with them about the questionnaires and the current state of supervisory roles and activities asking the degree of respondents' agreement or disagreement with them.
primary school supervision in general. They explained some theoretical issues in the field.

All pieces of information gathered from those mentioned subject specialists were brought together and were analysed to make the necessary corrections on the existing items. Irrelevant items which needed to be deleted were identified and new items which needed to be inserted were formulated and added to the questionnaires. All these changes were made before administering questionnaires to a pilot sample of respondents. These changes are explained in detail in the following paragraphs.

The pilot study was carried out in three sample provinces namely, Ankara, Izmir and Usak. As 33 primary school teachers, eleven primary school supervisors and three provincial directors of education, in total 47 respondents took part in the piloting process of the study. Twelve primary school teachers from Ankara, eleven teachers from Izmir and ten teachers from Usak provinces were given questionnaires. Approximately half of the teacher respondents were assigned from rural area schools and the other half from urban area schools. The numbers of supervisors according to their provinces were; four from Ankara, four from Izmir and three from Usak provinces. The provincial directors of education of these three provinces were given the questionnaires.

All questionnaires were applied to the respondents by the researcher personally. All respondents were also requested to criticise the questions, especially in terms of their relevance to the area and their understandability. Some of the respondents were also requested to take part in a tape recorded interview with the researcher. Some of them did not show any desire to take part in such an interview. However, three supervisors and two teachers accepted the offer and eventually, interviews were carried out. Moreover, some open-ended questions were included in the questionnaires which were asking for respondents' ideas about possible barriers and recommendations for the implementation of innovations.

As was stated, the pilot study was carried out in three provinces in December 1990. Questionnaires were re-applied a fortnight after the initial one. Eventually, completion of data for piloting required almost a month.

During formal and informal interviews respondents who took part in the process, especially the primary school supervisors, have raised some critical issues. The overwhelming majority of them repeatedly mentioned almost the same problems related to their jobs. As a result, these issues and their possible implications were
evaluated and added into the relevant sections of the questionnaires as formulated questions.

It is expected that genuine and enthusiastic participation and help provided by the respondents and subject specialists have raised the consistency and reliability of the questionnaires. Identifying and assessing all information gathered from the respondents, there appeared some corrections, deletions and additions to the questionnaires. These are as follows:

**CHANGES TO SUPERVISORS' QUESTIONNAIRES**

As for the other two questionnaires (teachers' and directors' questionnaires) of the study, the supervisors' questionnaire is made up of four sections. The first section of the questionnaire comprises the questions which are formulated to get personal information about the respondents, such as their ages, sex, experiences, etc. It also includes some questions which seek their personal opinions on some supervisory issues. The second section comprises the questions which ask about practical involvement in certain specific innovative behaviours and practices. The third section comprises a number of items which could be barriers to the implementation of innovations in primary schools. The respondents were requested to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement to these items that they have been barriers to the implementation of innovations in their own instances. Similarly, the fourth section comprises a number of items which could be recommendations to improve the degree of implementation of innovations in primary schools and requests respondents to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement to these recommendations. An open-ended question was added to the ends of the third and fourth sections to allow the respondents to state barriers and recommendations which were not included in the related sections.

The supervisors' questionnaire was composed of 67 questions before the pilot. Distribution of them according to sections was: 21 questions in the first, 22 questions in the second, 16 questions in the third and eight question in the fourth section. After a careful assessment of recorded tapes, notes and open-ended questions, 17 questions were subject to some minor changes on them. Six questions were completely deleted. Four different questions were re-shaped as ten different questions to get more specific information and better clarification. Nine completely new questions were inserted into the questionnaire. Finally, as the need emerged one question from the fourth section was shifted to the first section in a revised form.
Eventually, the supervisors' questionnaire was given final shape as comprising 76 questions.

CHANGES TO TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRES

The teachers' questionnaire is also made up of four sections. The first section comprises the questions which are formulated to get personal information about the respondents and to seek their personal opinions on some supervisory issues as it was in supervisors' questionnaires. The second section comprises the questions asking about their supervisors' practical involvement in certain specific innovative behaviours and practices. The content of the questions (items) is exactly the same as the ones included in the identical section of the supervisors' questionnaire simply to make relevant comparisons and inferences. The third and fourth sections of the questionnaire are exactly the same as the identical sections of the other two questionnaires of the study.

The teachers' questionnaire was composed of 64 questions before the application. Distribution of them according to the sections was; 18 questions in the first, 22 questions in the second and eight questions in the fourth section. After the assessment of recorded tapes, notes and open-ended questions, 13 questions were subject to some minor changes on them, five questions were completely omitted and three questions were re-shaped as eight different questions. Five completely new questions were added to the questionnaire. Finally, one question from the fourth section was shifted to the first section in a revised form. Eventually, the teachers' questionnaire comprised 69 questions.

CHANGES TO PROVINCIAL DIRECTORS' QUESTIONNAIRES

As for the other two questionnaires, the questionnaire for the provincial directors of education was also made up of four sections. The first section comprises the questions which are designed to ask personal information about the respondents and to get their personal opinions on some given supervisory issues, as in the other two questionnaires of the study.

The second section of the provincial directors' questionnaire, which differs slightly from the second sections of the other two questionnaires, comprises questions which request directors to give information about the practical involvement of primary school supervisors in certain specific innovative behaviours and practices.
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Provincial directors were requested to consider the supervision reports submitted to them and meetings with his/her primary school supervisors in the province.

The third and fourth sections of the provincial directors’ questionnaire are exactly the same as the third and fourth sections of the other two questionnaires of the study.

This questionnaire was composed of 54 questions before the pilot. Distribution of the questions according to the sections was; 18 questions in the first, twelve questions in the second, 16 questions in the third and finally eight questions in the fourth section. After the evaluation of notes taken by the researcher and open-ended questions, the need emerged to make some minor changes in six questions. Six questions were completely omitted and three questions were re-shaped as eight different questions. While three new questions were inserted into the questionnaire, one question from the fourth section was shifted to the first section in a revised form. Finally, the provincial directors’ questionnaire comprised 56 questions in total.

APPLICATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

The field work of this study (application of the questionnaires) was carried out in May and June of 1991 in ten randomly selected provinces of Turkey. As was planned, three types of questionnaires were applied to three groups of representative respondents respectively. These groups were primary school teachers, primary school supervisors and province directors of national education (hereafter called teachers, supervisors and directors respectively). As was stated in detail in the earlier section, the first drafts of the questionnaires were submitted to qualified people for criticism and then these questionnaires were given preliminary trial by representatives of the proposed respondents. Questionnaires were improved and given their final shapes through these criticisms and trials. Finally they were printed, duplicated and out into operation. Each of the questionnaires was accompanied by a covering page which informed the recipient of the nature and purpose of the study and stressed the indispensability of their information.

Questionnaires were delivered in two ways. One was to visit the representative respondents, and the other one was to mail them to the recipients. Respondents representing Ankara, Izmir, Denizli and Usak provinces were given questionnaires personally by the researcher who visited them in their schools or offices in working hours.
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However, due to some economic and transportation difficulties respondents representing Tekirdag, Trabzon, Amasya, Tokat, Sanliurfa and Kars provinces received their questionnaires by post, a relatively more practical way.

QUESTIONNAIRES DELIVERED PERSONALLY TO THE RESPONDENTS

Before the questionnaires were applied, necessary clearances were obtained from the authorities. A letter of permission was obtained from the Ministry of National Education for the application of the questionnaires in the ten randomly selected provinces mentioned above.

Afterwards required clearances were obtained from each province director of national education for the application of the questionnaires to the supervisors and teachers representing the province capital. Finally, each district director of national education gave clearance for the application of the questionnaires to the teachers representing district centres, towns and villages.

Questionnaires were applied to the representative respondents of four provinces mentioned above by the researcher. Directors were given the questionnaires in their offices. Five sample supervisors from each province were given the questionnaires as a group in one session in their common meeting offices. Sample teachers (varying in number for different schools) were given questionnaires as a group in one session in their schools, generally in the teachers' common room.

Four directors, 20 supervisors and 76 teachers took part in the study as representative respondents of these provinces. Thus, 100 questionnaires were applied, and a return of 100 percent was yielded.

QUESTIONNAIRES SENT BY POST

A total of 150 questionnaires was sent to the representative respondents of six provinces named above. However, the questionnaires were not mailed directly to the individual respondents in order to ensure confidentiality. Each individual respondent was requested not to mention his/her name on the questionnaire or give any personal sign which might enable others to identify him/her.

In this phase of the field work directors of six provinces were contacted and their cooperation requested. They all responded positively and provided valuable support. As was agreed, a parcel was posted to each one of the directors of these six provinces with 25 questionnaires in it. The composition of the questionnaires was
one questionnaire for the director himself, five questionnaires for supervisors and 19 questionnaires for teachers from five different locations and schools. Each parcel was provided with a photocopy of the official permit (the original copy was officially sent to each province earlier) so that the researcher might conduct the study in the province.

In this stage of the field work, the main concern was to achieve the following purposes:

a) to ensure safe and easy delivery of the questionnaires to the recipients
b) to obtain a satisfactory return of response
c) to secure each recipient to complete and return the questionnaire willingly and without any hesitation.

In order to achieve these purposes some precautionary steps were taken. These are explained in the following paragraphs.

First of all, the parcels which were sent to the directors were provided with a detailed instruction paper containing instructions and necessary information for the directors in order to secure, especially, the delivery of the questionnaires to the right questionnaire recipients.

Directors were requested to provide help only for the distribution of the questionnaires. Thus, they provided necessary means and conditions for safe and quick delivery of the questionnaires and ordered the recipients to complete and return the questionnaires as soon as possible, nothing more than that.

Questionnaires were accompanied by a self-addressed stamped envelope for their return. These envelopes were code-marked to be identified by the researcher in terms of their destination provinces and district centres to avoid possible confusion when they were returned. To overcome any reluctance of respondents to complete and return the questionnaire, it was clearly stated on the cover page of the questionnaire that his/her individual answers would be treated confidentially. Finally, several follow-up requests were made to those who failed to respond.

As was planned, a total of 150 questionnaires were mailed to six province directors. The following figures were obtained from the six provinces where questionnaires were mailed to the recipients. Of the six questionnaires mailed to directors, four came back, a return of 67 percent, of the 30 questionnaires mailed to supervisors, 25 came back, a return of 83 percent, of the 114 questionnaires mailed to teachers, 102
came back, a return of 89 percent. Thus, the respondents sample from these six provinces became, 131 return out of 150, with a return of 87 percent.

As can be seen in Table 5, a return of 100 percent could not be achieved from some provinces where questionnaires were mailed. Thus, the provinces such as Sanliurfa, Trabzon, Kars and Tokat had returns of 64%, 72%, 92%, and 96%, respectively. It can be concluded that the main reason might be the difficulties in transportation and the post in remote areas of these provinces.

When we considered the whole representative sample and representative returns of the study, the following figures were obtained. Of the 10 questionnaires applied to the directors, 8 were obtained, a return of 80 percent; of the 50 questionnaires applied to the supervisors, 45 were obtained, a return of 90 percent; of the 190 questionnaires applied to the teachers, 178 were obtained, a return of 94 percent. The following table shows these figures in detail.
Table 5: The frequency distribution of representative sample of the study and representative returns by regions and provinces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE REGION RANK</th>
<th>PROVINCE</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTED BY</th>
<th>DIRECTOR</th>
<th>SUPERVISOR</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>PROVINCE</th>
<th>REGION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAP. OF PROVINCE</td>
<td>DISTRICT CENTRE</td>
<td>TOWN OR VILLAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ANKARA</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IZMIR</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>DENIZLI</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEKIRDAG</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>TRABZON</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USAK</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>AMASYA</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOKAT</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>S. URFA</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KARS</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible maximum number of questionnaires (respondents) for each province: 25
Possible maximum number of questionnaires (respondents) for the sample of the study: 250
Introduction

In this chapter of the study, the findings gathered by the application of the questionnaires are stated. This chapter is composed of five sub-sections. In the formulation and presentation of these sub-sections, mainly the shape of the questionnaires is kept and utilised. In all sub-sections, after the presentation of the results, a discussion related to these results is also produced.

As was mentioned in the earlier chapters, this study included 178 primary school teachers, 45 primary school supervisors and eight provincial directors of education. These three groups of respondents were given questionnaires. Although the questionnaires included sections in which they have completely identical questions or items, the groups were not given the same questionnaires. However, the contents of the questions, especially the ones in the teachers' and supervisors' questionnaires were almost the same. That is to say, they did not include the same questions, but they required the same sort of information. This was done mainly to make comparisons possible for the groups.

The questionnaires were in four sections. The first section itself falls into two sub-sections. The first asked the respondents' personal characteristics and some factual information about some supervisory (or even sometimes non-supervisory) activities in Turkish primary education. Secondly, respondents were asked to express reactions to some general statements about the supervisory roles and activities of primary school supervisors. They were also asked about their overall views on primary school supervision and some related administrative matters. These views of the respondents were sometimes considered as a base in making some other comparisons as well. So, in the first two sub-sections of this chapter some detailed personal characteristics of the respondents and some of their views are presented. Tables and figures (generally histograms) are used in the presentation.

The third sub-section of this chapter deals with the findings and analysis of the questions which were placed in the second sections of the questionnaires. For the teachers part, this section comprised the questions about their supervisors' practical involvement in certain specific innovative behaviours and practices. The content of the questions (items) is exactly
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the same as the ones included in the identical section of the supervisors' questionnaire in order to make relevant comparisons and inferences. These questions are 21 in total for both teachers and supervisors.

For the directors part, nine questions were formulated and directors were requested to answer these questions about supervisors’ practical involvement in certain innovative behaviours and practices, by considering the information gathered through the supervision reports submitted to them and meetings with his/her primary school supervisors in the province. The findings from these questions are presented either as tables or as histograms. As is explained, since the questions in the directors’ questionnaire differ significantly from the other two questionnaires, their statistical analysis is presented separately.

The fourth sub-section of the chapter is about the findings and analysis of the data gathered from the questions which were about factors which could be barriers to the implementation of innovations in primary schools, and requests respondents to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement to these barriers. Similarly, the fifth sub-section comprises a number of items which could be recommendations to improve the degree of implementation of innovations in primary schools and requests respondents to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement to these recommendations. An open-ended question was added to the ends of these sections to allow the respondents to state barriers and recommendations which were not included in the related sections. These open ended questions were also analysed and findings are presented.

For the statistical analysis, the numerical findings of the study are analysed to explore the differences between the groups’ opinions and attitudes. These differences are examined in terms of their statistical significance. For the entire study the following significance levels (whenever necessary) are considered and indicated thus:

- *** $p < 0.001$
- **$0.001 < p < 0.01$
- *$0.01 < p < 0.05$
- Otherwise $0.05 < p$
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SECTION ONE

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Age Distribution of the Respondents:

The population of this study included three groups of educators, namely, provincial directors of education, primary school supervisors and primary school teachers in the Turkish education system. In the whole population, the number of primary school teachers in 1990-91 Education Year was 233,441 (Akyol, 1990). The figures were 1763 for primary school supervisors and 67 for directors.

Eight directors 45 supervisors and 178 teachers took part in this study as the sample respondents of the mentioned population. The age distribution of these respondents is shown in Table 1.1. As the table shows, the biggest percentage of supervisors (47%) falls into the age group of 31-40 and the second highest (36%) into the 31-40. Or, to put it another way, more than four fifths of the supervisors (82%) have an age of between 31 and 50.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SUPERVISOR</th>
<th>DIRECTOR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or below</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, the highest percentage of the directors (75%) falls into the age group of 41-50, along with 13% with 51 or more years of age. In other words, the vast majority of the directors (87%) is 41 or more years of age.
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For the teachers part, the highest percentage (55%) falls into the age group of 36-45, with the second highest (31%) into 26-35. Or, to put it another way, 85% of the teacher respondents are between 26-45 years of age.

Considering these figures, it appears that among the respondent groups, teachers are the youngest, then supervisors. Directors appeared to be the oldest group. In other words, the biggest gap in terms of their ages is between teachers and directors. It should be noted that approximately 4% of the teachers were aged 25 or below, whereas there was not any director with the age of 30 or below.

Sex Distribution of the Respondents:

The sex distribution of the respondent groups is shown in Figure 1.1. As is seen in the figure, the most balanced distribution between the sexes is within the teachers group. 56% of the teachers group were male against 44% were female. On the other hand, only 2% of supervisor respondents were female against the vast majority of 98% of male respondents.

![Figure 1.1: The distribution of the respondents by sex](image)

These figures of teachers and supervisors samples are very much consistent with the population of the study. Thus, approximately 42% of teachers were female in 1989-90 Education Year (State Institute of Statistics, 1991, p.133). In the same Education Year there were 1763 primary school supervisors in total (Akyol, 1990), only 40 to 50 (2.5-3%) of them female.

For the directors part, it appeared that 12% of them were female against 88% of male. But, it should be noted that at the time of the application of the questionnaires of this study it
was known that there was only (and first time ever) one female provincial director of education among the 67. She was also one of the respondents of the study. That is to say, considering the whole population the exact figure of sex distribution for directors is, 1.5% female and 98.5% male.

Professional Experiences of the Respondents:

As is shown in Figure 1.2, there appears a highly unevenly distributed professional experience (total experience as an educator, including teaching, supervising and administering) among the respondent groups. As expected, it appeared that teachers had the lowest amount of experience in terms of years, then supervisors.

For the directors part, they appear as the most experienced group of all, three-quarters of them with 21 years or more experience. Moreover, the remaining one-quarter have experience between 11-20 years. As is seen in the figure, there is not any single director whose experience is ten years or Less. The second experienced group appears to be the supervisors group, as approximately 67% of them are 21 years or more experienced, and 31% have between 11-20 years of experience. Only 2% of supervisors have less than eleven years of experience. For the teachers part, they are the least experienced group. More than one-third of teachers have experience of less than 15 years. Within the teachers group itself, teachers with experience between 16-25 years are the biggest group. The experience of supervisors and directors of education are also examined in terms of their experiences in their current positions.
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As Table 1.2 shows, approximately 29% of supervisors have five years or less experience as supervisors. The biggest group of supervisors is with 6-10 years experience, as of 31%. The 11-15 year experienced supervisors form the third biggest proportion with 27%. In other words, the vast majority of the supervisors (87%) is 15 years or less experienced. Table 1.2 shows the figures in detail.

**Table 1.2 : The experiences of supervisors (as supervisor only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the directors part, it appears that approximately 63% of them have experience of between three and six years. The categories of 2 years or less, 7-10 years and 11-14 years have almost the same number of directors with approximately 12% each. It should be noted that there appeared no directors of education with experience of 15 years or more. Table 1.4 shows the numbers and percentages of directors with their experiences.

**Table 1.3 : The experiences of directors (as director only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 years or less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years or more</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Background of the Respondents:

Considering the school background of the respondent, there appears a very diverse situation, as there were more than eight different possible sources in total for three groups
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of respondents. If we begin with the teachers group, as is shown in Table 1.4, almost half of the teachers (49%) are university (including Open University) graduates. The second biggest group of teachers (40%) graduated from 2 year education institutes. While approximately 8% of teacher respondents declared that they attended 3 or 4 year teachers schools, there was not any single teacher who holds a higher degree.

Table 1.4: The distribution of the respondents by last graduated school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUPERVISOR</th>
<th>DIRECTOR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year Teachers School</td>
<td>10 5.6</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>10 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Teachers School</td>
<td>4 2.2</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>4 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year Education Institute</td>
<td>70 39.3</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 25</td>
<td>72 30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year Education Institute</td>
<td>3 1.7</td>
<td>26 57.8</td>
<td>3 37.5</td>
<td>32 13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Education Institute</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (incl Open Univ)</td>
<td>87 48.9</td>
<td>6 13.3</td>
<td>3 37.5</td>
<td>96 41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Degree (MA or Ph.D.)</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 4.4</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Formation Program</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>10 22.2</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>10 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or no answer</td>
<td>4 2.2</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>4 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>178 100</td>
<td>45 100</td>
<td>8 100</td>
<td>231 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the biggest group within the supervisor group, 58% of supervisors declared that they were the graduates of 3 year education institutes. The percentage of university graduates is approximately 13%. On the other hand, more than one-fifth (22%) of supervisors attended supervisor formation programs arranged by the Ministry of Education, with a duration of, generally speaking, six months.

It appears that the universities and 3 year education institutes are the main sources for provincial directors of education. Each one of these institutions is declared as the last graduated school by approximately 38% of the director respondents of the study. On the other hand, a substantial number (25%) of directors are the graduates of 2 year education institute, as was the case for almost 40% of teachers.
Discussion:

In the earlier paragraphs the results regarding some of the personal characteristics of the respondents, such as age, sex, experience and school background are presented.

With regard to these characteristics the findings do reveal some interesting differences. As might be expected, teachers are the youngest among the groups, then supervisors. However, it can be concluded that the differences among the respondent groups in terms of their ages are not of great difference, as whilst 85% of teachers are aged between 26-45, 82% of supervisors and 87% of directors are aged between 31-50. As was stated in the earlier section of the study, supervisors are required to have, at least, five years of teaching or administration experience, or both, in primary education institutions by the regulation. So, it can be said that the age difference between teachers and supervisors is as much as is thought required to make possible a good supervision relationship between a supervisor and a supervisor.

Considering the sex distribution of the respondent groups the differences appear to be much higher and more unevenly distributed than those of age. First of all, it should be noted that the figures yielded from the sample are very much consistent with the population of the study. As was stated in the results section, 56% of the teachers group were male against 44% female. First of all, it can generally be concluded that gender differences are not great here. These figures can perhaps be best interpreted by taking the situation of other professions in Turkey into account, as the distribution of sexes in most of the other professions is not as evenly as distributed as for primary school teachers. Although the situation does not seem bleak, it can be concluded that this should not prevent policy and decision makers from making the profession more easily accessible by female teachers, at least up to the same level with their male counterparts.

On the other hand, the picture for the female supervisors does not seem as bright as the one for female teachers. The findings do reveal that only one of 45 respondents of primary school supervisors is female (2.2%). Similarly, in terms of the whole population, only 40-50 of 1763 (2.3%) of them were female in 1990.

The findings on the sex distribution of respondent supervisors and directors of the study revealed that it was difficult to be appointed to those posts for female candidates.
First of all, it must be stressed that the sex distribution of supervisors is not compatible with the sex distribution of teachers. It simply means that while you have supervisees (teachers) nearly half of whom are female, you have supervisors of whom the vast majority (98%) are male. Although it is possible to speculate on the reasons for this, it would be more appropriate if the distribution of the sexes in the supervisors group were more well-balanced and compatible with the figures for teachers.

Similarly, the same conclusion can be drawn for the directors. There was only one provincial director of education in the national total of 67 in 1990. This must be considered far from the desired number.

In the case of the professional experience of the respondents, the findings do reveal certain differences. But, it should be noted that these differences, particularly the ones between supervisors and teachers groups, are not as big as previously expected. As is the case in the age distribution of the respondents, as expected, teachers are the least experienced group, then supervisors. The biggest gap regarding the total experience of the respondents is between the teachers and directors groups. It can be concluded that the amount of difference of experience between supervisees and supervisors, as compatible with the age distribution, is well-balanced.

On the other hand, if we consider the experiences of the groups in terms of their current positions, it appears that the vast majority of directors have an experience of only between 3-6 years in their posts. It suggests that, compared with the other groups, directors hold the most vulnerable post. It can be concluded that this is mainly due to the frequent changing of the directors.

Regarding the school background of respondents, the most striking finding is that almost half of the teachers are university graduates. However, it should be noted that the vast majority, if not all, of those teachers are the graduates of the Open University (A Two Year Education Program for Teachers). It is worth mentioning here that the graduates of this program get some extra promotion facilities, both statutory and financial.

It is also found that more than one-fifth of supervisors are the graduates of supervisor formation programs. As was stated earlier, these are the programs that are arranged by the ministry with a duration of six months. It suggests that the Ministry of Education seems to
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maintain its long-standing principle of "the foundation of the supervision profession is being a teacher at first".

It can be argued that it would have been more sensible if the teachers (with required teaching experiences as well) who were the graduates of the relevant departments of the universities had been appointed rather than those of six-month formation programs. However, the Ministry, to its credit, have started to appoint those teachers who graduated from those mentioned departments, beginning in 1990-91. It is hoped that this approach is to be maintained.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AND SOME SUPERVISION STATISTICS

The Number of Supervisions and the Number of Teachers per Supervisor

The eighth question of the supervisors' questionnaires of the study requested supervisors to indicate the number of teachers who they supervised within the 1989-90 education year. The vast majority of them (71%) stated that they had supervised between 101 and 150 teachers in the year. Moreover, more than one-fifth of them ticked the alternative of 'more than 151'. The figures are presented in Table 1.5 in detail.

