

Assessment of Counselors' Supervision Processes

Ali Ünal¹, Abdullah Sürücü¹ & Mustafa Yavuz¹

¹ Ahmet Kelesoglu Education Faculty, Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya, Turkey

Correspondence: Ali Unal, Ahmet Kelesoglu Education Faculty, Necmettin Erbakan University, Meram, Konya, Turkey. Tel: 90-332-323-8220. E-mail: aliunal@konya@edu.tr

Received: October 22, 2012 Accepted: November 15, 2012 Online Published: December 11, 2012

doi:10.5539/ies.v6n1p184

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n1p184>

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate elementary and high school counselors' supervision processes and efficiency of their supervision. The interview method was used as it was thought to be better for realizing the aim of the study. The study group was composed of ten counselors who were chosen through purposeful sampling method. Data were collected via an interview form prepared for this study and analyzed using the descriptive analysis method. Findings were grouped under nine themes: informed supervision, meeting, construction of supervision process, the focus of supervision process, communication, interaction, assessment, period, and effectiveness. According to the results of the research: education supervisors and ministerial supervisors' activities related to the supervision are not compatible with the aims of supervision and they act in a similar manner. So supervision of counselors working at primary and high school is not effective.

Keywords: school guidance services, counselor, counseling teacher, education supervisor, ministerial supervisor

1. Introduction

In the education and organizational theory literature, supervision is identified as the process of guiding and leading people in their work to implement the goals of organization (Daresh, 2001). The supervision of the teacher is an organizational function concerned with promoting teacher growth, leading to improvement in teaching performance and greater student learning (Nolan & Hoover, 2008; Sullivan & Glanz, 1999). In this definition, the main component is instructional supervision. Instructional supervision is the act of working professionally with teachers to determine what works best in the classroom and what needs to be improved (Zepeda, 2007). In the light of this information, the aim of educational Supervision is to achieve student success, teacher development, and educational equity by enhancing cooperation among educators and, thus, to improve teaching and school success (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2004). Garmston, Lipton, and Kaiser (1998) name three different functions of supervision: supervision should improve instruction, must develop an educator's potential for growth, and should improve the organization's ability to renew and grow.

When related literature is reviewed, to fulfill its functions, three characteristics of supervision come into prominence. First, supervision, built on trust, is a collaborative process between the supervisor and the teacher (Acheson & Gall, 1997; Pajak, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1982). Second, through reflection and ownership, supervision fosters individual teacher growth (Glickman, et al., 2004; Pajak, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1982). Third, the primary aim of supervision is the improvement of teaching and learning, which enhances the quality of instruction offered to students (Glickman, et al., 2004; Pajak, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1982). The motive for supervision is that only the individual himself can change his behaviors. To achieve this, supervision effort is to be carried out continuously in line with the development levels of teachers (Aydın, 1986). The supervisor is no longer the expert, passing along judgments and advice to teacher technicians. Instead, the teacher is an equal who contributes valuable expertise and experience to the supervisory process (Poole, 1994, p. 287).

There are various views about what the roles of the education supervisors should be. According to Başar (1995), the source of this variation is that the roles of supervisors are grouped with different points of views in terms of their duties, behavioral patterns, individual features, and supervision. Considering all different grouping of supervisors' roles, Başar identified these roles as leadership, directorship, guidance and helping, in-service education, researching, and inquisitiveness. Olivia and Pawlas (2001) state that service-oriented supervisors are to fulfil coordinator, consultant, group leader, and evaluator roles. Wiles and Bondi (1996) identified supervisor roles as instructional specialist, human relation worker, staff developer, administrator, manager of change, and

evaluator. The way supervisors fulfill their roles should be in pursuant of teachers' views and requirements. Nolan and Hoover (2008) stated