Table 1.5: Number of teachers supervised by individual respondent supervisors in 1989-90 education year (approximate number of teachers per supervisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 151</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the eighth question to the supervisors, the teacher respondents of the study are individually asked to state how many times they were supervised within the same education term. It appeared that a very big majority of the teachers (58%) had one supervision. The second biggest group of the teachers (30%) experienced two supervisions in the same
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period. Whilst approximately 6% of the teachers were supervised three or more times, 5% of them did not report any at all. More detailed figures are presented in Table 1.6.

Table 1.6: Numbers of supervisions on individual teachers in 1989-90 (average number of supervisions per teacher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISION</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, supervisors were asked to state the number of teachers per supervisor in their supervision areas as they observed the situation. Almost half of the supervisors (49%) indicated that the number of teachers per supervisor was between 126 and 150. The second biggest group of supervisors (22%) declared that the number was between 101 and 125 in their areas. While more than one-fourth of supervisors had more than 151 teachers per supervisor in their areas, only 2% of them had less than 100 teachers. Table 1.7 shows the approximate numbers of teachers per supervisor in the supervision areas.

Table 1.7: Approximate numbers of teachers per supervisor by respondent supervisors' supervision areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-150</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-175</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In addition to the previous question, respondent supervisors were also requested to state the number of supervisors in their supervision groups. It appears from the responses that more than half of the supervisors (53%) are working within groups each of which comprises four supervisors. More than one-fifth of the supervisors (22%) state that their groups are composed of three supervisors. While 7% of the supervisors are working with five other colleagues, only 2% of them have only one colleague. It also appears from the responses of the supervisors that the vast majority (91%) of supervision groups comprise three, four or five primary school supervisors. Table 1.8 shows the details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBERS OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 supervisors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 supervisors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 supervisors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more supervisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervision Activities, Supervision Areas and Supervisors

In the earlier chapters of the study we have mentioned the duties which are supposed to be performed by primary school supervisors. With regard to these duties supervisors were requested to state both the time they actually spend and the time they would like to spend on these duties. The distribution of these answers is given in Table 1.9. As it shows, supervisors say they are actually spending approximately 44% of their time on inspection and assessment duties. The second biggest (31%) amount of time is devoted to advice, guidance and on-the-job training. Supervisors also state that they spent 13% of their time on each one of examination and investigation duties.
Chapter 4: Results and Discussion

Table 1.9: The comparison of percentages of time actually spent and would like to be spent by supervisors for main supervisory duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUTIES</th>
<th>Actually spent (Mean of %)</th>
<th>Would like to be spent (Mean of %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice, guidance and on-the-job training</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and assessment</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As opposed to these times actually spent in practice, it appeared that supervisors would like to spend more of their time on advice, guidance and on-the-job training, and less on inspection and assessment duties. The percentage of time which supervisors would like to dedicate to examination and investigation duties is approximately 8% to each one.

Similarly, supervisors were also asked to state the percentages of time they actually spent and they would like to spend with regard to three main supervision areas, as stated in related official documents (see, for instance, Supervisors' Decree presented in the second chapter). It is calculated that supervisors are spending approximately 79% on average of their time in state-run primary schools. Interestingly, this is almost identical to the amount of time (78.9%) they would like to be spent in the same sector. Seven percent of time is declared as actually spent in private schools, against 13% which they would like to be spent there. Although 8% of time could be devoted to private driving licence schools, supervisors stated that 14% of their time had to be given for the activities of these schools. Table 1.10 shows the mean percentages of times calculated on the basis of the responses given by supervisors.
Table 1.10: The comparison of percentages of time **actually spent** and **would like to be spent** by supervisors for main supervision areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERVISION AREAS</th>
<th>Actually spent (Mean of %s)</th>
<th>Would like to be spent (Mean of %s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Schools</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Schools</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priv.Driv.Licence Schools</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Nature of the Last Supervision and its Evaluation**

All three groups of respondents were asked to assess the last supervision of the 1990-91 Education Year, as they experienced it as teacher, supervisor or director depending on their situation. Naturally, the questions were formulated accordingly for the three groups of respondents. Teachers who hadn’t had any supervision in that year were requested to consider the previous one. As is presented in Table 1.11, more than three-quarters of teachers stated that their last supervision was on the assessment of his/her teaching performance. On the other hand only 27% of supervisors stated that their last supervisions were related to the same topic. Similarly, 38% of directors declared that (by considering the supervision reports submitted to him/her) primary school supervisions in their provinces were mainly on the assessment of teachers’ teaching performances. Table 1.11 shows the nature of the last supervision of 1990-91 Education Year as experienced by the three groups of respondents.
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Table 1.11: Nature of the Last Supervision of 1990-91 Education Year According to Teachers, Supervisors, and Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Teachers (%)</th>
<th>Supervisors (%)</th>
<th>Directors (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to meet staff as a group</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to discuss curriculum generally</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to discuss a general, personal matter</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to offer teachers support over a problem</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to evaluate teachers' teaching performances</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to discuss a specific innovation</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to attend a school event</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second most declared category appears to be "to discuss curriculum generally" when all of the responses of the three groups are taken into account. Whilst almost one-quarter of supervisors and directors each state this category as the nature of the last supervision, only 11% of teachers do so.

The category "to offer teachers support over a problem" appears to be the category that reveals a big discrepancy between teachers and supervisors groups. While 38% of supervisors asserted that their last supervisions were on this topic, only 3% of teachers declared that the nature of the last supervision was to offer them support over a problem.

On the other hand, nearly the same percentages are yielded for teachers (3%) and supervisors (4%) for "the discussion of a specific innovation" as the topic of the last supervision of the 1990-91 Education Year. Table 1.11 provides detailed figures for the other features of the last supervision of that year.

With regard to the nature of the last supervision of 1990-91 Education Year, Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests were employed to find out whether significant differences existed among and/or between the responses of the respondents. It appeared that there were significant differences between the responses of teachers and supervisors.
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(z=-5.60, p<.001), and the responses of teachers and directors (z=-3.88, p<.001). However, there was no significant difference between the responses of supervisors and directors.

For the evaluation of the supervisions of the 1990-91 Education Year, groups were requested to state their opinions on a five point scale ranging from “definitely helpful” to “no help at all”. 89% of supervisors and 88% of directors rated the supervisions either definitely or generally “helpful”. On the other hand, the percentage for teachers who found the last supervision either definitely or generally “helpful” was 36. However, 61% of teachers found the last supervision either as “very little help” or “no help at all”. It should be noted that while more than one-fourth of teachers stated that they had found the last supervision they had as “no help at all”, not surprisingly, only 2% of supervisors stated so. No director found the supervisions of his/her province as “no help at all”. However, 12% of them reported the supervisions as “very little help”. Figure 1.3 shows the evaluation of the supervisions of 1990-91 Education Years.

Figure 1.3: Evaluation of the supervisions of 1990-91 Education Year by groups

With regard to the evaluation of the supervisions of 1990-91 Education Year, Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests were employed to find out whether significant differences existed among and/or between the views of teachers, supervisors and directors of education. It appeared that there were significant differences between the views of teachers and supervisors (z=-6.22, p<.001), and the responses of teachers and directors (z=-3.07, p<.01). However, there was no significant difference between the responses of supervisors and directors.
Discussion:

In the previous paragraphs the result on the occurrences of some supervisory behaviours and supervisory activities were analysed and the figures for the average number of teachers per supervisor (actually experienced and observed by supervisors in their supervision areas); the number of supervision experienced by individual teachers and the composition of supervisory groups were presented. In addition to these figures, the data on the time actually spent and would like to be spent by supervisors for four major supervisory duties were also analysed.

With regard to the average number of teachers per supervisor, as actually experienced by individual supervisors, virtually all supervisors state that they supervised more than one hundred teachers in 1989-90 Education Year. Similarly, It appears that the approximate number of teachers per supervisor, as observed by supervisors, in supervision areas is between 100 and 150. It is worth mentioning that these figures are also compatible with the parameters of the population of the study, as the national average is around 133 teachers per supervisor.

We know that the average number of working days in primary schools in Turkey in one education year is between 180-190 days. This means that each supervisor has less than two days to deal with the problems of each teacher. If we consider the amount of unavoidable time which every supervisor has to spend for unproductive but required duties, such as transportation, writing up of reports, etc., it becomes even clearer that this amount of time is simply not enough to perform supervisory duties, even at its most basic.

So, it can be concluded that there are too many teachers per supervisor, so that it is not possible for supervisors to cope with their supervisory duties and responsibilities properly.

On the other hand, with regard to the numbers of supervisions of individual teachers in the 1989-90 Education Year, it was found that the vast majority of teachers did experience at least one supervision in that period.

In terms of the findings concerning the duties that are supposed to be performed by supervisors, and findings concerning supervision areas, there appear some interesting associations among them. For instance, It appeared that supervisors would like to spend less time in inspection and assessment duties than they actually spend on them in real
practice. On the other hand they would like to spend more time in advice, guidance and on-the-job training. Moreover, they would like to spend less time for their examination and particularly for investigation duties.

Taking these points into account, it seems that we may draw the following conclusions;

First of all, it seems that supervisors are not happy with the distribution of time on their duties. They want to make a shift toward the advice and support end of the supervision scale. They would like to reduce the time which they have been spending for inspection and assessment, examination and investigation duties. They want to shift this obtained time in the favour of advice, guidance and on-the-job training duties.

It also seems that, although at least some of them do still want to have it, most of the supervisors are not keen on keeping the investigation dimension of their role, as they put it to the end of their preference list.

Similarly, it appears that supervisors do not want to spend their time in private driving licence schools. It is obvious that they must have been thinking that this is not a proper job for a primary school supervisor. On the other hand, supervisors do want to spare more time to private schools. It can be concluded that this could be the result of the opening of the new private primary schools in big numbers in recent years.

It is one of the most surprising findings of the study that the groups have revealed very different ideas about the nature of the supervisions of the 1990-91 Education Year. The difference is striking particularly between teachers and supervisors. It must be stressed that, it was not possible to pair 'the teacher' and 'the supervisor' up as giving and receiving ends of 'the same' supervision visit and to get their views. That means that it was quite possible to end up with the views of teachers whose supervisors were different from the ones who were included in the study, and vice-versa. However, as we consider the general situation, it can be expected that there should be some degree of consistency between the views of the groups.

In the event, one of the main differences between the opinions of the teachers and supervisors is about the activity “to evaluate teachers’ teaching performances”. On the one hand three-quarters of the teachers reported that the supervision activity was on the evaluation of their teaching performance. However, almost the same proportion of
supervisors claimed that it was not so. Moreover, a substantial proportion of supervisors stated that the supervisions were "to offer teachers support over a problem".

First of all it can be concluded that the reason for this could be the different valuation of the supervision activity to which they are referring. It seems that while teachers are considering the activities of the supervisors as a kind of evaluation of their teaching performances, supervisors are valuing the same activity as a support to the teacher. It seems that supervisors are "performance evaluators" or "quality controllers" rather than "support providers" or "advice givers" in the eyes of the teachers.

It also appeared from the findings of the study that only a tiny proportion of supervisors and teachers declared that the supervisions in 1990-91 were on a discussion of a specific innovation. Another interesting aspect of this finding is that, although the groups appear to have different perceptions on other categories of listed activities, they seem to have the same perception on this matter. It appears that new ideas and practices are as far from supervisors, as from schools, teachers and pupils. It seems that supervisors are heavily engaged with tradition and routine.

It can be concluded that taking also the other factors mentioned so far into account it seems that supervisors do not have favourable conditions to exhibit more innovative behaviours.

Another interesting finding with regard to the nature of the supervisions of 1990-91 is the similarities between the perceptions of the supervisors and directors. In terms of seven possible supervisory activities mentioned (see Table 1.11), there are significant differences between the perceptions of teachers and supervisors and between the perceptions of teachers and directors, but not between the perceptions of supervisors and directors.

Similarly, although significant differences exist between the views of teachers and supervisors and between the views of teachers and directors, there is not any significant difference between the views of supervisors and directors with regard to the evaluation of the supervisions of the 1990-91 Education Year.

It appears that supervisors and directors find the supervisions more 'helpful' than teachers. Teachers have lower perceptions than the perceptions of supervisors and directors. These findings suggest that among the three groups teachers are distant from supervisors and directors. On the other hand, directors and supervisors seem to share more common views about the supervisions between themselves than the teachers.
SECTION TWO

THE VIEWS OF THE RESPONDENTS ON EDUCATIONAL AND SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES

1- "SUPERVISORS SHOULD SPEND MORE TIME HELPING TEACHERS TO ASSESS THEIR CLASSROOM PERFORMANCES"

Results

With regard to the proposition "supervisors should spend more time helping teachers to assess their classroom performance" figures for the three groups demonstrated that almost three quarters of the teachers, 84% of the supervisors and all of the directors 'agreed' with it, either generally or strongly. Teachers appeared as the group with the highest dissatisfaction, as nearly one-third of them declared either generally or strongly 'disagreement' with the statement. On the other hand, directors showed no disagreement at all. Figure 2.1 presents the comparative figures of the responses of the three groups.

Figure 2.1: "Supervisors should spend more time helping teachers to assess their classroom performance"

Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests were employed to find out whether significant differences existed among and/or between the views of the respondents. For the group comparisons, it appeared that there were no significant differences among the views of teachers, supervisors and directors with regard to the above statement.
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The same tests were also employed to look at whether significant differences existed within the groups themselves in terms of a number of independent variables. Within the teachers group, for example, there were no significant differences among the views of teachers, according to age, region, experience, and number of supervisions they had. However, there appeared a significant difference between male and female teachers ($z=-2.11$, $p<.05$) with regard to the proposition. Thus, as the negative $z$ value indicated, female teachers had more positive attitudes toward the statement. In other words, female teachers 'agreed more' than their male counterparts that supervisors should spend more time helping teachers to assess their classroom performances.

On the other hand, when the same tests were applied to the supervisors group to find out whether they had different views in terms of their age groups, regions and experience, it appeared that supervisors exhibited no significant differences among their views with regard to the above proposition (the number of female supervisors was too small to test differences).

Discussion

The findings presented here with regard to the proposition do reveal a number of interesting associations between the views of the three groups. First of all, it can be concluded that all groups, teachers, supervisors and directors want supervisors to help teachers more to assess their classroom performance. It seems that all groups consider the help coming from supervisors to teachers about their classroom performance as insufficient. It can also be concluded that, within the teachers group, female teachers say that they need more time, in other words help, from their supervisors.

On the other hand it also appeared that, although it was not statistically significantly different, teachers seemed more reluctant to respond positively to the statement than the other groups. In other words they need help from their supervisors but they still are not as enthusiastic as supervisors and directors to spend more time with the supervisors. It can also be seen that these findings are compatible with the other findings of the study mentioned earlier.
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2- "THE FEEDBACK TO TEACHERS THAT COMES FROM SUPERVISORS IS OF CONSIDERABLE USE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOLS"

It appeared that the vast majority of the teachers, supervisors and directors either generally or strongly ‘agreed’ with the proposition “The feedback to teachers that comes from supervisors is of considerable use in the development of schools.” The highest percentage of agreement was scored by supervisors, as 93% of them ‘agreed’ (57% strongly, 36 % generally) with the statement, while 88% of both the teachers and the directors groups ‘agreed’ either generally or strongly with it. On the other hand, the highest ‘strongly agreed’ proportion was within the teachers group of 63 %. Figure 2.2 presents the comparative figures of the responses of the three groups relating to the proposition.

Figure 2.2: “The feedback to teachers that comes from supervisors is of considerable use in the development of schools”

Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests were employed to find out whether significant differences existed among and/or between the views of the respondents. For the group comparisons, it appeared that there were no significant differences among the views of teachers, supervisors and directors with regard to the above statement.

The same tests were also employed to look at whether significant differences existed within the groups themselves in terms of a number of independent variables. Within the teachers group, for example, there were no significant differences among the views of teachers with regard to age groups, sexes, regions, area types, experience, and number of supervisions they had.
Similarly, when the same tests were applied to the supervisors group to find out whether
they had different views in terms of their age groups, regions and experience, it appeared
that supervisors exhibited no significant differences among their views with regard to these
variables.

Discussion

The findings presented here with regard to the proposition exhibit a number of associations
between the views of the three groups of respondents. Since the vast majority of all three
groups agreed either strongly or generally with the proposition “the feedback to teachers
that comes from supervisors is of considerable use in the development of schools”, and
given the finding that there were significant differences among the views of the three
groups, it can easily be concluded that all groups consider feedback by supervisors as an
important aspect of the way of performing supervisory duties. On the other hand, it is
worthy of note that since supervisors have scored the highest percentage of agreement
either generally or strongly among the three groups, it seems that, to their credit, they are
quite enthusiastic and conscientious about their responsibilities.

The findings also suggest that the teachers and supervisors groups within themselves
exhibit a unity in their views towards the above proposition, as there are no significant
differences among the views of teachers no matter their age, sex, region, area, experience,
and the number of supervision they have, and also among the views of supervisors no
matter their age, region and experience.

3- “SUPERVISORS ARE VERY IMPORTANT IN HELPING TO REVITALISE
TEACHERS PROFESSIONALLY”

Responses to the statement “supervisors are very important in helping to revitalise teachers
professionally” indicated that the vast majority of supervisors (96%), and directors (88%)
‘agreed’ with it either generally or strongly. On the other hand, teachers seemed divided, as
one half (48%) ‘agree’ with the statement, whilst the other half (49%) ‘disagreed’ either
generally or strongly. Figure 2.3 presents the comparative figures of the responses of the
three groups relating to the proposition.
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Figure 2.3: “Supervisors are very important in helping to revitalise teachers professionally”

Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests were employed to find out whether significant differences existed among and/or between the views of the respondents. For the group comparisons, there were significant differences between the views of teachers and supervisors (z = -6.08, p < .001) and between the views of teachers and directors (z = -2.65, p < .01) with regard to the above statement. Thus, it appeared that, as the negative z values indicated, supervisors agreed more strongly than teachers, and similarly directors had more positive attitudes towards the above proposition than the teachers. However, there were no significant differences between the views of supervisors and directors. Table 2.6 provides the z values of comparisons of groups and their probability levels.

Table 2.1: Z Values of Comparisons of Groups (Mann-Whitney U Tests)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers vs Supervisors</td>
<td>-6.0794***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers vs Directors</td>
<td>-2.6460**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors vs Directors</td>
<td>-.1037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (* = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001)

The same tests were also employed to look at whether significant differences existed within the groups themselves in terms of a number of independent variables. Within the teachers
group, for example, there were no significant differences among the views of teachers with regard to age groups, sexes, regions, area types, experience, and number of supervisions they had.

On the other hand, when the same tests were applied to the supervisors group it appeared that there were significant differences between the age groups “31-40” and “51 or more” ($z=-2.56, p<.05$), and between the age groups “41-50” and “51 or more” ($z=-1.99, p<.05$). Thus, as the negative $z$ values indicated, the supervisors aged 51 or above had more positive attitudes towards the statement than the ones aged between 31-40 and also aged between 41 and 50. Table 2.2 presents the $z$ values of comparisons by age groups and their probability levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared Age Categories</th>
<th>Z Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30 or less) vs (31-40)</td>
<td>.5547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 or less) vs (41-50)</td>
<td>.7475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 or less) vs (51 or more)</td>
<td>1.3944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31-40) vs (41-50)</td>
<td>.9018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31-40) vs (51 or more)</td>
<td>2.5588*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41-50) vs (51 or more)</td>
<td>1.9963*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (*= $p<.05$; **= $p<.01$; ***=$p<.001$)

However, there appeared no significant difference between the views of supervisors of different regions and between the views of supervisors with different years of experience.

**Discussion**

The findings regarding the proposition “supervisors are very important in helping to revitalise teachers professionally” allows us to draw a number of interesting conclusions. First of all, that teachers are not in accord with supervisors and directors as there are significant differences between their views. On the one hand, there are supervisors and
director who think that supervisors are important in helping to revitalise teachers professionally, on the other hand the teachers are almost equally divided in their views with regard to the same proposition. It is a quite striking finding that, as the receiving end of supervision, teachers do not find (at least half of them) supervisors helpful to equip teachers with new ideas and to give professional encouragement to them.

Teachers have the same attitudes towards the proposition regardless of their age, sex, region, area, experience and the number of supervision they have. On the other hand, for the supervisors part, although there are no statistically significant differences among the views of supervisors from different regions and with different experience, it appears that supervisors aged 51 or more (the oldest age category) have agreed significantly more than the ones aged between 31-40 and similarly than the ones aged between 41-50.

4- "SUPERVISION OF OUR SCHOOLS MAKES NO DIFFERENCE IN THE END TO THEIR PERFORMANCE"

As might be expected, it appeared that the vast majority of supervisors opposed the proposition "supervision of our schools make no difference in the end to their performances". The percentage of supervisors who responded as 'strongly disagree' with the statement is 68%. In addition to this, 14% of the supervisors 'generally disagreed' with it. In other words, more than four fifths of them indicated their disagreement with the proposition. Similarly, none of the directors 'agreed' with the statement, as 50% of them strongly disagreed while the other 50% disagreed generally. On the other hand, again, as for the previous statement, teachers are divided into two groups, one half 'agree' with the statement (46%) , while the other half 'disagree' (47%) with it either generally or strongly. Figure 2.4 presents the comparative figures of the responses of the three groups relating to the proposition.

Chapter 4: Results and Discussion
Figure 2.4: "supervision of our schools makes no difference in the end to their performance"

Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests were employed to find out whether significant differences existed among and/or between the views of the respondents. For the group comparisons, it appeared that there were significant differences between the views of teachers and supervisors (z = 5.03, p < .001) and between the views of teachers and directors (z = 2.53, p < .05) with regard to the above statement. Thus, supervisors disagreed more strongly than teachers, and similarly directors had more negative attitudes towards the above proposition than the teachers. However, there were no significant differences between the views of supervisors and directors. Table 2.9 shows the z values of comparisons of groups and their probability levels.

Table 2.3: Z Values of Comparisons of Groups (Mann-Whitney U Tests)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers vs Supervisors</td>
<td>-5.0296***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers vs Directors</td>
<td>-2.5266*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors vs Directors</td>
<td>-.4806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (* = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001)

The same tests were also employed to look at whether significant differences existed within the groups themselves in terms of a number of independent variables. Within the teachers group, for example, there were no significant differences among the views of teachers with
regard to age groups, sexes, regions, area types, experience, and number of supervisions they had.

On the other hand, when the same tests were applied to the supervisors group it appeared that there were significant differences between the age groups “30 or less” and “31-40” (z = 2.46, p < .05). thus, supervisors aged between 31-40 had more negative attitudes towards the proposition “supervision of our schools make no difference in the end to their performances” than the ones aged 30 or less. On the other hand, there appeared no significant difference between the other age group categories. Table 2.4 shows the z values of comparisons by age groups and their probability levels.

**Table 2.4 : Z values of Comparisons by Age Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared Age Categories</th>
<th>Z Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30 or less) vs (31-40)</td>
<td>2.4551*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 or less) vs (41-50)</td>
<td>1.7760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 or less) vs (51 or more)</td>
<td>1.3098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31-40) vs (41-50)</td>
<td>-1.6895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31-40) vs (51 or more)</td>
<td>-1.9094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41-50) vs (51 or more)</td>
<td>-.7242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (* = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001)

Similarly, there were significant differences between the attitudes of supervisors with 10 years or less experience and the ones with 11-20 years of experience. Supervisors with 11-20 years of experience disagreed the above proposition more strongly than the supervisors with 10 years or less experience. On the other hand, there appeared no significant differences between the other experience categories. Table 2.5 provides the z values of comparisons by experience categories and their probability levels.
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Table 2.5: Z Values of Comparisons by Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Categories (years)</th>
<th>Z Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10 or less) vs (11-20)</td>
<td>2.3205*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 or less) vs (21 or more)</td>
<td>1.7671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11-20) vs (21 or more)</td>
<td>-1.7585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (* = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001)

Discussion

The findings presented here regarding the proposition "supervision of our schools make no difference in the end to their performance" do reveal a number of different attitudes of the three groups of respondents. First of all, it should be noted that although there were no statistically significant differences between the views of the supervisors and the directors, as the vast majority of both groups 'disagreed' either generally or strongly with the proposition, teachers, however, had statistically significantly different views from both supervisors and directors. They 'agreed' more strongly than the supervisors and directors that supervision of schools makes no difference in the end to their performance.

However, as for the previous statement, teachers again were almost equally divided in their views regarding the proposition. Whilst half of them agreed with it, the other half disagreed. It is quite striking that while the vast majority of supervising personnel, (i.e. 82% of supervisors) do report that they 'disagree' with the statement, almost half of the supervised personnel (i.e. teachers) do report that supervision of schools does not make any difference to their performance.

It is worthy of noting here that, although there is a statistically significant difference between the views of the supervisors aged 31-40 and the ones aged 30 or less, we need to be cautious in making comparisons between these supervisors, since we have only one out of 45 supervisors aged 30 or less.
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5- "SUPERVISORS MAY PERFORM THEIR INVESTIGATION ROLES TOGETHER WITH THEIR ADVICE AND GUIDANCE ROLES"

Figure 2.5 depicts the distinction of the views of the directors from the other two groups about the statement "supervisors may perform their investigation roles together with their advice and guidance roles". As the figure shows, almost 88% of the directors 'agreed' with the statement either generally or strongly, while 58% of the supervisors and 54% of the teachers responded in the same way. On the other hand, 40% of the supervisors and almost one-thirds of the teachers 'disagreed' with the proposition either generally or strongly.

Figure 2.5: "Supervisors may perform their investigation roles together with their advice and guidance roles"

Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests showed no significant differences among the views of teachers, supervisors and directors with regard to the above statement.

Within the teachers group there were no significant differences among the views of teachers with regard to age groups, sexes, regions, experience, and number of supervisions they had. On the other hand, regarding the above proposition there appeared significant differences between the views of the teachers from city centres and town centres (z= -2.23, p<.05), and also between the teachers from city centres and villages (z= -2.68, p<.01). Teachers who teach in town centres had more positive attitudes towards the statement than the ones who teach in city centres. Similarly, it also appeared that teachers from villages had more positive attitudes toward the same proposition than their colleagues from city centres.
centres. However, there was no significant difference between the views of town centre teachers and village teachers. Table 2.6 shows z values of comparisons by locality types and their probability levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared Areas</th>
<th>Z Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centres vs Town Centres</td>
<td>-2.2299*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centres vs Villages</td>
<td>-2.6809**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centres vs Villages</td>
<td>-0.5345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (* = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001)

On the other hand, when the same tests were applied to the supervisors group to find out whether they had different views in terms of their age groups, regions and experience, it appeared that supervisors exhibited no significant differences among their views with regard to the above proposition.

**Discussion**

The findings in relation to the statement allow us to draw the following conclusions. First of all, although teachers and supervisors had conflicting attitudes towards the statement within themselves, directors expressed more clear-cut attitudes towards the proposition. Directors claimed that supervisors might perform their investigation roles together with their advice and guidance roles.

On the other hand, interestingly, nearly half of the supervisors' attitudes were not so. Another interesting finding with regard to this statement was the high percentage of teachers who reported that they had “no idea” on this matter. Nearly one-fifth of them declared so.

**6- “OUR SCHOOLS ARE BECOMING INCREASINGLY CENTRALISED”**

With regard to the proposition “our schools are becoming increasingly centralised” responses revealed that although three quarters of the directors 'disagreed', more than half
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of the teacher (51%) and supervisor groups (63%) ‘agreed’ either generally or strongly with the statement. It also is worth noting that 28% of teachers stated that they had no idea about the statement. Similarly 16% of supervisors also had no idea about the matter. Figure 2.6 looks at the comparative figures of the responses of the three groups relating to the proposition.

Figure 2.6: “Our Schools are becoming increasingly centralised”

There were no significant differences among the views of teachers, supervisors and directors with regard to the above statement. Similarly, there were no significant differences among the views of teachers with regard to age groups, sexes, area types, experience, and number of supervisions they had. On the other hand, regarding this proposition there appeared significant differences between the views of the teachers of different regions. The comparisons in Table 2.7 suggest that although there is a general tendency that the teachers from more prosperous regions agreed more with the statement, the teachers from the third region have the strongest agreement with the statement among the all groups.
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Table 2.7: Z Values of Comparisons by Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared Regions</th>
<th>Z Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 2nd</td>
<td>-1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 3rd</td>
<td>-2.5395*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 4th</td>
<td>-0.8092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 5th</td>
<td>1.9219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd vs 3rd</td>
<td>-0.8979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd vs 4th</td>
<td>0.9400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd vs 5th</td>
<td>3.2673**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd vs 4th</td>
<td>1.9205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd vs 5th</td>
<td>3.6370***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th vs 5th</td>
<td>2.2949***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (*= p< .05; **=p<.01; ***=p< .001)

On the other hand, when the same tests were applied to the supervisors group to find out whether they had different views in terms of their age groups, regions and experience, it appeared that supervisors exhibited no significant differences among their views with regard to the above proposition.

Discussion

Generally speaking, although there were no statistically significant differences between them, a substantial proportion of supervisors, teachers and directors reported that schools were becoming increasingly centralised in their regions. However, it should be noted that directors, as the first hand representatives of the central authority in the regions, most strongly “disagreed” with the statement among the respondents.

It is also worthy of note that, as the comparisons in Table 2.7 show, the less prosperous the region the teachers were in, the more likely they were to “disagree” with the statement. However, interestingly, the teachers from the third region are the most strongly in agreement with the statement.
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7- “OUR SCHOOLS SHOULD HAVE MORE AUTONOMY”

Considering the responses by the three groups to the statement “our schools should have more autonomy”, figures appeared more or less similar to each other in terms of the percentages of the respondents’ opinions, as of 74% teachers, 63% of directors and almost 60% of supervisors ‘agreed’ with it, either strongly or generally. 36% of supervisors ‘disagreed’ with the statement, whilst 25% of directors and 14% of teachers stated their opinions in the same direction. Figure 2.7 depicts the comparative figures of the responses of the three groups relating to the proposition. Differences between the three groups were not statistically significant.

**Figure 2.7: “Our schools should have more autonomy”**

Within the teachers group there were no significant differences with regard to age groups, sexes, regions, area types, experience, and number of supervisions they had. Similarly, there were no statistically significant differences among supervisors’ views according to their age group, region, and experience.

**Discussion**

It can generally be concluded that a substantial proportion of respondents (at least, more than 60% of each group) “agreed” that schools should have more autonomy. Although there were no statistically significant difference between the groups, teachers agreed stronger then the supervisors and the directors. In addition to that, the findings do seem compatible with the findings of the previous statement. Thus, none the less it does seem apparent from the overall comparison of the findings of the two statements that respondents
generally agree that schools are becoming increasingly centralised and they should be given more autonomy.

8- "SUPERVISORS SHOULD HAVE A CONSIDERABLE SAY IN THE PROMOTION OF TEACHERS"

As might be expected, 75% of supervisors ‘strongly agreed’ with the statement “supervisors should have a considerable say in the promotion of teachers.” In addition a further 13% of them ‘generally agreed’ with the idea. Similarly, all of the directors (50% generally, 50% strongly) ‘agreed’ with the idea. On the other hand, more than half of the teachers (56%) ‘disagreed’ with the statement, although still a good deal of them (42%) ‘agreed’ either generally or strongly. Figure 2.8 presents the comparative figures of the responses of the three groups relating to the proposition.

Figure 2.8: “Supervisors should have a considerable say in the promotion of teachers”

Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests were employed to find out whether significant differences existed among and/or between the views of the respondents. For the group comparisons, it appeared that there were significant differences between the views of teachers and supervisors (z= -7.20, p<.001) and between the views of teachers and directors (z= -3.14, p<.01) with regard to the above statement. Supervisors agreed more strongly than teachers, and similarly directors had more positive attitudes towards the above proposition than the teachers. However, there were no significant differences between the views of supervisors and directors. Table 2.6 looks at the z values of comparisons of groups and their probability levels.
Table 2.8: Z Values of Comparisons of Groups (Mann-Whitney U Tests)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers vs Supervisors</td>
<td>-7.1996***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers vs Directors</td>
<td>-3.1429**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors vs Directors</td>
<td>-1.0840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (*= p < .05; **= p < .01; ***= p < .001)

The same tests were also employed to look at whether significant differences existed within the groups themselves in terms of a number of independent variables. Within neither the teachers nor the supervisors were there such differences.

Discussion

The proposition "supervisors should have a considerable say in the promotion of teachers" did reveal that teachers and supervisors had statistically different attitudes towards it. While supervisors strongly agreed with it, teachers did not report in the same way. Interestingly, all of the directors agreed with it either generally or strongly.

It can be concluded that, given the fact that supervisors have a quite considerable say in the promotion of teachers in existing practice, a substantial proportion of the teachers are not in favour of this practice. However, yet again, directors and supervisors were in accord in their views on this statement.

9- "HAVING AN INNOVATIVE BEHAVIOUR FOR A SUPERVISOR IS ONE OF THE MAIN ASPECTS OF HIS/HER ROLE"

With regard to the statement "having an innovative behaviour for a supervisor is one of the main aspects of his/her role", the vast majority of the three groups, separately, indicated that they 'strongly agree' with it. When the percentages of 'generally agreed' (14% for teachers, 11% for supervisors and 25% for directors) are added the figures become 93% for teachers, 93% for supervisors and 100% for directors. Figure 2.9 presents the comparative figures of the responses of the three groups relating to the proposition. Not surprisingly, differences are not statistically significant.
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Figure 2.9: “Having an innovative behaviour for a supervisor is one of the main aspects of his/her role”

Within the teachers group there were no significant differences with regard to age groups, sexes, regions, area types, experience, and number of supervisions they had.

However, there were significant differences with regard to the above proposition according to age. Supervisors aged 51 or more disagreed more strongly that having an innovative behaviour for a supervisor was one of the main aspects of his/her role than the ones aged between 31-40 and also than the ones aged between 41-50. However, there were no significant differences between the other age group categories. Table 2.9 provides the z values of comparisons by age groups and their probability levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared Age Categories</th>
<th>Z Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30 or less) vs (31-40)</td>
<td>.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 or less) vs (41-50)</td>
<td>.3964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 or less) vs (51 or more)</td>
<td>.9363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31-40) vs (41-50)</td>
<td>.7967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31-40) vs (51 or more)</td>
<td>2.7353**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41-50) vs (51 or more)</td>
<td>2.2379*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (*= p< .05; **= p< .01; ***=p< .001)
With regard to the regions, there appeared significant differences between the attitudes of supervisors from the 1st and the 3rd regions \((z = -2.38, p < .05)\), and also between the supervisors from the 1st and the 5th regions \((z = -2.13, p < .05)\). Supervisors from the 3rd region and from the 5th region agreed more strongly with the above proposition than the ones from the 1st region. However, there appeared no significant differences between the views of supervisors of other regions (Table 2.10).

**Table 2.10: Z Values of Comparisons by Regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared Regions</th>
<th>Z Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 2nd</td>
<td>-1.6824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 3rd</td>
<td>-2.3769*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 4th</td>
<td>-1.3842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 5th</td>
<td>-2.1271*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd vs 3rd</td>
<td>-0.9487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd vs 4th</td>
<td>0.5790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd vs 5th</td>
<td>-0.8367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd vs 4th</td>
<td>1.4577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd vs 5th</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th vs 5th</td>
<td>-1.2910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second group are more positive than the first group; positive values vice-versa. (*= p < .05; **= p < .01; ***= p < .001)

On the other hand, the analysis of the findings did not reveal any significant differences between the views of supervisors within different experience categories regarding the above proposition.

**Discussion**

With regard to the proposition “having an innovative behaviour for a supervisor is one of the main aspects of his/her role”, not surprisingly, all groups reported that they strongly agreed with it. In terms of percentages, this proposition had the highest “strongly agree” reporting among all these items. In other words, there were very few respondents who either generally or strongly “disagreed” with the proposition.
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The findings also suggest that the supervisors from less prosperous regions agreed more strongly with the proposition. It can be concluded that the supervisors working in these regions probably experience that there is much more need to be more innovative in these regions.

10- “SUPERVISORS ARE SHOWING MORE AND MORE INNOVATIVE BEHAVIOUR YEAR BY YEAR”

As Figure 2.10 demonstrates, 58% of teachers responded to the statement “supervisors are showing more and more innovative behaviour year by year” as either generally or strongly ‘disagree’. Interestingly, although 58% of supervisors ‘agreed’ either generally or strongly with the proposition, 40% of them ‘disagreed’ with it. While half of the directors ‘generally agreed’ with the same statement, the other half ‘generally disagreed’ with it. Figure 2.10 presents the comparative figures of the responses by the three groups relating to the proposition.

Figure 2.10: “Supervisors are showing more and more innovative behaviour year by year”

For the group comparisons, it appeared that there were significant differences between the views of teachers and supervisors ($z = -3.56, p<.001$) with regard to the above statement. However, there were no significant differences between the views of teachers and directors and between the views of supervisors and directors. Table 2.6 shows the $z$ values of comparisons of groups and their probability levels.
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Table 2.11: Z Values of Comparisons of Groups (Mann-Whitney U Tests)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers vs Supervisors</td>
<td>-3.5642***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers vs Directors</td>
<td>-1.3508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors vs Directors</td>
<td>-.6787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (*= p< .05; **= p< .01; ***= p< .001)

Within the teachers group there were no significant differences among the views of teachers with regard to age groups, regions, area-types, experience, and number of supervisions they had. On the other hand, there appeared a significant difference between male and female teachers (z=2.05, p< .05) with regard to the proposition. Female teachers 'disagreed more' than their male counterparts that supervisors were showing more and more innovative behaviour year by year.

For the supervisors part, although there were no any significant difference between the supervisors of different age groups, and between the supervisors of different experience categories, there appeared significant differences between the views of the supervisors of the 1st region and the 3rd region (z= 2.03, p<.05), and also between the views of supervisors of the 3rd and the 4th regions (z= -2.21, p<.05) with regard to the proposition. Table 2.12 shows the z values of comparisons by regions and their probability levels.
Table 2.12: Z Values of Comparisons by Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared Regions</th>
<th>Z Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 2nd</td>
<td>.3575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 3rd</td>
<td>2.0274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 4th</td>
<td>-.0430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st vs 5th</td>
<td>1.3872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd vs 3rd</td>
<td>1.9225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd vs 4th</td>
<td>-.5559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd vs 5th</td>
<td>1.1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd vs 4th</td>
<td>-2.2051*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd vs 5th</td>
<td>-1.0271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th vs 5th</td>
<td>1.7323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative values indicate that perceptions of the second groups are more positive than the first groups; positive values vice-versa. (*= p < .05; **= p < .01; ***= p < .001)

Discussion

Not surprisingly, supervisors agreed more strongly than teachers that they themselves were showing more and more innovative behaviour year by year. However, the vast majority of teachers, as the receivers of the supervision, reported that they did not think so. Generally speaking, it can be concluded from the findings that a substantial proportion of all three groups ‘disagreed’ with the proposition. Interestingly, the supervisors from the 3rd region most strongly disagreed compared to their colleagues.

Factor Analysis of the Ten propositions for Teachers Group

To determine possible factors that could result from the inter correlations of the aforementioned ten general educational propositions, principal factor analysis method was utilised. First, a correlation matrix was computed to see if there were significant correlations among these items. The results showed that some of these items had statistically significant correlation (at less than the 0.05 probability level) with some others. Then, through the “oblimin” factor rotation procedure which was used to determine the
correlated (oblique) factors, a pattern matrix was obtained for the ten items. The items and their correlations with three factors which were extracted by these procedures are presented in detail in Table 2.13.

### Table 2.13: Item Loading on Three Factors (Pattern Matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item 8</td>
<td>.53641</td>
<td>-.16276</td>
<td>.22520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 1</td>
<td>.48876</td>
<td>.24113</td>
<td>-.02463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 5</td>
<td>.42570</td>
<td>-.16517</td>
<td>.03906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 6</td>
<td>.20246</td>
<td>.10221</td>
<td>-.19987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 9</td>
<td>-.00884</td>
<td>.64816</td>
<td>.13754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 2</td>
<td>.41530</td>
<td>.42223</td>
<td>.03544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 7</td>
<td>-.06455</td>
<td>.32512</td>
<td>-.08559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 10</td>
<td>.00379</td>
<td>.10566</td>
<td>.61775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 3</td>
<td>.08628</td>
<td>.11212</td>
<td>.56140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 4</td>
<td>-.03794</td>
<td>.14736</td>
<td>-.30266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Var.</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.29895</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.97252</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.49333</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, items 8, 1, 5, and 6 may have a common factor which has a contribution to all of them. If we examine these four items, it can be said that these are the items related to inspection (items 5 and 8), control (items 8 and 1), scrutiny (items 1 and 8), assessment (items 1 and 8), investigation (item 5), and centralisation (item 6).

The factor which represents these four items could relate to the “close control” of teachers, both by their supervisors and the system in which they were working. It can also be suggested that this factor includes some amount of “stress” in it and, therefore, refers to a kind of “strained” relationship rather than a productive one.
However, items 9, 2 and 7 seem to have a common factor which may be related to innovative, relaxed, supportive and effective relationships of teachers with their supervisors and with the system, and therefore related to the development of schools in general as well. Thus, whilst item 9 and item 2 are related to innovative behaviour of supervisors and feedback to teachers, item 7 is related to autonomy of schools.

For the third factor, it can be concluded that it could be related to the professional revitalisation of teachers and their expectations about the relationship with their supervisors and also about the future of the supervision of schools.

However, as was shown in Table 2.13, it should be noted that the first factor could only explain 13 per cent of the variation, and the percentages for factor 2 and factor 3 were 10 and 5 respectively.

Similarly, the same methods were applied to the supervisors to determine possible factors that could be correlated each other with regard to those ten items. But, most probably, due to the insufficient number of cases, it was not possible to extract any factor(s) to draw conclusions.
SECTION THREE

SUPERVISORS' INNOVATIVE BEHAVIOURS AND PRACTICES

This section concerns teachers' and supervisors' responses to the questions on the innovative behaviours and practices of the supervisors. Results are described below for each item, with an overall discussion at the end of the section.

1- "TO ARRANGE MEETINGS WITH COLLEAGUES FROM OTHER SCHOOLS TO DISCUSS AND SHARE NEW IDEAS"

The first question of this section was designed to obtain information on supervisors' exhibition of the behaviour "to arrange meetings with colleagues from other schools". The data for this question indicates that almost two-thirds of the teachers replied "yes" to the question "did you attend any meeting with your colleagues from other schools arranged by your supervisors for the purpose of discussing and sharing new ideas?" For the supervisors part, more than three-quarters of supervisors replied "yes" when asked "did you arrange any meeting(s) among the teachers of different primary schools for the purpose of discussing and sharing of new ideas?" The Figures are shown in Table 3.1a.

The proportions of the teacher and the supervisor groups were compared through chi-square tests regarding the statement. As was shown in Table 3.1a, there was no statistically significant difference between the teacher and the supervisor groups on the above mentioned behaviour.
Table 3.1a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to arrange meetings with colleagues from other schools to discuss and share new ideas”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>No (f)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>No (f)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ² = 1.97 (1df) ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of meetings arranged by supervisors is shown in Table 3.1b. As is seen in the table, 38 per cent of supervisors who organised such meetings stated that they arranged them 2-3 times within the last five years. The second biggest supervisors group (32 per cent) stated that they organised such meetings ten or more times within the last five years. In other words, they roughly organised two meetings in every year. Four supervisors stated that they organised four-six meetings and another four (12 per cent) stated they arranged only one meeting within the last five years. The smallest group of supervisors who stated that they organised seven-nine meetings comprised two supervisors.
Table 3.1b: The distribution of the number of meetings arranged by supervisors for the teachers of different primary schools to discuss and share new ideas by supervisors’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF MEETINGS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 times</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more times</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the teachers part, 37 of them (approximately 32\% of teachers who attended any such meeting) stated that they attended such meetings organised by their supervisors five or more times within the last five years. In other words, they participated in such meetings an average once in every year. The second biggest group of teachers (28\% ) of 32 stated that they participated such meetings twice within the same time period. The third group of teachers included 26 teachers (22\%). They stated that they participated in such meetings only one time within the last five years. The remaining two groups included 11 (10\%) and 10 teachers (9\%). These groups stated that they attended such meetings three and four times respectively. The figures are presented in Table 3.1c.
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Table 3.1c: The distribution of the number of meetings arranged by supervisors and attended by teachers with colleagues to discuss and share new ideas by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENDANCE TO MEETINGS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 time</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more times</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2- "TO PAIR TEACHERS UP WITH A COLLEAGUE TO DISCUSS TEACHING PERFORMANCES"

The second question of the section sought information on the activity of supervisors in pairing teachers with a colleague for the purpose of discussing teaching performances. The data for this question indicates that the vast majority of the teachers replied "no" to the question "did any of your supervisor(s) request you to pair up with one of your colleagues to observe and then discuss together your teaching performances in the classroom?" On the other hand, more than three-quarters of the supervisors reported that they did not pair up teachers for this purpose. These figures are comparatively presented in Table 3.2a.
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Table 3.2a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors' exhibition of the behaviour of “to pair up with a colleague to discuss teaching performances”

As is seen in Table 3.2a, the chi-square test found a statistically significant difference at the 0.001 level between the group responses. This may suggest inconsistency between the experiences of the teachers and supervisors with regard to this supervisory activity.

However, it may suggest that supervisors who used this technique, did so with only a minority of their teachers. Indeed, when the supervisors who replied ‘yes’ to the above question were asked “for about how many of these teachers whom you supervised have you done this?” whilst 27 per cent of supervisors reported that they paired ‘most of the teachers’ up whom they supervised, 36 per cent of the supervisors declared that they paired ‘fewer than a quarter of the teachers’ for the same purpose. Table 3.2b shows the details.
Table 3.2b: The proportion of teachers who were paired up by supervisors to observe and discuss teaching performances (according to supervisors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, when the teachers who replied ‘yes’ to the first part of the question were asked “how many of your supervisors requested this?” , 60 per cent of them (however, only six teachers) stated that only one of their supervisors requested this. Interestingly, although only one of these teachers stated that two of his/her supervisors did so, 30 per cent (three teachers) declared that five or more of their supervisors paired the teachers up. Table 3.2c provides the relevant figures in detail.

Table 3.2c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who paired up teachers with one of his/her colleagues by teachers’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3- “TO ASK ABOUT IN-SERVICE TRAINING NEEDS OF TEACHERS”

The third question of this section was designed to collect information on supervisors' exhibition of the behaviour of “to ask about in-service training needs of teachers”. The findings gathered for this question indicated that whilst 87 per cent of the teachers declared that their in-service training needs were not asked about by their supervisors, 93 per cent of the supervisors reported that they did ask about the in-service training needs of teachers whom they supervised. The comparative figures are shown in Table 3.3a in detail.

Table 3.3a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors' exhibition of the behaviour of “to ask in-service training needs of teachers”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (f)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (f)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (f)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (f)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 109.29 (1df) p < 0.001

The chi-square test found a statistically significant difference at the 0.001 level between the group responses. In other words, the findings suggested that there was substantial discrepancy between the views of the teachers and supervisors with regard to the behaviour of supervisors in “asking about in-service training needs of teachers”.
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Those supervisors who had replied 'yes' were requested to state the proportion of teachers who they asked about their in-service training needs. 45 per cent of them stated 'most of the teachers'. Furthermore, according to the answers of 12 per cent of those supervisors all of the teachers whom they supervised were asked about their in-service training needs. Detailed figures are presented in Table 3.3b.

Table 3.3b: The proportion of teachers who were asked about their In-service training needs (according to supervisors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the teachers part, when they were requested to state the number of supervisors who asked about their in-service training needs, the biggest teachers group, 46 per cent of them (eleven in number) reported that "only one of their supervisors" did so. 17 per cent (only four in number) stated that five or more of their supervisors asked about their training needs. Figures are presented in Table 3.3c in detail.


Table 3.3c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who asked teachers' in-service training needs by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the practises of the teachers and the supervisors, the directors were requested to state if any of their primary school supervisors brought any recommendation about in-service training needs of teachers. Interestingly, all of the eight directors of education declared that their supervisors bring recommendations about in-service training needs of teachers. Moreover, half of the directors reported that 'most of the supervisors' did such recommendations. However, while only one director stated that 'only one or two of the supervisors' did so, again one director declared that fewer than a quarter of his/her supervisors brought in-service training recommendations (see Table 4.1 in Appendix II for the details).

4. "TO REQUEST SELF-EVALUATION FROM TEACHERS"

The fourth question of this section elicited information on supervisors' exhibition of the behaviour "to request self evaluation from teachers". The findings gathered for this question indicated that while 93 per cent of the teachers declared that their supervisors did not request them to evaluate themselves orally, 80 per cent of the supervisors reported that they did request the teachers whom they supervised to evaluate themselves orally. The comparative figures are summarised in Table 3.4a in detail.
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Table 3.4a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to request self-evaluation from teachers”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (f)</th>
<th>No (f)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 112.88 \ (1\ df) \ p < 0.001
\]

As is shown in Table 3.4a, there is a statistically significant difference at the 0.001 probability level between the responses of the teacher and the supervisor groups.

When the supervisors were asked to state the proportion of teachers whom they requested to evaluate themselves orally, while a quarter of supervisors reported that ‘most of the teachers’ were requested, 31 per cent each reported that ‘nearly half of teachers’ and ‘fewer than a quarter of them’ (22 supervisors in total) were so requested. Table 3.4b shows the numbers and the proportions.
Table 3.4b: The proportion of teachers who were requested to evaluate themselves orally by their supervisors (according to supervisors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, when teachers were asked to state the number of supervisors who requested teachers to evaluate themselves, the vast majority of those teachers who had had this experience (83 per cent, ten in number) reported that only 'only one of their supervisors' did so. Moreover, the findings also revealed that there was no any single teacher who reported that more than four of his/her supervisors made the same request within the last five years. Detailed figures are in Table 3.4c.

Table 3.4c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who requested teachers to evaluate themselves orally by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, when teachers were asked to report the number of such requests by their supervisors, the vast majority of teachers who had been asked to do so at all declared that this
had happened only once within the last five years. Relevant figures are presented in Table 3.4d.

Table 3.4d: The distribution of the number of oral evaluation requests by supervisors by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF REQUESTS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5- "TO GIVE AN EXAMPLE LECTURE"

The fifth question of this section was designed to get information on supervisors' exhibition of the behaviour "to give an example lecture". The findings yielded for this question showed that whilst 82 per cent of the supervisors (37 in number) declared that they did give an example lecture to show how effectively it could be done, almost the same percent of teachers (145 in number) reported that none of their supervisors did so within the last five years. The comparative figures are shown in Table 3.5a in detail. Again, this contrast is highly statistically significant.
Table 3.5a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to give an example lecture”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>No (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 70.22 \) (1 df) \( p < 0.001 \)

When supervisors were asked ‘for about how many of these teachers whom you supervised did you give an example lecture?’ the largest group, 44 per cent of them, reported that they had done this for ‘fewer than a quarter of them’. The percentage of supervisors who stated ‘nearly half of teachers’ was 17, and the same percentage replied ‘most of the teachers’. Relevant figures are shown in Table 3.5b.
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Table 3.5b: The proportion of teachers who were given an example lecture by their supervisors (according to supervisors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, when the teachers were asked to state the number of their supervisors who gave example lecture(s), the majority of those who had received any (61 per cent and 19 in number) reported that only one of their supervisors gave an example lecture within the last five years. Figures are presented in Table 3.5c.

Table 3.5c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who gave example lectures by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6- "TO ASK IDEAS AND OPINIONS OF TEACHERS ABOUT EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS"

When the question “did any of your supervisor(s) ask your ideas and opinions about the implementation process of any specific innovation?” was addressed to the teachers 92 per cent of them replied ‘no’. On the other hand, 87 per cent of the supervisors stated that they did ask teachers ideas and opinions on the same topic. The comparison of the groups indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Table 3.6a shows the details.

Table 3.6a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to ask ideas and opinions of teachers about any educational innovations”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (f)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (f)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 121.13 \text{ (1df) } p < 0.001 \]

When those supervisors who had replied positively to the above question were asked about the proportion of teachers whose ideas and opinions were sought, 54 per cent of them reported that they inquired about such ideas and opinions from fewer than a quarter of the teachers. In addition to this, while ten per cent of them reported the proportion ‘only one or two of them’, five per cent replied that ‘all of them’ were asked. Table 3.6b shows the proportions and the percentages.
Table 3.6b: The proportion of teachers whose ideas and opinions about the implementation process of any specific innovation are asked by their supervisors (according to supervisors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of those teachers who had been asked at all (8 out of 14 in number) stated that their opinions were asked by only two of their supervisors within the last five years. What is more, 29 per cent of these teachers were asked by only one of their supervisors. Table 3.6c shows the details.

Table 3.6c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who asked teachers’ ideas and opinions about the implementation process of any specific innovation by teachers’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above question, teachers were also asked about the number of cases in which they had a chance in real practice to mention their ideas and opinions. While 36 per
cent of these teachers (however, only five teachers in total) said only once, exactly the same proportion of them had the same sort of chance twice within the last five years. Table 3.6d presents the number of cases in more detail.

Table 3.6d: The number of cases that teachers had a chance to mention their ideas and opinions about any specific innovation (according to teachers’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF CASES</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more times</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the practises of the teachers and the supervisors, the provincial directors of education were also requested to state if their supervisors submitted information in their supervision reports about the implementation of any specific educational innovation in primary schools. While five of the eight directors reported that they were not given information, the remained three stated that they were submitted reports that contained such information (see Table 4.2 in Appendix II for the details). However, all of the three information submitted directors declared that fewer than a quarter of their supervisors did submit such reports. Similarly, while two of these three directors stated that they faced with such kinds of information in the supervision reports of the 1989-90 education year, one director claimed that he/she faced with such information between five and ten times in the same term.

7- "TO ORGANISE MEETINGS WITH TEACHERS ABOUT THE TEACHING METHODS APPLICABLE TO REQUIRING SPECIAL ATTENTION PUPILS"

When the teachers and the supervisors were asked to state their practices with regard to the behaviour of the supervisors “to organise meetings with teachers about the teaching
methods which could be applied to any individual pupil or group of pupils whose learning capacities and speeds were significantly lower or higher than their schoolmates", whilst 88 per cent of supervisors indicated that they organised such meetings, only 18 per cent of teachers stated so. In other words, 82 per cent of the teachers reported that they had not experienced such meetings organised by their supervisors. The numbers and percentages of the teachers and the supervisors are provided in Table 3.7a.

**Table 3.7a**: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to organise meetings with teachers about the teaching methods applicable to special attention required pupils”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (f)</th>
<th>No (f)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 61.93 \text{ (1df) } p < 0.001 \]

The chi-square test showed that there was inconsistency between the responses of the teachers and supervisors with regard to this question.

When the supervisors were asked about the proportion of teachers who were involved in such meetings organised by them, 37 per cent of those who claimed to organise such meetings supervisors (13 of the supervisors) declared that most of the teachers were involved in this kind of meeting. Not surprisingly, none of the supervisors chose the ‘only one or two teachers’ item of the alternatives for the proportion of teachers. The numbers and proportions are summarised in Table 3.7b.
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Table 3.7b: The proportion of teachers who were involved in meetings related to teaching methods applicable to least or most able pupils (according to supervisors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the teachers were asked about the number of their supervisors who organised such meetings, more than three-quarters of them (23 teachers in total) reported that either one or two of their supervisors did so. Only three of the teachers (ten per cent) stated that five or more of their supervisors organised such meetings within the last five years. Table 3.7c provides the relevant figures.

Table 3.7c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who organised meetings among teachers about the teaching methods applicable to least or most able students by teachers’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above mentioned practices of the teachers and the supervisors, the directors were requested to state if their primary school supervisors recommended any
remedial coaching for slow learning pupils. Five of the eight directors reported that their supervisors did so. However, four of these five directors declared that ‘only one or two of them’ did this. On the other hand remaining three directors claimed that no one of their supervisors recommended any such thing (see Table 4.3 in Appendix II for the details).

8- “TO ATTEND WORKSHOP SESSIONS WITH TEACHERS ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ANY EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION”

“Did any of your supervisors attend any workshop sessions with you and your colleagues about the implementation of any innovation?” was the question asked of the teachers. The vast majority of them (91 per cent) replied ‘no’. On the other hand, 58 per cent of the supervisors reported that they attended such workshop sessions. This, difference is statistically significant at the 0.001 probability level. The following table provides the relevant figures.

Table 3.8a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to attend workshop sessions with teachers about the implementation of any educational innovation”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (f)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (f)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 29.27 \text{ (1df) } p < 0.001 \]
Nearly half of supervisors who claimed to organise such sessions stated that they did attend these sessions with 'fewer than a quarter of the teachers'. Furthermore, while 42 per cent of them (eight in number) divided into two groups, half to state 'most of the teachers' and the other half 'nearly half of the teachers', only one supervisor declared that he/she attended such workshop sessions with all of the teachers he/she supervised. The figures are provided in Table 3.8b.

Table 3.8b: The proportion of teachers who were involved in any workshop session(s) about the implementation of an innovation (according to supervisors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the teachers were asked about the number of supervisors who attended such sessions, the largest group, 44 per cent of them (seven in number) claimed that only one of their supervisors attended these sessions. According to the responses of 31 per cent of the teachers only two of their supervisors attended such sessions, while 19 per cent declared that three of their supervisors did so. Only one teacher stated that five or more of his/her supervisors attended these sessions within the last five years. The detailed figures are shown in the following table.
Table 3.8c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who attended workshop sessions with the teachers by teachers’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above question, teachers were also requested to state the number of these workshop sessions they experienced within the last five years. Half (eight in number) declared that they experienced these sessions only once. Only one teacher claimed that he/she had done so five or more times within the last five years. Table 3.8d shows these figures.

Table 3.8d: The number of workshop sessions about the implementation of any educational innovation attended by supervisors (according to teachers’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF WORKSHOP SESSIONS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. “TO BRING LEAFLETS OR ANY PRINTED RESOURCES RELATED TO TEACHING LEARNING ACTIVITIES IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS”

The questions designed to collect information about the above mentioned behaviours of supervisors revealed that although 60 per cent of supervisors claimed that they did this, 87 per cent of teachers reported that they did not see their supervisors bringing newly published documents related to teaching and learning activities in primary schools. When the teacher and the supervisor groups were compared according to their responses to the above question, the comparison suggested that there was a significant difference at the 0.001 probability level between the teacher and the supervisor groups. The comparative figures are presented in Table 3.9a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (f)</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (f)</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 45.42 \ (1 \text{df}) \ p < 0.001 \]

The inconsistency between the groups continued on the findings about the proportion of teachers who were given, and about the number of supervisors who brought, those newly published documents. While more than 80 per cent of supervisors who said they had provided such documents (60 per cent of all teachers) claimed that at least more than “fewer
than a quarter of teachers" were given those documents, all of the teachers who said they had received such documents (who were only 13 per cent of all) reported that, at most, only two of their supervisors provided documents. So, it can generally be concluded that there is inconsistency here between the groups as well. While the proportion of teachers given such documents are presented in Table 3.9a, the number of providers of these documents are shown in Table 3.9c.

Table 3.9b: The proportion of teachers who were given newly published documents related to teaching learning activities (according to supervisors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who brought newly published documents related to teaching learning activities in primary schools by teachers’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In addition to the practices of the teachers and the supervisors, the directors were requested to state if they were requested by any of their supervisor(s) for any help in providing newly published document(s) related to teaching and learning activities in primary schools. Interestingly, seven of the eight directors of education declared that their supervisors did request such kind of documents. Although three of these seven supervisors declared that 'nearly half of the supervisors' did so, two of the directors claimed that 'only one or two of the supervisors requested such documents (see Table 4.4 in Appendix II for the details). In addition to this, directors were also asked to state how many times approximately they were requested in one academic year. While three of them reported that it was less than five times, the same number of directors claimed that the number was between five and ten. However, one director reported that his/her supervisors requested these kind of documents between 21-30 times in one academic year (see Table 4.5 in Appendix II for the details).

10- ‘TO OFFER PROPOSALS FOR THE IN-SERVICE TRAINING NEEDS OF TEACHERS’

The offers made by supervisors for the in-service training of teachers were examined through the tenth questions of the teacher’s and supervisor’s questionnaires. Thus, while supervisors were asked if they offered any kind of proposals for in-service training of teachers, the teachers were requested to state whether any of their supervisors made such an offer to them. As presented in Table 3.10a, the findings revealed that although the vast majority of the supervisors (89 per cent) claimed that they did make such offers, almost the same per cent of teachers claimed that their supervisors did not make any kind of in-service training proposals.
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Table 3.10a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to offer proposals for in-service training needs of teachers”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (f)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (f)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 97.46$ (1 df) $p < 0.001$

Again, the findings suggested a statistically significant inconsistency between the responses of the teachers and supervisors. The relevant figures are summarised in the above table.

When supervisors who claimed to have made such offers were requested to state the proportion of teachers to whom they made them, while 44 per cent of them claimed that they did this to “fewer than a quarter of teachers”, a substantial number (31 per cent) reported that they did this for more than half of teachers (i.e. ‘most of them’ or ‘all of them’). The more detailed figures are in Table 3.10b.
Table 3.10b: The proportion of teachers who were offered proposal(s) for their in-service training needs by their supervisors (according to supervisors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, one half of the relevant teachers (twelve in number) reported that only one of his/her supervisors made such an offer. Only 17 per cent of these teachers declared that more than three of their supervisors did so (table 3.10c).

Table 3.10c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who offered proposals to teachers for their in-service training needs by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the above questions, teachers were also requested to state their opinions about the in-service training proposals which came from their supervisors. The evaluation of the proposals by the teachers (24 in total) revealed that 69 per cent of them (16 in number) found the proposals either generally or definitely helpful. However, while 26 per cent of the teachers reported that they found the proposals of 'very little help', there was not a single teacher who found the proposals of 'no help at all'.

11. “TO HAVE PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCES”

The eleventh and the following two questions were designed to ask information about the general plan and program of each supervision visit paid by the primary school supervisors. In this first of the three, the responses of both the teacher and the supervisor groups were collected to show whether supervisors did conduct pre-observation conferences with the teachers before the actual observation of them in their classrooms. As was the case for most of the previous questions mentioned so far, the teacher and the supervisor groups revealed conflicting responses yet again. Thus, although 83 per cent of the supervisors claimed that they did pre-observation conferences with the teachers whom they were going to observe in their classrooms, the vast majority of the teachers (89 per cent) reported just the opposite by responding ‘no’ to the question “did any of your supervisor(s) have a pre-observation conference about the observation(s) which you were going to face in your classroom?”. The figures are shown in Table 3.11a.
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Table 3.11a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to have pre-observation conferences”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 95.12 \ (1\text{df}) \ p < 0.001$

According to the responses given by the supervisors, 38 per cent of them (14 in number) held pre-observation conferences with fewer than a quarter of teachers. Similarly, while 27 per cent of these supervisors claimed that they did so with most of the teachers, 11 per cent (four supervisor) claimed that they did it with all of the teachers whom they were going to observe in their classrooms. Table 3.11b shows the details.
Table 3.11b: The proportion of teachers whose supervisors did pre-observation conferences before the classroom observation with them (according to supervisors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, nearly half of the teachers who had pre-observation conferences (nine in number) reported that only one of his/her supervisors held such conferences. Only two teachers claimed that 'five or more of their supervisors' arranged such conferences within the last five years (table 3. 11c).

Table 3.11c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who did pre-observation conferences before the classroom observations by teachers’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers and supervisors were also asked to state the approximate time devoted by the supervisors to those pre-observation conferences. Interestingly, almost the same
proportions (70 per cent) of each group reported that these conferences lasted approximately between 5-15 minutes. Another striking finding was that while only 11 per cent of teachers reported that these conferences lasted less than 5 minutes, the percentage of the supervisors who stated the same amount of time was 20. However, only one teacher and one supervisor reported that their conferences lasted between 31-45 minutes. It is noteworthy here that there was no single teacher or supervisor saying that his/her pre-observation conference lasted more than 45 minutes (table 3.1d).

Table 3.1d: Approximate time spent for each one of the pre-observation conferences done by supervisors (according to teachers and supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME SPENT (Approx.)</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS (f)</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS (%)</th>
<th>TEACHERS (f)</th>
<th>TEACHERS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 5 minutes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15 minutes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30 minutes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 45 min.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the evaluations made by the teachers who had pre-observation conferences were examined, three-quarters of these teachers stated that they found these conferences either generally or definitely helpful. However, four of them (20 per cent) declared that they found the conferences of 'very little help'. It should also be noted that no teacher found them 'no help at all'.

12. “TO HAVE POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCES”

As opposed to the previous one this question was designed to collect information about the post-observation conference practices of the supervisors. The findings for this question were striking. Thus, literally all of the supervisors stated that they held post-observation conferences with the teachers after the classroom observation of them. It should be noted that this is the first question on which there was only unanimity. On the other hand, as can be seen in Table 3.12a, even more interestingly, although 61 per cent of the teachers
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responded in the way that their supervisors did, there were still quite a substantial percentage of teachers (39 per cent) who claimed that their supervisors ‘did not’ hold any observation after their classroom observations. The difference between the responses of the two groups was still statistically significant at the 0.001 probability level.

Table 3.12a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to have post-observation conferences”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (f)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (f)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (f)</th>
<th>No (f)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 24.93 \ (1 \text{df}) \ p < 0.001 \]

When supervisors were asked about the proportion of teachers with whom they held post-observation conferences, the largest group (36 per cent) claimed that they held it with ‘most of the teachers’. The second largest group (27 per cent) reported that all of the teachers they supervised had post-observation conferences after their classroom observations. Table 3.12b shows the details.
Table 3.12b: The proportion of teachers whose supervisors did post-observation conferences after the classroom observation with them (according to supervisors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, 36 per cent of the teachers stated that only one of their supervisors held such kind of conferences within the last five years. However, while 26 per cent of them stated the number of supervisor as two, 22 per cent claimed that five or more of their supervisors did so. Table 3.12c shows the figures.

Table 3.12c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who did post-observation conferences after the classroom observations by teachers’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the responses of the teachers and the supervisors about the time spent for each one of the post-observation conferences were examined, it appeared that the biggest groups (61 per cent of the supervisors and 51 per cent of the teachers) claimed that these conferences
lasted between 5-15 minutes. Similar to the previously mentioned time spent for the pre-observation conferences, it also appeared from the responses of the two groups that although only 2 per cent of the supervisors stated that the conferences lasted less than 5 minutes, 44 per cent of the teachers reported the same amount of time. Table 3.12d gives details.

Table 3.12d: Approximate time spent for each one of the post-observation conferences done by supervisors (according to teachers and supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME SPENT (Approx.)</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 5 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15 minutes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30 minutes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45 minutes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 45 min.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the evaluations made by the teachers who had post-observation conferences were examined, 65 per cent of these teachers stated that they found these conferences either generally or definitely helpful. However, one-third of them (35 in number) declared that they found the conferences either of 'very little help' or 'no help at all'.

13. "TO HAVE BOTH PRE AND POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCES"

As the last question of the series, this third question asked the teachers and the supervisors about the practice of doing both pre and post observation conferences of primary school supervisors. The findings revealed that although 81 per cent of the supervisors claimed that they performed both of the conferences, 84 per cent of the teachers stated contradictory responses, replying “no” the question 'did any of your supervisor(s) do both pre-observation and post-observation conferences before and after your classroom observations'. This is a significant difference at the 0.001 probability level between the teacher and the supervisor groups. Table 3.13a compares the relevant figures.
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Table 3.13a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to have both pre and post-observation conferences”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Yes (f)</th>
<th>No (f)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 70.41 \ (1 \text{df}) \ p < 0.001$

According to the responses given by the supervisors, 34 per cent of them (12 in number) held both pre and post observation conferences with fewer than a quarter of teachers. Similarly, while 29 per cent of supervisors who held both conferences claimed that they held it with most of the teachers, 6 per cent (two supervisors) claimed that they did it with all of the teachers whom they supervised. Table 3.13b shows the details.
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Table 3.13b: The proportion of teachers whose supervisors did both pre and post-observation conferences with them by supervisors' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, 61 per cent of teachers claimed that only one of their supervisors held both of the conferences. In addition to this, while 14 per cent stated the number of supervisors as 'two', 11 per cent of the teachers (three in number) reported that 5 or more of their supervisors behaved so within the last five years. The following table has the figures in detail.

Table 3.13c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who did both pre and post-observation conferences with the teachers by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the supervisors indicated that the total time spent on the pre and post conferences was between 15 and 30 minutes. However, more than a quarter of them
reported that the time was less than 15 minutes for both conferences. Only one supervisor claimed that the time was between 46-60 minutes. It should be noted that there was not any single supervisor who stated more than 60 minutes for the total time spent for both conferences. On the other hand, the vast majority of the teachers (63 per cent) claimed that their supervisors spent less than 15 minutes for the conferences. However, 26 per cent of them declared that the time spent for the conferences was between 15-30 minutes. Interestingly, although there was not any supervisor who stated so, one of the teachers claimed that his/her supervisor spent more than 60 minutes for the conferences. The figures are presented in Table 3.13d comparatively.

Table 3.13d: Approximate time spent for both pre and post-observation conferences done by supervisors (according to teachers and supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME SPENT (Approx.)</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 15 minutes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 minutes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45 minutes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 60 min.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the evaluations made by the teachers who had both pre and post-observation conferences were examined, two-thirds of these teachers (18 in number) stated that they found these conferences either generally or definitely helpful. On the other hand nearly one third of them (eight in number) declared that they found the conferences to be either 'very little help' or 'no help at all'.

14. "TO BRING LEAFLETS OR ANY PRINTED RESOURCES ABOUT SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTED INNOVATIONS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS"

The fourteenth questions of both the teacher’s and the supervisor’s questionnaires were designed to gather information about the practices of the supervisors on bringing leaflets or any printed resources about successfully implemented innovations in primary schools. The
findings revealed that, although more than three-quarters of the supervisors declared that they brought such resources, 91 per cent of the teachers claimed that their supervisors did not bring documents of this kind. So, when the teacher and the supervisor groups were compared according to their responses about their behaviour of the supervisors, as is shown in Table 3.14a, there was a significant difference at the 0.001 probability level between the teacher and the supervisor groups.

**Table 3.14a**: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors' exhibition of the behaviour of “to bring leaflets or any printed resources about successfully implemented innovations in primary schools”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Yes (f)</th>
<th>No (f)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 96.35 \text{ (1 df)} \ p < 0.001 \]

When supervisors were asked the question ‘to how many teachers have you brought such materials?’, the largest group, 43 per cent of them reported that ‘fewer than a quarter of the teachers’ were brought such materials. The percentage of supervisors who stated that ‘nearly half of teachers’ were brought them was 29. Only one supervisor claimed that he/she brought such materials to all of the teachers he/she supervised. Table 3.14b provides the figures in detail.
Table 3.14b: The proportion of teachers who were informed by their supervisors about the outcome of successfully implemented innovations (according to supervisors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, 69 per cent of the teachers who had received material (11 in number) reported that only one of their supervisors brought such materials. Only one teacher claimed that five or more of his/her supervisors brought him/her such materials within the last five years. Table 3.14c shows the detailed figures.

Table 3.14c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who informed teachers about the outcomes of successfully implemented educational innovations by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above questions, the teachers and the supervisors were asked to state the number of educational innovations for which supervisors informed teachers about their outcomes. While 69 per cent of the teachers stated that their supervisors brought
leaflets/documents which contained information about only one innovation, only 11 per cent of the supervisors gave the same response. Moreover, more than half of the supervisors stated that they had given information about two innovations, whereas the percentage of the teachers who responded so was only 25. What is more, while 12 per cent of those supervisors stated that these leaflets included information about four or more innovations, no teacher reported such numbers. Table 3.14d shows the relevant figures in detail.

Table 3.14d: The number of educational innovations for which supervisors informed teachers about their outcomes (according to teachers and supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF INNOVATIONS</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 innovation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 innovations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 innovations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 innovations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more innov.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the practices of the teachers and the supervisors, the provincial directors of education were also requested to state if they were requested by any of their supervisor(s) for any help in providing newly published document(s) related to the implementation of educational innovations in primary schools. While four of the eight directors claimed that their supervisors did so, the same number of directors stated that they were not requested for the mentioned documents. Although three of the requested directors claimed that only one or two of their supervisors did so, most of the supervisors of only one director requested such kind of materials. In addition to this, directors were also asked to state how many times approximately they were requested in one academic year. While three of them reported that it was less than five times, only one of the directors claimed that the number was between five and ten.
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15- “TO PROVIDE ANY OUTSIDE HELP AND/OR AID FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF SCHOOL LIBRARIES”

School libraries were the topic of the 15th question of both the teacher’s and the supervisor’s questionnaires. The question which was put to the teachers was “did any of your supervisor(s) get any aid of any person(s) or agency for the improvement of the school library?” Similarly, the supervisors’ question read “have you ever recommended or helped teachers and/or school to get any aid or help of any person(s) or agency for the improvement of school libraries?”. Findings revealed that while 82 per cent of the supervisors responded “yes” to the above question, 91 per cent of the teachers replied “no” to their question, a difference which is significant at the 0.001 level.

Table 3.15a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to provide any outside help and/or aid for the improvement of school libraries”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (f)</th>
<th>No (f)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 106.32 \text{ (1df) } p < 0.001$

When the supervisors were asked to state the proportion of schools for which they had provided help for their libraries, 32 per cent of these supervisors claimed that they helped ‘fewer than a quarter of the schools’. On the other hand, nearly the same percentage of the supervisors (30 per cent) reported that the proportion of those schools was “most of them”. It is noteworthy that three of the supervisors claimed that they provided help for the
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improvement of the libraries of all the schools they supervised. Table 3.15b shows the details.

Table 3.15b: The proportion of schools which were helped by supervisors for the improvement of their libraries (according to supervisors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF SCHOOLS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, when the teachers were asked about the proportion of their supervisors who provided aid for the school libraries, while 44 per cent of them declared that only one of their supervisors provided aid, only two teachers (13 per cent) claimed that five or more of their supervisors provided help for the school libraries within the last five years. Table 3.15c shows the details.

Table 3.15c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who got some kind of aid for the improvement of the school libraries by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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When the supervisors were asked to report the proportion of school libraries for which some kind of aid had resulted from their efforts, half of supervisors who had provided help (18 in number) claimed that only one or two of the school libraries got such aid. Another large group of the supervisors (39 per cent) reported that fewer than a quarter of the school libraries had benefited. The figures are presented in Table 3.15d.

Table 3.15d: The proportion of the number of school libraries which had some kind of aids resulting from supervisors' efforts (according to supervisors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF SCHOOL LIBRARIES</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16- "TO ATTEMPT TO ESTABLISH COMMUNICATION CHANNELS BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITIES"

When the supervisors were addressed the question “have you ever made an attempt to have any kind of communication channels (e.g. newspapers, magazines, documents, local radio stations etc.) between schools and their local communities?”, the vast majority of them responded positively. But, on the other hand, when the teachers were asked if any one of their supervisor(s) had made such an attempt, 90 per cent of them responded ‘no’ (a difference significant at the 0.001 level).
Table 3.16a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to attempt to establish communication channels between schools and their local communities”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (f)</th>
<th>No (f)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 97.63 (1df) p < 0.001

Similarly, it can be seen from the responses of the two groups that the same inconsistency has maintained when 43 per cent of the supervisors claimed that they had made such an attempt more than ten times within the last five years (table 3.16b), while 78 per cent (14 in number) of the teachers acknowledging some activity claimed that they witnessed only one or two of their supervisors making such an attempt within the same period of time.
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Table 3.16b: The distribution of the number of attempts made by supervisors for the schools to have communication channels with their local communities by supervisors' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF ATTEMPTS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 times</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 times</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 times</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more times</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, only one teacher claimed that five or more of his/her supervisors made such an attempt within the same period. The figures are presented in Table 3.16c in more detail.

Table 3.16c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who made an attempt to have some kind of communication channels between schools and their local communities by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers were also asked to state their opinions about the attempts which came from their supervisors to help schools to communicate with their local community of the 18 teachers to whom this was relevant. 67 per cent found the proposals either generally or definitely helpful. However, while 17 per cent of the teachers reported that they found the
proposals of 'very little help', there was only one teacher who found the proposals of 'no help at all'.

17- “TO HELP TO ORGANISE MEETINGS BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO ENABLE TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS TO EXPLAIN THE AIMS OF THE SCHOOL TO THE PARENTS”

When the teachers were requested asked whether they witnessed their supervisors organising meetings with parents and/or the local community to enable teachers and school administrators to explain the aims of the school to them, 92 per cent of them declared that their supervisors did not organise such kind of meetings. On the other hand, 59 per cent of the supervisors claimed that they did organise such meetings. The comparative figures are presented in Table 3.17a.

Table 3.17a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to help to organise meetings between schools and their local communities to enable teachers and administrators to explain the aims of the school to the parents”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>No (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 61.87 \ (1 \text{df}) \ p < 0.001$

Table 3.17b and 3.17c reveal similar contradictions in the teachers’ and supervisors’ view of how widespread was this practice.
Table 3.17b: The proportion of schools which were involved in meetings to explain the aims of the school to the parents (according to supervisors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF SCHOOLS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.17c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who organised meetings with parents and/or local communities to enable teachers and school administrators to explain the aims of the school to them by teachers’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers were also asked to state the number of such meetings each of them personally experienced. Interestingly, and compatible with the findings of the previous question, 29 per cent of those teachers who had witnessed meetings stated that each of them personally experienced five or more meetings within the last five years. However, 43 per cent of these teachers declared that they experienced only one or two meetings within the same period of time. Table 3.17d presents the details.
Table 3.17d: The number of meetings organised by supervisors to enable schools to explain their aims to the parents and the local community experienced by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF MEETINGS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 meeting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18- "TO HELP TO ARRANGE ANY SOCIO-CULTURAL EVENTS PERFORMED OR PARTICIPATED IN BY PUPILS"

When the question 'have you ever helped to arrange any socio-cultural events (e.g. musicals, dances, drama activities, etc.) performed or participated in by pupils?' was asked of the supervisors, 84 per cent of them replied 'yes'. But, on the other hand, 78 per cent of the teachers claimed that their supervisors did not arrange (or help to arrange) these kinds of events. The figures are shown in Table 3.18a.
Table 3.18a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to help to arrange any socio-cultural events performed or participated by pupils”

\[ \chi^2 = 62.74 \text{ (1df) } p < 0.001 \]

Table 3.18b and 3.18c show the distribution of responses to the questions on the number of socio-cultural events arranged by supervisors and, the number of supervisors who arranged those kind of activities.

Table 3.18b: The number of socio-cultural events for pupils arranged by supervisors (according to supervisors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF OCCASIONS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 times</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 times</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more times</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.18c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who arranged socio-cultural activities performed by school children by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19- "TO HELP TO ORGANISE MEETINGS AMONG TEACHERS, LOCAL ADMINISTRATORS AND PARENTS ABOUT THE FUTURE LIFE OF PUPILS"

With regard to the above behaviour of the supervisors, the vast majority of the teachers (92 per cent) reported that their supervisors did not exhibit it. On the other hand, while more than half of the supervisors claimed that they organised such kinds of meetings, the others (48 per cent) did not make such claim, stating that they did not organise meetings among teachers, local administrators and parents about the future life of pupils. The more detailed figures are shown in Table 3.19a.
Table 3.19a: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors' exhibition of the behaviour of "to help to organise meetings among teachers, local administrators, and parents about the future life of pupils".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes (f)</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No (f)</strong></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (f)</strong></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 49.03 \ (1 \text{df}) \ p < 0.001 \]

The responses of the supervisors revealed that although one-quarter of them reported that these meetings took place 15 or more times within the last five years, 38 per cent of the supervisors who organised such meetings claimed that these meetings took place only once or twice within the same period of time. More information is presented in Table 3.19b.
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Table 3.19b: The distribution of the number of meetings about the future life of pupils organised by supervisors by supervisors’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF MEETINGS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 times</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more times</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 24 100

When the question “how many of your supervisors have organised such meetings?” was addressed to the teachers, while 62 per cent of them reported that only one or two of their supervisors arranged such meetings, still a considerable proportion of teachers (23 per cent) claimed that five or more of their supervisors did so. The following table presents the details.

Table 3.19c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who organised meetings among teachers, parents and local administrators about the future life of the pupils by teachers’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 14 100
"TO INVITE OR RECOMMEND TEACHERS TO INVITE PERIPATETIC
TEACHERS TO THEIR CLASSROOMS"

The responses of the supervisors and teachers with regard to the above behaviour of the supervisors revealed yet another intriguing contradiction. For instance, although 93 per cent of the supervisors claimed that they did exhibit the above behaviour, nearly the same proportion of the teachers (89 per cent) stated that their supervisors did not exhibit that behaviour. The comparative figures can be seen in the following table.

**Table 3.20a**: Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors' exhibition of the behaviour of “to invite or recommend teachers to invite peripatetic teachers to their classrooms”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Yes (f)</th>
<th>No (f)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 123.50 (1df) p < 0.001

Almost one-third of the supervisors (14 in number) reported that they either themselves invited, or recommended most of the teachers to invite peripatetic teachers. Moreover, 21 per cent of these supervisors claimed that they made the recommendation to all of the teachers they supervised. However, 12 per cent of them reported that they made this recommendation to only one or two of the teachers they supervised. Figures are presented in Table 3.20b more detailed.
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Table 3.20b: The proportion of teachers who were recommended and/or were helped to invite peripatetic teacher by supervisors (according to supervisors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the teachers were asked to state the number of their supervisors who recommended that they invite peripatetic teachers to their classrooms, 58 per cent of them (eleven in number) stated that only one or two of their supervisors had made such a recommendation. However, a further 32 per cent claimed that five or more of them did so. The more detailed figures are presented in Table 3.20c.

Table 3.20c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who invited or recommended teachers to invite peripatetic teachers to their classrooms by teachers’ response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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21- “TO ARRANGE OR TO RECOMMEND TEACHERS TO ARRANGE MEETINGS WITH THE PARENTS TO TRAIN THEM TO IMPROVE THE READINESS OF THEIR CHILDREN BEFORE ENTERING PRIMARY SCHOOLS”

In the last question of this section, the teachers and the supervisors were asked to state the situation about the above mentioned behaviours of the supervisors. While two-thirds of the supervisors claimed that they arranged or recommended teachers to arrange such meetings, 88 per cent of the teachers reported that no one of their supervisors did so. The following table shows the comparison.

**Table 3.21a** : Percentage and frequency distribution of teachers and supervisors on supervisors’ exhibition of the behaviour of “to arrange or to recommend teachers to arrange meetings with the parents to train them to improve the readiness of their children before entering primary schools”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (f)</td>
<td>No (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 59.24 \text{ (1df) } p < 0.001 \]

Interestingly, while 31 per cent of the relevant supervisors claimed that they recommended this to ‘most of the teachers’, a further 28 per cent claimed that they made the recommendation to all the teachers they supervised. However, 14 per cent of them reported that the number of recommended teachers was ‘only one or two’. The following table shows the details.
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Table 3.21b: The proportion of teachers who were recommended and/or were helped to hold meetings with the parents about pre-school preparations of their children (according to supervisors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, 32 per cent of the teachers (seven in number) reported that only one of their supervisors arranged or recommended such meetings within the last five years, while a further 32 per cent claimed that three of their supervisors did so in the same period of time. It is also noteworthy that more than a quarter of the teachers reported that four or more of their supervisors either arranged or recommended them to arrange meetings with the parents to train them to improve the readiness of their children before entering primary schools. The more detailed figures are presented in Table 3.21c.

Table 3.21c: The distribution of the number of supervisors who arranged or recommended teachers to arrange meetings with the parents to inform them to improve the readiness of their children before starting primary school by teachers' response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only 1 of them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more of them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the practices, experience and opinions of the teachers, the supervisors and the directors about the innovative behaviours of supervisors mentioned so far, there were certain behaviours which could be exhibited by the supervisors about which information could be gathered from the directors only. The first such question concerned recommendations to the provincial directors of education about possible curriculum revisions in the provinces. Thus, directors were asked the question “did any of your primary school supervisor(s) recommend any curriculum revision in your province?” Six of the eight directors responded ‘yes’ to this question, whilst the other two reported ‘no’. However, although two of these directors stated that nearly half of their supervisors did this, three of the directors reported that they had recommendations from only one or two of their supervisors. One director claimed that the proportion of the supervisors who made recommendations was ‘fewer than a quarter of them’ (see Table 4.6 in Appendix II for the details).

On the other hand, when the directors were asked to evaluate these recommendations made by supervisors, all of the six relevant directors reported that they found the recommendations “generally helpful”.

The directors were also asked to state whether their supervisors brought any recommendation(s) on the measurement of academic achievement of pupils. Interestingly, although three of the eight directors responded ‘yes’ to the question, the remaining five stated that they were not brought such kinds of recommendations. However, each one of the relevant three directors stated different proportions for the number of supervisors. These categories were ‘only one or two of them’, ‘fewer than a quarter of them’ and ‘nearly half of them’ (see Table 4.7 in Appendix II for the details).

Finally, when the provincial directors of education were asked the following question “considering supervision reports submitted to you and request from your primary school supervisors, do you feel that supervisors are acting reasonably effectively in the implementation of educational innovations in primary schools?”, strikingly, they were divided exactly into two parts. While four of them responded ‘yes’, the other four stated the opposite. However, while two of the directors responding yes stated that most of their supervisors were acting effectively in the implementation of educational innovations in primary schools, one director reported that ‘only one or two of his/her supervisors did so.
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According to the remaining yes declared director 'fewer than a quarter of the supervisors' were effective in the same activity (see Table 4.8 in Appendix II for the details).

Discussion

In the earlier pages the results with regard to primary school supervisors' practical involvement in certain specific innovative behaviours and practices as experienced or witnessed, first by the supervisors themselves and, by the teachers and the provincial directors of education are presented.

The findings do reveal some striking differences and sometimes interesting associations among the practices of the teachers, supervisors and directors. First of all, it should be noted that there were statistically significant differences at the 0.001 probability level between the responses of the teachers and the supervisors regarding all but one of the 21 would be innovative behaviours or practices of supervisors examined in the earlier pages. This is one of the most striking findings of the study. Such a difference between the perceptions of the supervisors and the "supervisees" is clearly of great importance.

On one hand, there are supervisors who claim that they did perform the mentioned practices, but, on the other hand, there are teachers who respond in the way that denies all these claims. One possible explanation for this, at least for some of the activities, could be the different definition of the activities by the teachers and the supervisors. It might be that some specific behaviour was seen by a supervisor as meeting the definition implied by the question, but not by a teacher. However, the size of the differences found strongly suggests that there are real substantial differences in the perceptions of supervisory practices, and also in what supervisory roles should be in general. The apparent lack of awareness and understanding of each others activities much greater than anticipated.

It should also be noted here that the existence of this amount of difference between the two groups creates a considerable difficulty for the understanding of the true nature of the situation.

However, it appeared that the teachers and the supervisors did not reveal statistically significant difference on the supervisors' activity "to arrange meetings with colleagues from other schools to discuss and share new ideas". A considerable proportion of teachers (more than two-thirds of them) and the vast majority of the supervisors (more than three-quarters of them) reported that this activity was carried on by the supervisors. It is also
noteworthy here that the highest ‘yes’ response from the teachers was on this practice of the supervisors.

Taking the other findings with regard to the aforementioned innovative supervisory behaviours into account, we may draw the following conclusions;

The two behaviours of supervisors on which more than 50 per cent of each group reported that the behaviour was exhibited by the supervisors were; “to arrange meetings with colleagues from other schools to discuss and share new ideas” and “to have post-observation conferences”. As was also stated earlier, although there was not any significant difference between the groups regarding the former activity, there was a statistically significant difference at 0.001 probability level for the latter.

However, the findings suggested that, taking the both groups’ responses together into account, the two most practiced activities by the supervisors were the above mentioned ones. Interestingly, these two items were the only ones on which more than 50 per cent of the teachers reported that their supervisors practiced them. Moreover, 100% of the supervisors reported that they did have post-observation conferences with teachers.

Generally speaking, the findings suggest that although the supervisors do not seem eager to have pre-observation conferences, they do hold a conference after each classroom observation.

On the other hand, as the findings revealed, the only two behaviours on which more than 50 per cent of the supervisors responded that they did not practice the behaviours were; “to pair teachers up with a colleague to discuss teaching performances” and “to attend workshop sessions with teachers about the implementation of any educational innovation”.

What is more, the highest ‘no’ responses that came from the supervisors (76 per cent) was on the former item. In other words, more than three-quarters of supervisors stated that they did not pair teachers up.

It can be concluded that the majority of the supervisors might have thought that this activity could have some negative psychological effects on the teachers. On the other hand, the limited number of the practices of attending workshop sessions with teachers could be due to the limited time that supervisors had to devote to fulfill the other supervisory activities, as another finding suggested that average number of teachers per supervisor was more than 130.
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On the other hand, the evaluation of some supervisory practices by the teachers revealed some interesting findings. First of all, it must be stated that, generally speaking, these evaluations were mostly positive. In other words, the vast majority of the teachers stated that they found the stated exhibited practices either generally or definitely helpful.

The teachers’ evaluations of the practices “to offer proposals for in-service training needs of the teachers”, “to have pre-observation conferences”, “to have post-observation conferences”, and “to attempt to establish communication channels between schools and their local communities” revealed these kinds of results. It means that the teachers expressed their positive experiences about all the practices they were requested to evaluate. Therefore, it can be concluded that once an innovative practice was performed by the supervisors it was appreciated and widely accepted by the teachers.
This section concerns teachers', directors' and supervisors' responses to the items which could be barriers to the implementation of educational innovations in primary schools. Results and group comparisons are presented for each item in the following paragraphs. However, discussion of the findings will be made in Chapter 5 together with the overall conclusion of the results and recommendations.

17 Pre-identified items were placed in the questionnaires and the respondents were requested to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement to those barriers on a five-point scale. In addition to this, an open-ended question was added to allow the respondents to state barrier(s) which were not included in the pre-prepared ones. Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests were employed to find out whether significant differences existed among and/or between the views of the teachers, supervisors and directors regarding these barriers.

The responses of the directors, the supervisors and the teachers about these 17 barriers are presented in Table 3.1. With regard to the first item, for the group comparisons, it appeared that there were statistically significant differences among the views of the groups. Mann-Whitney U test showed that the difference was significant at the 0.001 level between the teacher and the supervisor groups \( (z=4.72) \), whereas the difference between the teachers and directors was significant at 0.01 level \( (z=2.99) \) regarding the same item. As positive z values indicated, the teachers agreed more strongly than the supervisors and the directors that "lack of information given by the supervisors about the implementation of innovations" was a barrier. However there was no significant difference between the responses of the supervisors and the directors.

For the second item, again, the teachers agreed more strongly than the supervisors and the directors that "unavailability of necessary materials for the implementation of innovations" was a barrier. The Mann-Whitney U test showed that the difference was significant at the 0.001 level between the teachers and the supervisors \( (z=4.72) \), and also between the teachers and the directors at the 0.05 level \( (z=2.26) \). However, similar to the first item, there was no significant difference between the views of the supervisors and the directors.
Table 3.1: The opinions of the directors, the supervisors and the teachers about the barriers to the implementation of innovations in primary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARRIERS</th>
<th>TEACHERS (%)</th>
<th>SUPervisors (%)</th>
<th>DIRECTORS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA GA NI GD SD</td>
<td>SA GA NI GD SD</td>
<td>SA GA NI GD SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of information given by the supervisors about the implementation of innovations</td>
<td>56 23 7 10 4</td>
<td>16 42 2 33 7</td>
<td>- 38 38 25 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unavailability of necessary materials for the implementation of innovations</td>
<td>52 33 3 8 4</td>
<td>18 55 2 18 7</td>
<td>12 50 - 38 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of performances of supervisors to show the implementation of innovations</td>
<td>39 34 13 7 7</td>
<td>7 33 7 42 11</td>
<td>- 62 - 38 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of performances of teachers for the implementation of innovations</td>
<td>20 35 10 23 12</td>
<td>20 54 4 18 4</td>
<td>25 62 - 12 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enthusiastic desires of supervisors for immediate outcomes of newly implemented innovations</td>
<td>22 24 29 14 11</td>
<td>9 37 20 23 9</td>
<td>- 25 38 25 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enthusiastic desires of teachers for immediate outcomes of newly implemented innovations</td>
<td>10 30 25 22 13</td>
<td>5 27 25 38 5</td>
<td>- 25 38 38 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lack of in-service training programs for supervisors about the implementation process of educational innovations</td>
<td>39 29 21 8 3</td>
<td>46 33 - 16 4</td>
<td>25 62 13 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of in-service training programs for teachers about the implementation process of educational innovations</td>
<td>47 32 8 8 5</td>
<td>51 37 2 4 4</td>
<td>38 50 12 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The existence of a general belief among the supervisors that their supervisory roles do not include the implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>26 24 32 11 7</td>
<td>13 28 10 45 5</td>
<td>- 57 - 43 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA: Strongly Agree, GA: Generally Agree, NI: No Idea, GD: Generally Disagree, SD: Strongly Disagree
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With regard to the third barrier, as predicted and similar to the first item, the teachers, yet again, agreed more strongly than the supervisors that "lack of performances of supervisors to show the implementation of innovations" was a barrier. But, there was not a statistically significant difference between them and the directors. However, the difference between the teachers' and the supervisors' perceptions was significant at the 0.001 probability level (z=4.98). Similar to the previous ones, there was no significant difference between the perceptions of the supervisors and the directors with regard to the item.

For the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth items there were no significant differences between the groups. While 87 per cent of the directors agreed either strongly or generally with the fourth item, more than half of the teachers and almost three-quarters of the supervisors responded in the same way. However, the fifth item was the item which all groups had an even distribution on the five alternatives of the scale. And also this item was one of the highest "no idea" responded items. Even 20 per cent of the supervisors reported that they had no idea about the barrier "enthusiastic desires of supervisors for immediate outcomes of newly implemented innovations. As might be expected, 29 per cent of the teachers had no idea on this barrier.

On the other hand, as opposed to the fifth one, the sixth item was the item for which the supervisors had their highest ‘no idea’ responses. The seventh barrier was again the one for which most of the teachers, the supervisors and the directors agreed either generally or strongly. The eighth barrier was one of the most ‘agreed’ barriers by the all groups. At least 79 per cent of the each group (teachers group) reported that they agreed either strongly or generally that "lack of in-service training programs for teachers about the implementation process of educational innovations.

With regard to the ninth barrier, There was a significant difference between the teachers and the supervisors at the 0.05 level (z=2.57). As the positive z value indicated, the teachers agreed more strongly than the supervisors that "the existence of a general belief among the supervisors that their supervisory roles do not include the implementation of educational innovations" was a barrier. However there was no statistically significant difference between the teachers and directors and also between the supervisors and directors.
Table 3.1 (cont.): The opinions of the directors, the supervisors and the teachers about the barriers to the implementation of innovations in primary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARRIERS</th>
<th>TEACHERS (%)</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS (%)</th>
<th>DIRECTORS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lack of authority delegated to supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lack of sufficient scientific publications on educational innovations for supervisors, teachers and school administrators</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lack of credibility given to the experiences of supervisors, teachers and school administrators on the implementation process of educational innovations</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lack of financial support allocated to primary schools for the implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of financial support allocated to teachers to motivate them for implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lack of financial support allocated to supervisors to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lack of moral support given to teachers to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lack of moral support given to supervisors to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA: Strongly Agree, GA: Generally Agree, NI: No Idea, GD: Generally Disagree, SD: Strongly Disagree
With regard to the barrier “lack of authority delegated to supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations”, as might be predicted, there was a significant difference between the views of the teachers and the supervisors at the 0.01 level (\(z=2.72\)). As the negative z value indicated, supervisors agreed more strongly than the teachers that they need more authority. This item was the one that the teachers reported their highest ‘strongly disagree’ responses (19 per cent). On the other hand, there was no significant difference between the teachers and the directors and also between the supervisors and the directors.

Regarding the eleventh barrier, there was no significant difference between the group responses. However, At least 77 per cent (the teachers) of each group agreed either generally or strongly that “lack of sufficient scientific publications on educational innovations for supervisors, teachers and school administrators” was a barrier.

“Lack of credibility given to the experiences of supervisors, teachers and school administrators on the implementation process of educational innovations” was the barrier on which there were significant differences between the views of the teachers and the directors at the 0.01 level (\(z=2.90\)), and between the teachers and the supervisors at the 0.05 level (\(z=2.34\)). As the positive z values indicated, the teachers agreed more strongly than the directors and supervisors with this barrier. However, there was no significant difference between the responses of the supervisors and directors.

With regard to the thirteenth barrier, there were no significant differences between the group responses. However, this barrier was also the one on which the vast majority of all groups (at least 86 per cent of each group) agreed either strongly or generally that “lack of financial support allocated to the primary schools for the implementation of educational innovations” was a barrier. 64 per cent of the supervisors ‘strongly agreed’ with this item, the highest percentage agreement for the supervisors. On the other hand, all of the directors agreed, either generally or strongly that this was a barrier.

For the fourteenth barrier, there were significant differences between the responses of the teachers and directors at the 0.001 level (\(z=3.47\)), and between the teachers and supervisors at the 0.01 level (\(z=2.79\)). As the positive z values indicated the teachers agreed more strongly than the directors and supervisors that “lack of financial support allocated to teachers to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations” was a barrier. However, there was no significant difference between the responses of the supervisors and
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directors. It is worthy of note that 81 per cent of the teachers 'strongly agreed' with this item, the highest percentage ever for the teachers.

With regard to the fifteenth barrier, there was a significant difference between the responses of the teachers and supervisors at the 0.001 level (z=-4.59), and also between the supervisors and directors at 0.05 level (z=2.20). As negative z value indicated, the supervisors agreed more strongly than the teachers that "lack of financial support allocated to supervisors to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations" was a barrier. Similarly, as the positive z value indicated, the supervisors, again, agreed more strongly than the directors on this barrier. However, there was no significant difference between the responses of the teachers and the directors.

The possible barrier "lack of moral support given to teachers to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations" was designed as the sixteenth item of this section and asked to the respondents. Although the majority of each group agreed with the item either generally or strongly, as might be predicted, there were significant differences between the views of the teachers and supervisors (z=4.73), and between the teachers and directors (z=4.43) at the 0.001 levels. As the positive z values indicated, the teachers agreed more strongly than supervisors and directors that the item was a barrier. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between the responses of the teachers and the directors.

As the last of pre-identified barriers, the seventeenth item was “the lack of moral support given to supervisors to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations”. Although Kruskal-Wallis Test showed that there were no significant differences among the groups, Mann-Whitney U Test depicted a significant difference between the teachers and supervisors at the 0.05 level (z=-2.16). As the negative z value indicated, as might be expected, the supervisors agreed with the item more strongly than the teachers. Thus, while 77 per cent of the supervisors agreed with the item either strongly or generally, the percentage of the teachers who reported the same categories was 52. However, there were no significant differences between the teachers and directors and between the supervisors and directors.

As was stated, an open-ended question was added to allow the respondents to state barrier(s) which were not included in the identified ones. The teachers, supervisors and directors did report certain issues which could be barriers to the implementation of
innovations in Turkish primary schools. However, it must be stated that most of the respondents stated these barriers together and in conjunction with their recommendations. Therefore, for the practical reasons, these barriers are examined and reported together with the recommendations of the respondents at the end of the next section (section 5).
SECTION 5
RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE THE DEGREE OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INNOVATIONS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Similar to the previous section, this section concerns teachers', directors' and supervisors' responses to the items which could be recommendations to improve the degree of implementation of educational innovations in primary schools. Results and group comparisons are presented for each item in the following paragraphs. However, discussion of the findings will be made in Chapter 5 together with the overall conclusion of the results and recommendations.

11 recommendations were placed in the questionnaires and the respondents were requested to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement to those recommendations on a five-point scale. In addition to this, an open-ended item was added to allow the respondents to state recommendation(s) which were not included in the pre-identified ones. Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests were employed to find out whether significant differences existed between the views of the teachers, supervisors and directors with regard to these recommendations.

The responses of the directors, the supervisors and the teachers about these recommendations are presented in Table 3.2. As far as the first, second and third items are concerned, it appeared that there were no statistically significant differences among the responses of the groups. However, while 75 per cent of the supervisors stated so, 55 per cent of the teachers and 88 per cent of the directors agreed either generally or strongly that "the ratio of the numbers of the supervisors to the teachers should be increased up to, at least, 1/50".

Regarding the second recommendation "the numbers and duration of school visits done by supervisors and time allocated per teacher should be increased", there were no significant differences among them, and the vast majority of all groups (at least 70 per cent of each group) agreed either strongly or generally with the recommendation. In fact, all of the directors agreed either generally or strongly with it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>TEACHERS (%)</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS (%)</th>
<th>DIRECTORS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The ratio of the numbers of the supervisors to teachers should be increased</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The number and duration of school visits done by supervisors and time</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocated per teacher should be increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In-service training programs should be arranged for both supervisors and</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers for the improvement of the implementation of innovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The amount of authority delegated to supervisors for the implementation of</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational innovations should be increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Financial support allocated to primary schools for educational innovations</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. More credit should be given to the practices, ideas and suggestions</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revealed by supervisors, teachers and school administrators on the implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process of educational innovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA: Strongly Agree, GA: Generally Agree, NI: No Idea, GD: Generally Disagree, SD: Strongly Disagree
Similar to the first and second ones, with regard to the third recommendation “in-service training programs should be arranged for both supervisors and teachers for the improvement of the implementation of innovations” there were no significant differences among the group responses, and the vast majority of each group (at least 91 per cent) agreed either generally or strongly with the recommendation. It is noteworthy that 82 per cent of the supervisors ‘strongly’ agreed with this item.

With regard to the fourth recommendation “the amount of authority delegated to supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations should be increased” there was a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level (z=-2.56) between the responses of the teachers and directors. As the negative z value indicated the directors agreed more strongly than the teachers that this item should be a recommendation. However, there were no significant differences between the teachers and supervisors and between the supervisors and the directors.

The fifth recommendation was “financial support allocated to primary schools for educational innovations should be increased”. Regarding this item, it appeared that the vast majority of each group (at least 93 per cent) agreed either generally or strongly with it. However, there was a significant difference between the teachers and supervisors at the 0.05 level (z=2.13). The teachers agreed more strongly with the item than the supervisors. However, there were no significant differences between the teachers and directors and also between the supervisors and directors. It is worth mentioning that 87 per cent of the teachers ‘strongly’ agreed with the recommendation (the highest percentage agreement of the teachers).

With regard to the sixth recommendation, it appeared that there were significant differences among the group responses. While difference was at the 0.001 level (z=3.32) between the teachers and directors, it was at 0.05 level (z=2.31) between the teachers and supervisors. Thus, as the positive z values indicated the teachers agreed more strongly than the directors and supervisors that “more credit should be given to the practices, ideas and suggestions revealed by supervisors, teachers and school administrators on the implementation process of educational innovations”. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between the views of the supervisors and directors.
The seventh recommendation was “new arrangements should be introduced to enable supervisors, teachers and school administrators to get more scientific publications on educational innovations”. Regarding this recommendation, yet again, the vast majority of all three groups (at least 96 per cent) stated that they agreed either generally or strongly that this could be a recommendation. However, interestingly, although there was no significant difference between the responses of the teachers and supervisors, there were significant differences at the 0.001 level ($z=3.41$) between the teachers and directors, and also between the supervisors and directors at the 0.05 level ($z=2.46$) as well. Thus, while, as the positive $z$ values indicated, teachers and supervisors agreed more strongly than directors with the recommendation.
Table 3.2 (cont.): The opinions of the directors, the supervisors and the teachers about the recommendations to improve
the degree of implementation of innovations in primary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>TEACHERS (%)</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS (%)</th>
<th>DIRECTORS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA  GA  NI  GD  SD</td>
<td>SA  GA  NI  GD  SD</td>
<td>SA  GA  NI  GD  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. New arrangements should be introduced to enable supervisors, teachers and school administrators to get more scientific publications on educational innov.</td>
<td>85 12 2 1 -</td>
<td>82 14 - 4</td>
<td>38 62 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New financial support arrangements should be introduced to motivate teachers for the implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>86 10 2 1 1</td>
<td>74 14 7 5</td>
<td>50 50 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. New financial support arrangements should be introduced to motivate supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>44 20 21 7 7</td>
<td>76 16 4 4</td>
<td>50 50 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. New moral support arrangements should be introduced to motivate teachers for the implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>75 19 1 2 3</td>
<td>71 18 2 4 4</td>
<td>42 25 - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. New moral support arrangements should be introduced to motivate supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations</td>
<td>50 26 15 3 6</td>
<td>62 26 4 7</td>
<td>62 25 - 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA: Strongly Agree, GA: Generally Agree, NI: No Idea, GD: Generally Disagree, SD: Strongly Disagree
The recommendation “new financial support arrangements should be introduced to motivate teachers for the implementation of educational innovations” was designed as the eighth item of this section. Regarding this item, the responses indicated that the vast majority of the respondents (at least 88 per cent) agreed either strongly or generally with it. However, although there were no significant differences between the views of the teachers and supervisors and, between the views of the supervisors and directors, it appeared that there was a statistically significant difference between the views of the teachers and directors at the 0.05 level (z=2.54), indicating that teachers agreed more strongly than directors.

With regard to the recommendation “new financial support arrangements should be introduced to motivate supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations” although at least more than half of each group (64 per cent of the teachers, as the lowest) agreed either generally or strongly with the item, there was a significant difference between the views of the teachers and supervisors at the 0.001 level (z=-3.69), indicating that, as might be expected, supervisors agreed more strongly than the teachers with this recommendation. There were no significant differences between the responses of the teachers and directors and, between the responses of the supervisors and directors.

For the tenth and eleventh recommendations which were designed to identify the views of the respondents on whether “new moral support arrangements should be introduced to motivate teachers (as item 10) and supervisors (as item 11) for the implementation of educational innovations”, it appeared that, yet again, the vast majority of each group (at least 87 per cent) either generally or strongly ‘agreed’ with both of them. There were no significant differences among the groups with regard to both of those recommendations.

As was stated, an open-ended question was added to allow the respondents to state recommendation(s) which were not included in the pre-prepared ones. The teachers, supervisors and directors suggested a number of recommendations for the implementation of innovations in Turkish primary schools. However, as was stated at the end of previous section, most of the respondents stated these recommendations in association with the barriers they experienced.

First of all, it must be stated that, generally speaking, approximately one-third of the teachers (approximately 60 in number) and a quarter of each of the supervisors (15 in number) and directors (two in number) did write in comment concerning barriers and
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recommendations. After the detailed review of these items, we identified the following ones for the three groups (see Table 4.9 in Appendix II for the details).

As the Table 4.9 shows, approximately one-fifth of the teachers (twelve in number) who had stated any additional barrier(s) and/or recommendation(s) reported that carrying out a supervision activity which was weighted in favour of its control and assessment aspects prevented educational innovations from being implemented. In other words, the heavy control function of supervisors was one of the main barriers to the innovations. In association with this barrier, those teachers, therefore, recommended that supervisors should carry out their supervisory activities by stressing the help, guidance and advice dimensions of their roles. Indeed, two of the supervisors reported that the desire to practice the control function of their roles by some of the supervisors also prevented them from being more innovative in their jobs.

In addition eleven teachers reported that the existence of political pressure coming from different sources on supervisors was preventing them from sustaining their job in a neutral manner. Three supervisors also stated that this situation was preventing them performing their jobs properly.

Although they were placed among the pre-identified items, particularly the teachers reported frequently that the lack of financial support to primary schools, teachers and supervisors, and also moral support to teachers and supervisors were barriers to the implementation of educational innovations, and therefore should be dealt with.

Six teachers reported that the training and selection of supervisors had a large effect on supervisors innovative behaviours and therefore should be paid more attention. They were particularly concerned with the handling of the examinations (The Primary School Supervisor Selection Examination) and reported that these examinations should be made neutrally. Two of the directors reported also that maximum attention should be paid to the appointment of primary school supervisors, and the ability, rather than other factors, should be given credit in the appointments.

One of the directors also stated that the role, authority and responsibility definitions for primary school supervisors needed to be re-examined and should be done consistently with new conditions and approaches in the field.
In addition to the above barriers and recommendations, three of the supervisors recommended that supervisors should be given courses on computer aided education to be more effective on the implementation of educational innovations. In addition to this, four of the supervisors recommended that primary school supervisors should be sent abroad to follow new developments in their fields. It is also worth mentioning another barrier and recommendation which was reported by five supervisors. These supervisors reported that the lack of transportation means in their regions was one of the main obstacles for the implementation of educational innovations, and therefore should be addressed.
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CHAPTER 5

THE OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter concerns the overall conclusions from the results that were reported in the previous chapter and the recommendations arrived at on the basis of these results. For practical reasons recommendations are placed just after the overall conclusion of the related result.

First, it must be stated that the overall findings of the study suggest that the long-standing discussion of the place and the role of supervisors in educational systems in general was also one of the most discussed and most controversial issues in Turkish primary education system as well. As is widely accepted there are two main tendencies in perceptions of the role of supervisors. While one of them stresses the “quality control” and “assessment” aspects of the role, the other stresses the “support” and “advice” dimensions of it.

As was stated, the findings of the study revealed that there were conflicting views within each of the teacher, supervisor and director groups, as well as among them. However, the results suggested that the “quality control” or “assessment” aspect of the primary school supervision in Turkey was given more weight than the “support” or “advice” aspects of it.

For instance, when the supervisors were asked to state the distribution of the percentages of time they had spent on the supervisory duties, it was calculated that while supervisors had spent approximately 31 per cent of their time on “advice, guidance and on the job training” duties, they reported that 44 per cent of their time had been spent on “inspection and assessment” duties. What is more, 76 per cent of the teachers reported that the last supervision of the 1990-91 education year was on the assessment of his/her teaching performance.

Therefore, if we take the conditions prevailing in Turkish primary education into consideration, it seems reasonable that the most appropriate role for primary school supervisors is the one that focuses upon advice and support complemented by inspection and assessment. The proportion of the dimensions must be carefully examined and then assigned, and open to review and change when the need arises. However, bearing in mind that it may vary from time to time and from case to case, it is the personal opinion of
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the researcher that in present circumstances the efforts devoted to the advice and support dimension of the role should compose, generally speaking, at least two-thirds of supervisory efforts in any case.

On the other hand, it is quite obvious that we do need to be cautious about it. As Lowe (1992, p.43) pointed out, “people like to be liked. ...Within the context of the individual school the adviser is often regarded as a supportive friend, a sounding board, in the words of one head ‘a shoulder to cry on’. Within the wider authority such an ad hoc approach to support and auditing, in whatever guise, is potentially damaging to the service as a whole. It can, all too often, convey a picture of laissez faire and inconsistency, particularly to those institutions who have not benefited from the service”.

Having said that, however, what is more important is the in-service and particularly pre-service education of primary school supervisors. As was stated in the previous chapter more than one-fifth of the supervisors were the graduates of supervisor formation programs. It should be noted that these programs are arranged by the ministry with a duration of six months.

It can also be concluded that the above mentioned recommendation is in line with the opinions of the teachers and supervisors. The need for shifting of the focus away from monitoring and inspection to support and advice in supervisory activities was frequently mentioned by the vast majority of the teachers, and also, though not as frequently as the teachers’, by the supervisors themselves. This was stated both in answering the specific questions and also among the barriers and recommendations for educational innovations in primary schools.

It can be argued that, with this form of supervision, primary school teachers will benefit from having their classroom organisation and teaching styles evaluated in depth and reviewed, pupils will benefit from having more effective teachers and, parents will benefit from having well educated pupils. In a way, as Hudson (1992, p.147-148) stated, “inspection is a process of holding up a mirror to a school or college and saying, ‘This is what your institution looks like at this point in the school year and within the national context of unabated change’. By offering schools an accurate description of how well they are performing, inspections will provide schools with evidence that helps them identify strengths and weaknesses. ....Quality assurance is concerned with monitoring and improving service delivery. This cannot be achieved by imposing penalties on
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schools where the quality of learning is poor but by process of celebrating strengths, identifying weaknesses and offering schools appropriate support where necessary”.

The education system in Turkey has recently experienced some changes which have major consequences for the managerial and professional roles and relationships of groups such as teachers, heads of schools, directors of education and particularly primary school supervisors. Especially after the publication of The Regulation for Ministry of Education Primary School Supervisors' Council (October 1990), the ministry started introducing new opportunities to teachers who wished to attend educational administration and supervision departments of the universities and started employing the graduates of these departments as ‘assistant primary school supervisors’.

No one can ignore the importance of experience in any job. But, along with the experience criteria, formal education and training, at least at graduate level, should be considered as a must in the appointments of primary school supervisors. Although there have been established certain departments at different universities in recent years for the purpose of educating and training primary school supervisors, considering the lack of primary school supervisors both in quantity and quality, it is necessary to open new departments and also to add new quotas to the existing ones. It must also be stressed here again that the suitability of the individual for this job is the most crucial criteria to be considered.

One of the other main striking findings of the study was the level of the quality and the quantity of the innovative behaviours exhibited by the supervisors. The results of the study suggest that twenty of the twenty-one pre-defined would-be innovative behaviours of supervisors had not been exhibited, according to the responses of the vast majority of the teachers. Generally speaking, more than three-quarters of the teachers reported for each one of these behaviours or activities that they had not witnessed or experienced such behaviours at all. However, it should be noted that a substantial proportion of the supervisors, as might be expected, reported that they had exhibited those behaviours.

On the other hand, the results of the study suggested that among the three groups, the teachers revealed views distant from the supervisors and directors with regard to the vast majority of the items for which they were asked to state their experiences and/or opinions. On the other hand, the supervisors and directors reported, generally speaking, very similar views for most items.
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As has been stressed by numerous educationalists, the importance of innovation and innovative behaviours in education cannot be denied. West-Burnham (1990, p.96) puts the meaning of managing change as follows;

“organisations only have reality through the experiences of the individuals working in them and so managing change comes down to enhancing the ability of individuals to learn and to communicate that learning within the context of the organisation as a whole. The implication of this is that managing change may be about a fundamental cultural shift which moves individuals and schools away from being victims to being in control of themselves and so able to respond in a positive and creative way rather than to react against it”

The overall examination of the results with regard to the questions related to curriculum matters in general revealed some interesting figures about the activities of Turkish primary school supervisors. These questions were about “recommendations on curriculum revisions”, “to bring leaflets or any printed resources related to teaching learning activities in primary schools”, “meeting(s) with teachers about the teaching methods applicable to requiring special attention pupils”, “giving an example lecture” and “recommendations on any remedial coaching for slow learning pupils”. As was stated in the results and discussion section of the study, generally speaking, the responses to these questions suggested that, although some of the supervisors did want to act effectively, it was not possible to draw positive conclusions for most of the findings extracted from these questions.

Thus, for instance, although six of the eight directors responded ‘yes’ to the question “did any of your primary school supervisor(s) recommend any curriculum revision in your province?”, half of these six directors reported that they had recommendations from only one or two of their supervisors. Only two of these directors stated that nearly half of their supervisors did this and, one director claimed that the proportion of the supervisors who made recommendations was ‘fewer than a quarter of them’. In other words, there was no any director who declared that either ‘most of his/her supervisors’ or ‘all of his/her supervisors’ did this. Similarly, when the teachers were requested to answer the question “ did any of your supervisor(s) bring any newly published documents related to teaching learning activities in primary schools?”, the vast majority of them (87 per cent) reported that they did not see their supervisors bringing newly published documents related to teaching and learning activities in primary schools. Moreover, a substantial proportion of
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the supervisors (40 per cent) accepted too that they did not bring the mentioned documents.

It can be concluded that supervisors need to learn to fulfill a variety of roles and induce a variety of roles in teachers too. They must recognise potentials of his/her teachers and encourage their individual growth. They also must have a clear understanding of curriculum in detail. They should have knowledge of the learning process and of what approach is acceptable with students of various ages and at various stages of development.

It can be said that the calibre and rate of curriculum change can be (and must be) different in different circumstances. Some revisions can be major ones while some others can only require minor tune-ups. Some supervisors may wish to be seen as a revolutionary change agent while some others may only prefer some minor improvements in the existing situation. However, neither of these two extreme points are found in the study data. A gradual but continuous approach can be more effective in the long-run in education, especially in curriculum matters. It can be concluded that, while sudden, quick and major changes can produce much initial attention, they often shortly disappear. However, fortunately, most supervisors are not forced to commit themselves solely to either of these extreme positions.

It must also be stressed here that changing the primary school curriculum in Turkish primary education requires the changing of all people involved in the process, especially teachers. Obviously this job is not the job of supervisors only. But, they can provide positive leadership and can initiate (or can help initiate) sound educational innovations. They can identify leaders among the education staff, especially teachers as the core and implementing staff, to become productive and decisive agents of change. It is also important and must be remembered that even the finest curriculum theory imaginable will be of little consequence unless it can be translated into something productive in the classroom. So, the method and patterns of instruction and required materials have great importance in the implementation and success of curriculum changes. Therefore, the supervisor should be aware of these matters as well.

In addition, supervisors are expected to be aware of the important part the directors of education, parents and students and also the support of the local community play in curriculum change. Since the director of education control sources and personnel it is vital, therefore, that supervisors should get directors’ support in the initiation and
implementation of educational changes. In many ways, initiation and implementation of these changes will also depend on the support of parents, students and, the local community. So, the best supervisory practice will include parent and student groups in the deliberations. The results will be less effective and of shorter duration if these groups are not in agreement with the purpose of the initiation and implementation purposes of intended educational changes.

Supervisors can develop ways of working with teachers through interrelationships which, allow each to recognise the contribution the other has to offer. It can also be concluded that the authority that comes from mere status is no help in such a relationship. Since respect is often earned by observing people and their competence in practice, supervisors do need to exhibit their competence and indispensability in the implementation of educational innovations in Turkish primary schools. What is more, unless they acknowledge the importance of the role of teachers and do take teachers along with them in this process, educational innovations or changes are likely to remain at the level of rhetoric or intention.

Forming a new “advisory teacher” post in Turkish primary education could be helpful and beneficial in the initiation and implementation processes of educational innovations as well as in other aspects of teaching and learning activities in primary schools. With considerable experience and expertise in teaching and learning process, “advisory teachers” can provide indispensable support for their younger colleagues. The general aim of this support would be to improve performance of teachers. Successful and, say, with at least, with 20 years of experience, “advisory teachers” can play a crucial role in balancing the old and the new for successful implementation of innovations. While these senior teachers provide experience and expertise, younger teachers can bring dynamism and enthusiasm to the teaching and learning process in primary schools. Blending the two may ultimately prove a way forward.

An explicit rationale can be developed for the necessity of creating such a post. The need for experienced teachers in every aspect and every level of teaching and learning process in schools can be considered as a starting point. As Newhofer, Cowling and Blanchard (1992, p.64) stated, the people (advisory teachers) to be appointed to these posts are expected to work practically alongside teachers in classrooms or in off-site sessions focusing on what to teach and how to teach.
These advisory teachers can also be very helpful to primary school supervisors. Thus, as Newhofer, Cowling and Blanchard (1992, p.64) reported advisers in England and Wales tended to describe 'their' advisory teachers as "agents of change" or "catalysts", blessed with good practice that they could use to anoint teachers as they dashed from school to school with missionary zeal. However, they also reported that the expectation that advisory teachers would effect large-scale change was not supported by any clear theoretical understanding of the processes involved in social, behavioural and attitudinal change.

It is quite important to bring together and make teachers and advisory teachers work together. Obviously it is not going to be an easy task. It won’t be easy because, as Winkley (1985, p.194) reported, there is the complicated process of the transmission of intention into practice. He reported that Shipman found in a study of a curriculum innovation that advisers and teachers tended to be concerned with different problems, seeing innovation as a means of achieving quite different sets of objectives. In Shipman’s analysis the teachers were more concerned about the immediate problems of the classroom: motivation, implementation, discipline, and so on. The advisers were more concerned with broader and less tangible issues: the raising of standards of attainment, and the relevance of the innovation to the school. But, if the three groups, the supervisors, the teachers and the advisory teachers are succeeded to bring together and work together there will be every opportunity to solve the problems. It is worth stressing here again that there is evidence from various sources which suggest that the more distant the adviser, the more administrative and centralised the initiative, the wider the gap between the intention and the practice (Winkley, 1985, p.194).

What could be the place of advisory teachers in the hierarchy in primary schools? What could their authorities and responsibilities be to be effective? Will they play a part in promotions or appointments? It can be concluded that these people can be more effective if they perform their roles in a supportive, helpful and guidance oriented manner. So, these people in the hierarchy can occupy "staff" positions rather than "line" positions. In other words, although they can be placed above the teachers of a school but, certainly under the headteacher in the hierarchy of a school, they shouldn’t be expected to perform administrative duties. Above all, it is vitally important that teachers must feel that these advisory teachers are more teachers than administrators.
In a way, this status of advisory teachers can also be very helpful for primary school supervisors in fulfilling their supervisory activities. As the findings of this study revealed, although primary school supervisors wanted to dedicate more time to advice, guidance and on-the-job training (see Table 1.9), they couldn’t succeed in actual practice for many reasons. So, it can be concluded that this important lack of supportive help can be provided by these able and experienced personnel.

The appointment of these advisory teachers can be made by the Provincial Director of Education among the potential candidates recommended by primary school supervisors together with headteachers in each province. As in line with the recommendations on decentralisation, there is no practical need for these advisory teachers (including teachers, headteachers and primary school supervisors as well) to be appointed by the education secretary himself/herself.

It can also be concluded that the fate of educational innovations depends heavily on supervisors and teachers making advantageous connections between the success in the implementation of these changes and the benefits they obtain as a result. Those benefits can either be material (i.e. salary and fringe benefits) or morally motivating. As the findings revealed, the vast majority of the teachers, supervisors and directors reported that they had ‘agreed’ on the importance of introducing new financial and moral support arrangements.

The results also highlight another controversial issue in Turkish primary education, about the main structure of the education system: in other words, whether schools are going to become increasingly centralised, and in conjunction with this, the amount of autonomy that primary schools possess. With regard to these issues, the results suggested that although there were differences (though not statistically significant), most of the teachers, supervisors and directors ‘agreed’ that primary schools in Turkey were becoming increasingly centralised, whereas the vast majority of them “agreed” that primary schools should have more autonomy.

It can also be concluded that there is a need to develop some national guidelines within the predominantly centrally administered education system in Turkey. But they need to be produced by professional educationalists rather than by politicians or civil servants. Therefore, primary school supervisors can have a very clear role to play within the central authority. This is an area where they will need to continue to guard against political interference and bureaucratic insensitivity to the implementation of educational
innovations in their local provinces. However, it is widely accepted in Turkey in recent years that there is a need to delegate more power to local administrations, including the education sector. This introduces the education system to new initiatives, because, although it is open to debate, it can be argued that the prevailing excessively centralised system is impairing the country’s ability to design local solutions to local situations.

It can be said that maybe one of the fundamental changes currently being discussed in the Turkish Education System is local management of education. Actually, decentralisation is a central underlying trend in most areas, including the administrative structure of the state itself. Up to today, the underlying character of Turkish Education System was over centralisation. It necessitated a means of monitoring and ensuring that schools are carrying out what was required of them by central government. But, in recent times, public opinion (including the government and the opposition) seemed to be in favour of decentralisation in most areas. There is some consensus of opinion about decentralisation almost in every area. This could be a kind of reaction to the over centralisation that Turkey has experienced over the years in almost every area. However, it is the personal opinion of the researcher that in present circumstances, especially bearing in mind that trying to control almost everything from Ankara by imposing from above did not prove to be practical and effective, local management of education (and even schools) deserves more attention than ever.

Obviously, the degree of decentralisation in education (and also in other areas) will very much depend on other conditions that the country is experiencing. In other words, the economic, social, cultural and political situation and conditions in the country will draw the borders between centralisation and decentralisation in Turkish Education System.

Maybe the most important point to consider in contention between centralisation and decentralisation is the problem of ‘accountability’. Unfortunately, accountability of the schools in Turkish Education System has been considered a kind of responsibility to the central authority. The central authority has held responsible schools to itself only, not accountable to the society, especially not to their local societies.

The results also highlight another controversial issue in Turkish primary education, namely the problem of ‘classroom observation’. As was declared in the White Paper Teaching quality (in HMI, 1988, p.5), “to make the best use of available resources to maintain and improve standards in education” and, with the teaching force as the “major single determinant of the quality of education” it was argued that, for this force to be
managed effectively, accurate knowledge of teacher performance is needed: knowledge based on assessment. And, another White Paper Better schools (in HMI, 1988, p. 5) holds to that view, based on the belief that knowledge of teacher performance results in teachers “being helped to respond to changing demands and to realise their professional potential”

As was the case for most of the questions included in the questionnaires, the supervisors and the teachers gave conflicting responses to the questions about the general plan and program of each supervision visit paid by the primary school supervisors, for example, to the questions related to pre and post-observation conferences and the actual observation itself. For instance, although 83 per cent of the supervisors claimed that they did pre-observation conferences with the teachers whom they were going to observe in their classrooms, the vast majority of the teachers (89 per cent) reported just the opposite. Similarly, while literally all of the supervisors stated that they held post-observation conferences with the teachers after the classroom observation of them, there were quite a substantial percentage of teachers (39 per cent) who claimed that their supervisors ‘did not’ hold any observation conferences after their classroom observations. As a third example, another question asked the teachers and the supervisors about the practice of doing both pre and post observation conferences. The findings revealed that although 81 per cent of the supervisors claimed that they performed both of the conferences, almost the same per cent of the teachers (84 per cent) stated just the opposite. Moreover, although the teachers and the supervisors gave different responses, it could be concluded that, generally speaking, the time devoted by the supervisors to each one of those conferences (if performed) was mostly between 5-15 minutes.

For the questions on the nature of the last supervision and its evaluation element, the results revealed yet again that the teachers and the supervisors gave conflicting responses. Thus, “to offer teachers support over a problem” (by the supervisor) revealed a major discrepancy between teachers and supervisors groups. While 38 per cent of the supervisors asserted that their last supervisions were on this topic, only 3 per cent of the teachers declared so. Similarly, while 27 per cent of the supervisors stated that their last supervisions were related to the category ‘to evaluate teachers’ teaching performances’, more than three-quarters (76 per cent) of the teachers that their last supervisions were related to this topic. Moreover, while the vast majority of the supervisors (89 per cent) stated that their last supervisions were either definitely or generally “helpful”, a substantial
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proportion of the teachers (61 per cent) found the last supervision either as “very little help” or “no help at all”.

On the other hand, it is worth mentioning here that, the evaluation of some supervisory practices by the teachers revealed some interesting findings. First of all, it must be stated that, these evaluations were mostly positive. In other words, most teachers stated that they found the practices either generally or definitely helpful.

The teachers’ evaluations of the practices “to offer proposals for in-service training needs of the teachers”, “to have pre-observation conferences”, “to have post-observation conferences”, and “to attempt to establish communication channels between schools and their local communities” produced such results. This means that the teachers expressed their positive experiences about all the practices they were requested to evaluate. Therefore, it can be concluded and it is quite important that once an innovative practice was performed by the supervisors it was appreciated and widely accepted by the teachers.

As Hudson (1992, p.149-150), states central to the inspection process is classroom observation. For him, the inspector will wish to share observations about some or all of the following:

- Planning and classroom management - was there clear planning, linking objectives, learning strategies, resources and assessment?
- Teacher/pupil and pupil/pupil relationships.
- Quality of tasks - were they matched to planned outcomes and fully differentiated?
- Quality of teaching styles - were teaching styles appropriate to the tasks set?
- Pupils’ achievement - the level of ‘on task’ behaviour, care taken with presentation.
- Assessment - was there a clear relationship between formative assessment and future planning?

It is also widely accepted that classroom observation is one of the supervisors’ major skills and is a central resource in the implementation of educational innovations. It can be said that it is this work with individual teachers which can initiate changes in how they teach and how they assess learning in the classrooms. However, it is also true that, for most teachers, having an inspector in the classroom for a whole day is the cause of some anxiety. On the other hand, if wanted, some of this tension can be eased by pre-
observation conferences arranged by supervisors. They can explain to teachers the nature of the classroom observation they are going to hold. The teachers and the head of the school must be made aware of the focus and methodologies of the supervision. Supervisors can also explain what they expect from teachers, and how they are going to obtain that information. They can also explain to teachers the way information will be used, since teachers are always nervous about it. Simply, the likelihood of confusion or misapprehension can be greatly reduced by a face-to-face preliminary meeting.

Similar to this process, supervisors can arrange post-observation conferences with teachers after each classroom observation. The prime purpose of this conference, of course, is to make a constructive evaluation of the performances of the teachers, as well as pupils. It should be remembered that since the ultimate objective of these activities is to make schools more effective in the teaching and learning process, this cannot be achieved by imposing penalties on individual teachers and schools. The actual practice and research done in this field strongly suggest that the best way to deal with poor quality of learning in schools is, while identifying weaknesses of schools and their teachers, to celebrate their strengths too. Supervisors can utilise post-observation conferences for this purpose as well.

Supervision has to be more than a passing snap-shot taken on a good or bad day. Supervisors have to do it in a thoroughly professional manner which includes professional research in depth with considerable time spent on it. All topics related to the supervision done have to be thought out and discussed with the related personnel, i.e. headmasters, teachers and other helping staff, in detail.

The overall examination of the results with regard to the factors which could be barriers to the implementation of educational innovations suggested that although there were statistically significant differences among the responses of the groups, all of 17 pre-identified barriers were acknowledged by the vast majority of the teachers, supervisors and directors. Similarly, although there were significant differences among the responses of the groups, the majority of the respondents stated that they ‘agreed’ with all of 11 suggested recommendations. However, the respondents did add a number of suggested barriers and recommendations of their own. Therefore, the recommendations considered in the questionnaires can also be considered to be among the recommendations of the study. However, in addition to these recommendations and also to the ones mentioned so far in this chapter, there are a number of striking results which should be addressed and
which lead to further conclusions and recommendations. These can be summarised as follows:

The first one of these findings was on the sex distribution of the respondents. As was also stated in the previous chapter, the findings suggested that, although the gender differences are not great for the teachers, there is a substantial gap between the sexes for the super-visors and also for the directors. It should also be noted that the population parameters are very much consistent with these figures. So, it can be concluded that the sex distribution of supervisors and directors is not compatible with the sex distribution of the teachers. It does seem that it is difficult to be appointed as a primary school supervisor and also as a provincial director of education for female educationalists. Arguably, it would be more appropriate if the distribution of the sexes were well-balanced.

Another finding was about the preferences of the supervisors about the percentages of time they had spent on three of their main super-vision areas. The findings revealed that the supervisors would like to spend considerably less time they do on private driving licence schools. The vast majority of the supervisors did not want to engage in this area of supervision, and did not appear to believe that this is a proper job for a primary school supervisor. In addition to this, as was stated in the results and discussion section it appeared that the approximate number of teachers per supervisor, as observed by supervisors, in supervision areas was between 100 and 150, compatible with the national average of 133. The findings of the study also suggested that each supervisor could devote only less than two days of his/her time for each teacher. Moreover, when the amount of unavoidable time which every supervisor had to spend for unproductive but required duties, such as transportation, writing up of reports, etc. considered, it was clear that this amount of time was simply not enough to perform supervisory duties, even at their most basic. Therefore, it would be quite sensible if the duty of supervising private driving licence schools was taken away from primary school supervisors. This could give supervisor the opportunity to spare a little more time to their primary school teachers.

Another striking finding was on the proposition “supervisors may perform their investigation roles together with their advice and guidance roles”. The findings on this proposition suggested that, interestingly, nearly half of the supervisors reported that they either generally or strongly ‘disagreed’ with the proposition. However, the vast majority of the directors ‘agreed’ with the proposition either generally or strongly. Therefore, it can generally be concluded that although, the directors claimed that supervisors might
perform their investigation roles along with their advice and guidance roles, a substantial proportion of the supervisors did not think so. Apparently, those supervisors who disagreed with the proposition thought that those roles were contradictory and could not go together.

Whether the focus of supervision should move away from the assessment of individual teachers to the school as a whole should be considered and its possible implications discussed and examined by educationalists and the ministry. It does seem to us that such a change in the nature of supervision could ease the tension between supervisors and teachers, as this could bring psychological relief for teachers, since the attention of supervisors will be spread across the whole school staff. Currently, in the Turkish primary education system, the practices of primary school supervisors are depicted as occasions which make teachers uneasy about them.

As Harris (1989, p.68) stated, while work in specific subject areas can involve the supervisor in contributing to his/her specialist interest, part of the role can be concerned with reinforcing the whole school and a whole curriculum review and development process. It is the supervisor’s role to encourage the school to define what the curriculum is now, to challenge the status quo and to define what programme should be provided. The supervisor have to assist the school in choosing a starting point from which to review current provision; to assist with regular communication with all staff as to what progress has been made and what short and long term goals the school has in mind. Some of the issues which emerge after an initial review can be subject specific, some can be cross curricular, some can be organisation and management matters and some can be related to community concerns.

Harris (1989, p.69) reported that work in Northern Ireland suggested that part of the role of the inspector as external agent was to monitor and honestly evaluate for school, through its principal, the stage which had been reached. He also reported that in addition the regular involvement of inspectors and board officers in meetings, courses and conferences with teachers in their own schools gave such development a measure of central approbation which some teachers valued. It was a tangible demonstration of three sections of educational personnel working in harmony for the best interests of pupils, he added. He, then, concluded that the sense of belonging to something which had a national dimension enhanced the school’s own image and to some extent the regular presence of an inspector was physical evidence of that partnership.
Chapter 5: The Overall Conclusions and Recommendations

As was stated in the results and discussion section, an open-ended question was added to allow the respondents to state their own barriers and recommendations on the implementation of educational innovations. A substantial number of the respondents did add some barriers and/or recommendations. For instance, approximately one-fifth of the teachers who had stated any additional barrier and/or recommendation reported that carrying out a supervision activity which was weighted in favour of its control and assessment aspects prevented educational innovations from being implemented. In other words, the heavy control function of supervisors was one of the main barriers to the innovations. In association with this barrier, those teachers, therefore, recommended that supervisors should carry out their supervisory activities by stressing the help, guidance and advice dimensions of their roles. Indeed, two of the supervisors reported that the desire to practice the control function of their roles by some of the supervisors also prevented them from being more innovative in their jobs.

Another controversial issue that was mentioned by some of the supervisors and the teachers was related to the political pressure on supervisors. Eleven teachers and three supervisors reported that the existence of political pressure coming from different sources on supervisors was preventing them from sustaining their job in a neutral manner and preventing them performing their jobs properly.

Some of the other issues which were raised by the supervisors are as follows; Three of the supervisors recommended that supervisors should be given courses on computer aided education to be more effective on the implementation of educational innovations. In addition to this, four of the supervisors recommended that primary school supervisors should be sent abroad to follow new developments in their fields. These recommendations need to be considered, examined and tried to be met.

Another important issue raised by the supervisors is the problem of transportation in some regions. Some supervisors reported that the lack of transportation means in their regions was one of the main obstacles for the implementation of educational innovations, and therefore should be addressed. There is a sense from the perceptions and responses of the supervisors that they have some transportation difficulties, especially in remote rural areas. Although most of the problems are related to the inappropriateness of the road and climate conditions, it is obvious from the reported complaints there is an element of the lack of transportation vehicles provided by the Ministry. If this problem is addressed, the supervisors can save a considerable amount of time and can devote it for their teachers.
Chapter 5: The Overall Conclusions and Recommendations

In conclusion, supporting school improvement provides the supervisor with a role which is complex, challenging and exhausting. The supervisor should facilitate a substantial range of in-service for all teachers; promote sound models of curriculum review and development; support the headteacher and senior management in the development of the programme; maintain an objective, informed, national perspective on all aspects of the programme; develop methods of assisting teachers to assess what and how they teach and how children learn; provide, where appropriate, sound models of good practice from other schools; liaise between the school and other educational projects to ensure compatibility of approach; assist in the production of resources and teaching units; acknowledge the rate of change which a school can accept; constantly direct the staff to the main task of changing how and what pupils experience in classroom and provide a 'focus of responsibility' for the partnership among teachers, head teachers, directors of education and other supervisors. It is hoped that such a partnership can be effective in supporting school improvement.

As Reynolds and Packer (1992, p.178-179) set out their arguments persuasively, in their conclusive study of School Effectiveness and School Improvement in the 1990's, we need to look in detail at the cultural and informal world of values, attitudes and perceptions and also the complicated web of personal relationships as those dimensions would determine a school's effectiveness or ineffectiveness. In the future, supervisors must give required credit to these aspects of education in their supervisory activities. For this purpose, they must arrange and organise necessary conditions for well-thought and well-prepared atmosphere for teachers, headteachers, and directors of education. It is the researcher's genuine belief that the difference between successful and unsuccessful school systems will most probably be determined by those mentioned aspects of education in the future. In other words, having these aspects (i.e. giving importance to them, or vice versa) will be a litmus test of schools and school systems.

Finally, it is important to appreciate and to acknowledge what has been achieved by primary school supervisors, especially bearing in mind the inappropriateness and undesirability of the conditions they experienced over the years. Their hard-won achievements must be credited. Having said that it must also be stressed here that with regard to the findings of this study, there appears a long way to go for the successful implementation of educational innovations and changes in most (if not all) of the primary schools in Turkey.
To increase the quality of education and to improve the degree of implementing educational innovations it is necessary to provide supervisors and teachers with better job satisfaction, more in-service training and well planned and implemented career development prospects. Supervisors must show their respects to teachers' ideas and opinions about the initiation and the implementation of educational changes. An "As long as I am the supervisors here, this is the way we will do it" approach can irritate teachers and stops any successful appraisal of problems. It can also produce results that the best solutions may never be applied to situations and successful practices never be reached.

The years of careful research and the libraries of writing in the field suggest that the successful implementation of educational innovations requires team work, rather than sporadic initiatives. Therefore, three groups of key professional educationalists, namely provincial directors of education, primary school supervisors and primary school teachers in the Turkish primary education system, can unite their efforts and work together in renewing educational practices for improved and effective primary schools.

CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE STUDY

It can be argued that, although the study has comprehended much of the activities originally planned, apparently there remains some aspects not covered fully. For example, conducting interviews with provincial directors of education, primary school supervisors and primary school teachers, would undoubtedly have added to the study.

Similarly, an extensive examination of relevant accessible formal and informal documents, particularly supervision reports prepared by supervisors and, diaries of supervisors and teachers, etc. would be helpful.

In addition to these, primary school headteachers, as an important figure in all kind of educational activities, could be included in the study as the fourth group, and their views about the supervision of their schools could be utilised to obtain more comprehensive results.

Moreover, a detailed observation of the work activities of primary school supervisors could be provided from which a more detailed analysis of the activities related to the initiation and implementation of educational innovations could be made.

It would also be better if it was possible to visit all of the ten provinces and to apply all the questionnaires by the researcher personally. By this way, it would be possible to see the
actual conditions that the respondents were experiencing in order to reach more realistic conclusions, as well as having a return of 100 percent with securing every respondent to complete and return the questionnaire.

As was mentioned in the results and discussion section, the Ministry of National Education had started to appoint teachers who graduated from the educational administration and supervision departments of the universities as assistant primary school supervisors, starting in 1990-91. The researcher wishes the ministry had started earlier this practice. If it had, it would be possible to compare these supervisors with the others to see whether there existed differences in supervisory practices and opinions. However, this opportunity will be available in the very near future, and such a study would be valuable. It would be the comparison between the old and the new really.

As was stated earlier, one of the main findings of the study (perhaps the most striking one) was the low level of the innovative behaviours exhibited by the supervisors both in quality and quantity. The results of the study suggested that twenty of the twenty-one pre-defined would-be innovative behaviours of supervisors related to the initiation and the implementation of educational innovations were not exhibited at the expected or anticipated level, according to the responses of the vast majority of the teachers.

Since today’s supervisors are required to be equipped with the necessary skills, expertise and proficiencies to lead teachers to have more effective schools through sound educational innovations both in quality and quantity when and where necessary, they must be educated and trained in pre-service education at first and, then, in in-service education programs. Therefore, research can is necessary for the purpose of forming education programs and curriculum materials to be utilised in such programs.
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Appendix I: Questionnaires

DATA GATHERING FORM
FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL SUPERVISORS

1. Please indicate your age.
   - [ ] 30 or below
   - [ ] 31-40
   - [ ] 41-50
   - [ ] 51 or more

2. Please indicate your sex.
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

3. Please indicate the last school you graduated from.
   - [ ] 3 Year Education Institute
   - [ ] 4 Year Education Institute
   - [ ] Supervisor Formation Program
   - [ ] University
   - [ ] Higher Degree (Master and/or Ph.D).
   - [ ] Other. Please specify: ....................................

4. Please indicate how long you have been working as an educator [including teaching and
administering]
   - [ ] 10 years or less
   - [ ] 11-15
   - [ ] 16-20
   - [ ] 21-25
   - [ ] 26 or more

5. Please indicate how long you have been working as a primary school supervisor.
   - [ ] 5 years or less
   - [ ] 6-10
   - [ ] 11-15
   - [ ] 16-20
   - [ ] 21 or more

6. Please indicate how many supervisors were included in your supervision group within 1989-90
   education year.
   - [ ] me alone
   - [ ] 2
   - [ ] 3
   - [ ] 4
   - [ ] 5
   - [ ] 6 or more
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7. Please indicate the approximate numbers of teachers per supervisor in your supervision area.

[ ] 50 or less
[ ] 51-75
[ ] 76-100
[ ] 101-125
[ ] 126-150
[ ] 151-175
[ ] 176 or more

8. Please indicate how many teachers you have supervised within 1989-90 education year.

[ ] less than 20
[ ] 20-50
[ ] 51-100
[ ] 101-150
[ ] more than 151

9. Please indicate how many times you have attended seminars and/or in-service training programs related to educational innovations in your supervisory career.

[ ] none
[ ] 1
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5 or more

10. Please indicate the approximate percentage of time that you spend for each one of the supervisory responsibilities of your job listed below.

Advice, guidance and on-the-job training [......%]
Inspection and assessment [......%]
Examination [......%]
Investigation [......%]
Total [ 100 %]

11. Please indicate the approximate percentage of time that you would like to spend for each one of the supervisory responsibilities of your job listed below.

Advice, guidance and on-the-job training [......%]
Inspection and assessment [......%]
Examination [......%]
Investigation [......%]
Total [ 100 %]

12. Please indicate the approximate percentage of time that you spend for each one of the supervision areas of your job.

State Schools [Pre-school+primary] [......%]
Private Schools [pre-school+primary] [......%]
Private Driving Licence Schools [......%]
Total [ 100 %]
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13. Please indicate the approximate percentage of time that you would like to spend for each one of the supervision areas of your job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Areas</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Schools (Pre-school+Primary)</td>
<td>[________%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Schools (Pre-school+Primary)</td>
<td>[________%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Driving Licence Schools</td>
<td>[________%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>[100%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I would describe the last supervision of 1989-90 education year as mainly:

**TICK APPROPRIATE DESCRIPTION**
(ONLY ONE PLEASE)

- [ ] to meet staff as a group to inform them about administrative laws
  rules and procedures which will be carried out in the schools
- [ ] to discuss curriculum generally
- [ ] to discuss a general, personal matter
- [ ] to discuss and offer teachers support over a specific problem
- [ ] to evaluate teachers’ teaching performances
- [ ] to discuss a specific innovation
- [ ] to attend a school event
- [ ] other. Please specify: ........................................................

15. I would say that the last supervision of 1989-90 education year which I made was

- [ ] definitely helpful
- [ ] generally helpful
- [ ] no idea
- [ ] very little help
- [ ] no help at all
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16. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements

(CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

| (a) Supervisors should spend more time helping teachers to assess their classroom performance. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (b) The feedback to teachers that comes from supervisors is of considerable use in the development of schools. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (c) Supervisors are very important in helping to revitalise teachers professionally. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (d) Supervision of our schools make no difference in the end to their performance. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (e) Supervisors may perform their investigation roles together with their advice and guidance roles. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (f) Our schools are becoming increasingly centralized. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (g) Our schools should have more autonomy. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (h) Supervisors should have a considerable say in the promotion of teachers. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (i) Having an innovative behaviour for a supervisor is one of the main aspects of his/her role. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| (j) Supervisors are showing more and more innovative behaviour year by year. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
Appendix I: Questionnaires

SECTION II

IN THIS SECTION:
Each question has two or more items. Please tick YES or NO for item (a) for each question. If your answer is YES for item (a) then please tick appropriate box stated in item (b) and item (c). If your answer is NO for the first item [item (a)] of any question, move on straight to the [item (a) of] next question.

In answering the questions please consider the supervisions you have done WITHIN THE LAST FIVE YEARS of your supervision profession.

1. a) Did you arrange any meeting(s) among the teachers of different primary schools for the purpose of discussing and sharing of new ideas?
   [ ] YES [ ] NO
   b) How many times?
      [ ] Only one time
      [ ] 2-3 times
      [ ] 4-6 times
      [ ] 7-9 times
      [ ] 10 or more times

2. a) Have you ever paired up two teachers to observe and then to discuss together themselves teaching performances in the classroom?
   [ ] YES [ ] NO
   b) For about how many of these teachers whom you supervised have you done this?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

3. a) Did you ask your teachers about their in-service training needs?
   [ ] YES [ ] NO
   b) For about how many of these teachers whom you supervised did you ask?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them
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4. a) Have you ever requested teachers to evaluate themselves orally?
   [ ] YES  [ ] NO

   b) How many of them were requested?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

5. a) Have you ever given an example lecture to show how effectively it can be proceeded?
   [ ] YES  [ ] NO

   b) For about how many of these teachers whom you supervised did you give an example lecture?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

6. a) Have you ever asked teachers’ ideas and opinions about the implementation process of any specific innovation?
   [ ] YES  [ ] NO

   b) How many teachers were asked?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

7. a) Have you ever organized meeting(s) with teachers about the teaching methods which could be applied to any individual pupil or group of pupils whose learning capacities are significantly lower or higher than their schoolmates?
   [ ] YES  [ ] NO

   b) How many of the teachers were involved in such meetings?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them
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8. a) Have you ever attended any workshop session(s) with teachers about the implementation of an innovation?
   [ ] YES  [ ] NO
   b) How many teachers involved in such session(s)?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

9. a) Have you ever given any newly published document(s) to the teachers related to teaching learning activities in primary schools?
   [ ] YES  [ ] NO
   b) How many teachers were given?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

10. a) Have you ever offered any kind of proposal(s) for in-service training needs of teachers?
    [ ] YES  [ ] NO
    b) To how many teachers have you offered this?
       [ ] only one or two of them
       [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
       [ ] nearly half of them
       [ ] most of them
       [ ] all of them

11. a) Have you ever done preobservation conference with the teacher you were going to observe in the classroom?
    [ ] YES  [ ] NO
    b) With how many teachers have you done such preobservation conferences
       [ ] only one or two of them
       [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
       [ ] nearly half of them
       [ ] most of them
       [ ] all of them
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c) I would say that each one of these preobservation conferences lasted approximately

- [ ] less than 5 minutes
- [ ] 5-15 minutes
- [ ] 16-30 minutes
- [ ] 31-45 minutes
- [ ] more than 45 minutes

12. a) Have you ever done postobservation conference with the teacher you have observed in the classroom?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO

b) With how many teachers have you done such postobservation conferences?

- [ ] only one or two of them
- [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
- [ ] nearly half of them
- [ ] most of them
- [ ] all of them

c) I would say that each one of these postobservation conferences lasted approximately

- [ ] less than 5 minutes
- [ ] 5-15 minutes
- [ ] 16-30 minutes
- [ ] 31-45 minutes
- [ ] more than 45 minutes

13. a) Have you ever done both preobservation and postobservation conferences before and after your observations?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO

b) With how many teachers have you done both preobservation and postobservation conferences?

- [ ] only one or two of them
- [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
- [ ] nearly half of them
- [ ] most of them
- [ ] all of them

c) I would say that the total time for both observation conferences was approximately?

- [ ] less than 15 minutes
- [ ] 15-30 minutes
- [ ] 31-45 minutes
- [ ] 46-60 minutes
- [ ] more than 60 minutes
14. a) Have you ever brought any leaflets and/or any other kind(s) of information or data to your teachers about the outcome of any innovation(s) which were successfully implemented in different schools?
   [ ] YES  [ ] NO

   b) To how many teachers have you brought such materials?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

   c) I would say that these leaflets/data were about
      [ ] only 1 innovation
      [ ] 2 innovations
      [ ] 3 innovations
      [ ] 4 innovations
      [ ] 5 or more innovations

15. a) Have you ever recommended or helped teachers and/or school to get any aid or help of any person(s) or agency for the improvement of school libraries?
   [ ] YES  [ ] NO

   b) To how many schools have you recommended or helped for this purpose?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

   c) How many school libraries have got such aids, resulting from your efforts?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

16. a) Have you ever made an attempt to have any kind of communication channels (e.g. newspapers, magazines, documents, local radio stations etc.) between schools and their local communities?
   [ ] YES  [ ] NO
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b) How many times have you done this?

[ ] 1-2 times
[ ] 3-6 times
[ ] 7-10 times
[ ] 11-14 times
[ ] 15 or more times

17. a) Have you ever organised meeting(s) between schools and their local communities to enable teachers and administrators to explain the aims of the school to the parents?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

b) How many schools have been involved in these meetings?

[ ] only one or two of them
[ ] fewer than a quarter of them
[ ] nearly half of them
[ ] most of them
[ ] all of them

18. a) Have you ever helped to arrange any sociocultural events (e.g. musicals, dances, drama activities, etc.) performed or participated by pupils?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

b) How many times have such occasions taken place?

[ ] 1-2 times
[ ] 3-6 times
[ ] 7-10 times
[ ] 11-14 times
[ ] 15 or more times

19. a) Have you ever organised meeting(s) among teachers, local administrators and parents about the future life of the pupils?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

b) How many times have such meetings taken place?

[ ] 1-2 times
[ ] 3-6 times
[ ] 7-10 times
[ ] 11-14 times
[ ] 15 or more times
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20. a) Have you ever invited or recommended teachers to invite any peripatetic teacher (subject specialist or volunteer) in any subject (e.g. local history, local geography, local industry, e.t.c) to their classroom?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

b) To how many teachers did you recommend this?

[ ] only one or two of them
[ ] fewer than a quarter of them
[ ] nearly half of them
[ ] most of them
[ ] all of them

21. a) Have you ever arranged or recommended teachers to arrange meetings with the parents to inform them to improve the readiness of their children before entering primary schools?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

b) How many teachers were recommended to do so?

[ ] only one or two of them
[ ] fewer than a quarter of them
[ ] nearly half of them
[ ] most of them
[ ] all of them
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SECTION III

IN THIS SECTION:

Listed below are a number of items which could be BARRIERS to the implementation of innovations in primary schools. From your own experience, please indicate the extend to which you agree or disagree that they have been barriers to the implementation of innovations in your own instances.

Please circle ONLY ONE number for each item.

1. Lack of information given by the supervisor about implementation of the innovations.
2. Unavailability of necessary materials for the implementation of the innovations.
3. Lack of performances of supervisors to show the implementation of the innovations.
4. Lack of performances of the teachers for the implementation of the innovations.
5. Enthusiastic desires of supervisors for immediate outcomes of newly implemented innovations.
6. Enthusiastic desires of teachers for immediate outcomes of newly implemented innovations.
7. Lack of inservice training programs for supervisors about the implementation process of educational innovations.
8. Lack of inservice training programs for teachers about the implementation process of educational innovations.
9. The existence of a general belief among the supervisors that their supervisory roles do not include the implementation of educational innovations.
10. Lack of authority delegated to supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations.
11. Lack of sufficient scientific publications on educational innovations for supervisors, teachers and school administrators.
12. Lack of credibility given to the experiences of supervisors, teachers and school administrators on the implementation process of educational innovations

13. Lack of financial support allocated to the primary schools for the implementation of educational innovations.

14. Lack of financial support allocated to teachers to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations.

15. Lack of financial support allocated to supervisors to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations.

16. Lack of moral support given to teachers to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations.

17. Lack of moral support given to supervisors to motivate them for the implementation of educational innovations.

18. If you think of any other barrier(s) please specify in detail in the space provided below;
### Appendix I: Questionnaires

#### SECTION IV

**IN THIS SECTION:**

Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each one of the following items which could be a RECOMMENDATION to improve the degree of implementation of educational innovations in primary schools. Please circle ONLY ONE number for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The ratio of the numbers of the supervisors to the teachers should be increased up to, at least, 1/50.</td>
<td>1. The ratio of the numbers of the supervisors to the teachers should be increased up to, at least, 1/50.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The numbers and duration of school visits done by supervisors and time allocated per teacher should be increased.</td>
<td>2. The numbers and duration of school visits done by supervisors and time allocated per teacher should be increased.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In-service training programs should be arranged for both supervisors and teachers for the improvement of the implementation of educational innovations.</td>
<td>3. In-service training programs should be arranged for both supervisors and teachers for the improvement of the implementation of educational innovations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The amount of authority delegated to supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations should be increased.</td>
<td>4. The amount of authority delegated to supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations should be increased.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Financial support allocated to primary schools for educational innovations should be increased.</td>
<td>5. Financial support allocated to primary schools for educational innovations should be increased.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. More credit should be given to the practices, ideas and suggestions revealed by supervisors, teachers and school administrators on the implementation process of educational innovations.</td>
<td>6. More credit should be given to the practices, ideas and suggestions revealed by supervisors, teachers and school administrators on the implementation process of educational innovations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. New arrangements should be introduced to enable supervisors, teachers and school administrators to get more scientific publications on educational innovations.</td>
<td>7. New arrangements should be introduced to enable supervisors, teachers and school administrators to get more scientific publications on educational innovations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New financial support arrangements should be introduced to motivate teachers for the implementation of educational innovations.</td>
<td>8. New financial support arrangements should be introduced to motivate teachers for the implementation of educational innovations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. New financial support arrangements should be introduced to motivate supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations.</td>
<td>9. New financial support arrangements should be introduced to motivate supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. New mental support arrangements should be introduced to motivate teachers for the implementation of educational innovations.</td>
<td>10. New mental support arrangements should be introduced to motivate teachers for the implementation of educational innovations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. New mental support arrangements should be introduced to motivate supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations.</td>
<td>11. New mental support arrangements should be introduced to motivate supervisors for the implementation of educational innovations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. If you think of any other recommendation(s) please specify in detail in the space provided below;

**THANK YOU**
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DATA GATHERING FORM
FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

1. Please indicate the type of the area in which you work:
   [ ] city centre
   [ ] town centre
   [ ] village

Please indicate your sex
   [ ] male
   [ ] female

3. Please indicate your age
   [ ] 25 or less
   [ ] 26-35
   [ ] 36-45
   [ ] 46 or more

4. Please indicate the last school you graduated from
   [ ] 4 Year Teachers' School
   [ ] 3 Year Teachers' School
   [ ] 2 Year Education Institute
   [ ] 3 or 4 Year Education Institute
   [ ] Higher Education (including Open University)
   [ ] Other. Please specify: ........................................

5. Please indicate how many years you have been working as a primary school teacher
   [ ] 5 years or less
   [ ] 6-10 years
   [ ] 11-15 years
   [ ] 16-20 years
   [ ] 21-25 years
   [ ] 26 or more years

6. Please indicate how many times you have been supervised within 1989-90 education year
   [ ] none
   [ ] 1
   [ ] 2
   [ ] 3
   [ ] 4 or more
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7. Please assess the last supervision you had in 1989-90 education year (if you had not, the previous one)

**TICK APPROPRIATE DESCRIPTION**

(ONLY ONE PLEASE)

I would describe it as mainly;

[ ] to meet staff as a group to inform them about administrative laws
  rules and procedures which will be carried out in the schools
[ ] to discuss curriculum generally
[ ] to discuss a general, personal matter
[ ] to discuss and offer teachers support over a specific problem
[ ] to evaluate teachers' teaching performances
[ ] to discuss a specific innovation
[ ] to attend a school event
[ ] other. Please specify: ...........................................................

8. I would say that the last supervision of 1989-90 education year which I had, was;

[ ] definitely helpful
[ ] generally helpful
[ ] no idea
[ ] very little help
[ ] no help at all
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9. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements (CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Supervisors should spend more time helping teachers to assess their classroom performance.</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>GENERALLY AGREE</th>
<th>NO IDEA</th>
<th>GENERALLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) The feedback to teachers that comes from supervisors is of considerable use in the development of schools.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Supervisors are very important in helping to revitalise teachers professionally.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Supervision of our schools make no difference in the end to their performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Supervisors may perform their investigation roles together with their advice and guidance roles.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Our schools are becoming increasingly centralized.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Our schools should have more autonomy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Supervisors should have a considerable say in the promotion of teachers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Having an innovative behaviour for a supervisor is one of the main aspects of his / her role.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Supervisors are showing more and more innovative behaviour year by year.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION II

IN THIS SECTION;

Each question has two or more items. Please tick YES or NO for item (a) for each question. If your answer is YES for item (a) then please tick appropriate box stated in item (b) and item (c). If your answer is NO for the first item [item (a)] of any question, move on straight to the [item (a) of] next question.

In answering the questions please consider the supervisions you have had WITHIN THE LAST FIVE YEARS of your teaching profession

1. a) Did you attend any meeting with your colleagues from other schools arranged by your supervisors for the purpose of discussing and sharing of new ideas?
   [ ] YES [ ] NO
   b) How many times have you attended?
      [ ] only one time
      [ ] 2 times
      [ ] 3 times
      [ ] 4 times
      [ ] 5 or more times

2. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) request you to pair up with one of your colleagues to observe and then discuss together your teaching performances in the classroom?
    [ ] YES [ ] NO
    b) How many of them requested this
       [ ] only one of them
       [ ] two of them
       [ ] three of them
       [ ] four of them
       [ ] five or more of them

3. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) ask about your inservice training needs?
    [ ] YES [ ] NO
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4. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) request you to evaluate yourself orally?
   [ ] YES [ ] NO
   b) How many of them did this?
      [ ] only one of them
      [ ] two of them
      [ ] three of them
      [ ] four of them
      [ ] five or more of them
   c) How many times has this been requested?
      [ ] only one time
      [ ] 2 times
      [ ] 3 times
      [ ] 4 times
      [ ] 5 or more times

5. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) give an example lecture to show how effectively it can be proceeded?
   [ ] YES [ ] NO
   b) How many of them did this?
      [ ] only one of them
      [ ] two of them
      [ ] three of them
      [ ] four of them
      [ ] five or more of them

6. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) ask your ideas and opinions about the implementation process of any specific innovation?
   [ ] YES [ ] NO
   b) How many of them did this?
      [ ] only one of them
      [ ] two of them
      [ ] three of them
      [ ] four of them
      [ ] five or more of them
   c) How many times have you had a chance to mention your ideas?
      [ ] only one time
      [ ] 2 times
      [ ] 3 times
      [ ] 4 times
      [ ] 5 or more times
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7. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) organise meetings with you and/or with your colleagues about the teaching methods which could be applied to any individual pupil or group of pupils whose learning capacities and speeds are significantly lower or higher than their schoolmates?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

b) How many of them did this?

[ ] only one of them
[ ] two of them
[ ] three of them
[ ] four of them
[ ] five or more of them

8. a) Did any of your supervisors attend any workshop sessions with you and your colleagues about the implementation of any innovation?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

b) How many of them attended such sessions?

[ ] only one of them
[ ] two of them
[ ] three of them
[ ] four of them
[ ] five or more of them

c) How many times have these sessions taken place?

[ ] only one time
[ ] 2 times
[ ] 3 times
[ ] 4 times
[ ] 5 or more times

9. a) Did any of your supervisors bring any newly published documents related to teaching learning activities in primary schools?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

b) How many of them did this?

[ ] only one of them
[ ] two of them
[ ] three of them
[ ] four of them
[ ] five or more of them
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10. a) Did any of your supervisors offer any kind of proposal(s) for inservice training needs of teachers in your school?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

b) How many of them offered this?

[ ] only one of them
[ ] two of them
[ ] three of them
[ ] four of them
[ ] five or more of them

c) I would say that proposals were

[ ] definitely helpful
[ ] generally helpful
[ ] no idea
[ ] very little help
[ ] no help at all

11. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) have a pre-observation conference about the observation(s) which you were going to face in your classroom?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

b) How many of them did this?

[ ] only one of them
[ ] two of them
[ ] three of them
[ ] four of them
[ ] five or more of them

c) I would say that each one of these pre-observation conferences lasted approximately

[ ] less than 5 minutes
[ ] 5-15 minutes
[ ] 16-30 minutes
[ ] 31-45 minutes
[ ] more than 45 minutes

d) I would say that these conferences were

[ ] definitely helpful
[ ] generally helpful
[ ] no idea
[ ] very little help
[ ] no help at all
12. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) have a post-observation conference after the observation you had?  
[ ] YES    [ ] NO

b) How many of them did this?
[ ] only one of them
[ ] two of them
[ ] three of them
[ ] four of them
[ ] five or more of them

c) I would say that each one of these post-observation conferences lasted approximately
[ ] less than 5 minutes
[ ] 5-15 minutes
[ ] 16-30 minutes
[ ] 31-45 minutes
[ ] more than 45 minutes

d) I would say that these conferences were
[ ] definitely helpful
[ ] generally helpful
[ ] no idea
[ ] very little help
[ ] no help at all

13. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) do both pre-observation and post-observation conferences before and after your observations?  
[ ] YES    [ ] NO

b) How many of them had both pre-observation and post-observation conferences?
[ ] only one of them
[ ] two of them
[ ] three of them
[ ] four of them
[ ] five or more of them

c) I would say that the total time for both observations was approximately
[ ] less than 15 minutes
[ ] 15-30 minutes
[ ] 31-45 minutes
[ ] 46-60 minutes
[ ] more than 60 minutes

d) I would say that these conferences were
[ ] definitely helpful
[ ] generally helpful
[ ] no idea
[ ] very little help
[ ] no help at all
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14. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) bring leaflets and/or any other kind(s) of information or data to you or to your colleagues about the outcomes of any innovation which were successfully implemented in different schools?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

b) How many of them brought them?

[ ] only one of them
[ ] two of them
[ ] three of them
[ ] four of them
[ ] five or more of them

c) I would say that I have seen these kinds of leaflets/data about

[ ] only one innovation
[ ] two innovations
[ ] three innovations
[ ] four innovations
[ ] five or more innovations

15. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) get any aid of any person(s) or agency for the improvement of the school library?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

b) How many of them have got such kinds of aid?

[ ] only one of them
[ ] two of them
[ ] three of them
[ ] four of them
[ ] five or more of them

16. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) make an attempt to have any kind of communication channels (e.g. newspapers, magazines, documents, local radio stations, etc.) between your school and local community?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

b) How many of them have made this attempt?

[ ] only one of them
[ ] two of them
[ ] three of them
[ ] four of them
[ ] five or more of them

c) I would say that these attempts were

[ ] definitely helpful
[ ] generally helpful
[ ] no idea
[ ] very little help
[ ] no help at all
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17. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) organize any meeting with parents and/or local community to enable teachers and administrators to explain the aims of the school to them?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

b) How many of your supervisor(s) did this?

[ ] only one of them  
[ ] two of them  
[ ] three of them  
[ ] four of them  
[ ] five or more of them  

c) How many such kind of meetings have you experienced?

[ ] only one  
[ ] two  
[ ] three  
[ ] four  
[ ] five or more

18. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) arrange (or help to arrange) any socio-cultural events (e.g. musicals, dances, drama activities, trips, etc.) performed by school children?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

b) How many of them did this

[ ] only one of them  
[ ] two of them  
[ ] three of them  
[ ] four of them  
[ ] five or more of them  

19. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) organise meeting(s) among teachers, local administrators and parents about the future life of the pupils?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

b) How many of your supervisors have organised such kind of meetings?

[ ] only one of them  
[ ] two of them  
[ ] three of them  
[ ] four of them  
[ ] five or more of them

20. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) invite or recommend you to invite any peripatetic teacher (subject specialist or volunteer) in any subject (e.g. local history, local geography, local industry, etc.) to your classroom?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

b) How many of them did this?

[ ] only one of them  
[ ] two of them  
[ ] three of them  
[ ] four of them  
[ ] five or more of them
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21. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) arrange or recommend you to arrange any meeting(s) with parents to inform them to improve the readiness of their children before entering primary school?
   [ ] YES [ ] NO

   b) How many of them did this?
      [ ] only one of them
      [ ] two of them
      [ ] three of them
      [ ] four of them
      [ ] five or more of them
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BOTH OF SECTION III AND SECTION IV ARE IDENTICAL TO
THE SAME NAMED SECTIONS OF THE SUPERVISORS’ QUESTIONNAIRE
Appendix I: Questionnaires

DATA GATHERING FORM
FOR PROVINCIAL DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION

1. Please indicate your age
   [ ] 30 or below
   [ ] 31-40
   [ ] 41-50
   [ ] 51-60
   [ ] 61-65

2. Please indicate your sex
   [ ] male
   [ ] female

3. Please indicate the last school you graduated from
   [ ] 2 Year Education Institute
   [ ] 3 Year Education Institute
   [ ] 4 Year Education Institute
   [ ] University
   [ ] Higher Degree (Master and/or Ph.D)
   [ ] Other. Please specify: ...........................................

4. Please indicate how long you have been working as provincial director of education
   [ ] 2 years or less
   [ ] 3-6 years
   [ ] 7-10 years
   [ ] 11-14 years
   [ ] 15 years or more

5. Please indicate how many years you worked as a primary education supervisor
   [ ] none
   [ ] 5 years or less
   [ ] 6-10 years
   [ ] 11-15 years
   [ ] 16 years or more

6. Please indicate how long you have been working as an educator (including teaching and administering)
   [ ] 10 years or less
   [ ] 11-15 years
   [ ] 16-20 years
   [ ] 21-25 years
   [ ] 26 years or more
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7. According to the most recent supervision reports submitted to me, I would say that primary school supervisions in this province were mainly:

**TICK APPROPRIATE DESCRIPTION**

(ONLY ONE PLEASE)

- [ ] to meet staff as a group to inform them about administrative laws, rules and procedures which will be carried out in the schools
- [ ] to discuss curriculum generally
- [ ] to discuss a general, personal matter
- [ ] to discuss and offer teachers support over a specific problem
- [ ] to evaluate teachers’ teaching performances
- [ ] to discuss a specific innovation
- [ ] to attend a school event
- [ ] other. Please specify: ........................................................

8. According to the most recent supervision reports submitted to me, I would say that primary school supervisions in this province were:

- [ ] definitely helpful
- [ ] generally helpful
- [ ] no idea
- [ ] very little help
- [ ] no help at all
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9. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Supervisors should spend more time helping teachers to assess their classroom performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The feedback to teachers that comes from supervisors is of considerable use in the development of schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Supervisors are very important in helping to revitalise teachers professionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Supervision of our schools makes no difference in the end to their performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Supervisors may perform their investigation roles together with their advice and guidance roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Our schools are becoming increasingly centralized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Our schools should have more autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Supervisors should have a considerable say in the promotion of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Having an innovative behaviour for a supervisor is one of the main aspects of his/her role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Supervisors are showing more and more innovative behaviour year by year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION II

IN THIS SECTION;

Each question has two or more items. Please tick YES or NO for item (a) for each question. If your answer is YES for item (a) then please tick appropriate box stated in item (b) and item (c). If your answer is NO for the first item [item (a)] of any question, move on straight to the [item (a) of] next question.

In answering the questions please consider the supervision reports submitted to you and meetings with primary school supervisors in your province WITHIN THE LAST FIVE YEARS as the provincial director of education.

1. a) Did any of your primary school supervisor(s) recommend any curriculum revision in your province?
   [ ] YES [ ] NO
   b) How many of your supervisors have done this?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them
   c) I would say that recommendations were;
      [ ] definitely helpful
      [ ] generally helpful
      [ ] no idea
      [ ] very little help
      [ ] no help at all

2. a) Did any of your primary school supervisor(s) recommend any remedial coaching for slow learning pupils?
   [ ] YES [ ] NO
   b) How many of your supervisors have done this?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them
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3. a) Did any of your primary school supervisor(s) bring any recommendation(s) on measurement of academic achievement of pupils which seemed to you reasonable?
   [ ] YES  |  [ ] NO
   b) How many of your supervisors have done this?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

4. a) Did any of your primary school supervisor(s) bring any recommendation about in-service training needs of teachers?
    [ ] YES  |  [ ] NO
    b) How many of them have done this?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

5. a) Have you ever been requested by any of your supervisor(s) for any help in providing newly published document(s) related to teaching and learning activities in primary schools?
     [ ] YES  |  [ ] NO
     b) How many of them did this?
        [ ] only one or two of them
        [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
        [ ] nearly half of them
        [ ] most of them
        [ ] all of them
     c) How many times approximately have you been requested in one academic year?
        [ ] less than 5 times
        [ ] 5-10 times
        [ ] 11-20 times
        [ ] 21-30 times
        [ ] more than 30 times

6. a) Have you ever been requested by any of your supervisor(s) for any help in providing newly published documents related to the implementation of educational innovations in primary schools?
    [ ] YES  |  [ ] NO
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b) How many of them did this?
   [ ] only one or two of them
   [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
   [ ] nearly half of them
   [ ] most of them
   [ ] all of them

c) How many times approximately have you been requested in one academic year?
   [ ] less than 5 times
   [ ] 5-10 times
   [ ] 11-20 times
   [ ] 21-30 times
   [ ] more than 30 times

7. a) Did any of your supervisor(s) give information in their supervision reports about the implementation of any specific educational innovation?
   [ ] YES
   [ ] NO

   b) How many of them did this?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them

   c) How many times approximately have you been faced with such kinds of information in the supervision reports submitted to you in the 1989-90 academic year?
      [ ] less than 5 times
      [ ] 5-10 times
      [ ] 11-20 times
      [ ] 21-30 times
      [ ] more than 30 times

8. a) Considering supervision reports submitted to you and request from your primary school supervisors, do you feel that supervisors are acting reasonably effectively in the implementation of educational innovations in primary schools?
   [ ] YES
   [ ] NO

   b) How many of them?
      [ ] only one or two of them
      [ ] fewer than a quarter of them
      [ ] nearly half of them
      [ ] most of them
      [ ] all of them
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Both of Section III and Section IV are identical to the same named sections of the Supervisors' Questionnaire.
### APPENDIX II

#### Table 4.1: The proportion of supervisors who brought any recommendation about In-service training needs of teachers (according to directors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Directors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4.2: The proportion of supervisors who submitted information in their supervision reports about the implementation of any specific educational innovation (according to directors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Directors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.3: The proportion of supervisors who recommended any remedial coaching for slow learning pupils (according to directors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Directors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.4: The proportion of supervisors who requested their directors for any help in providing newly published documents related to teaching and learning activities (according to directors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Directors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5: The number of request from directors by supervisors in one academic year for any help in providing newly published documents on the implementation of educational innovations (according to directors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF REQUESTS</th>
<th>Number of Directors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 5 times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 30 times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: The proportion of supervisors who recommended any curriculum revision in their provinces (according to directors' response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Directors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.7: The proportion of supervisors who brought any recommendation(s) on the measurement of academic achievement of pupils (according to directors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Directors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.8: The proportion of supervisors who acted reasonably effectively in the implementation of educational innovations in primary schools (according to directors’ response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPORTION OF SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>Number of Directors (N)</th>
<th>Valid Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only one or two of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer than a quarter of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearly half of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9: The number and frequency distribution of the teachers, the supervisors and the directors who stated any additional barrier(s) and/or recommendations through open-ended questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARRIERS and/or RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS</th>
<th>DIRECTORS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The excessive control function of the duty of supervisors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Political pressure coming from different sources on supervisors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The training, selection and appointment problems of supervisors.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The lack of transportation means for supervisors.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The necessity of courses on computer aided education for supervisors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The necessity of sending supervisors abroad to follow new developments in the field</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The ambiguity in the role, authority and responsibility definitions of the supervisors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>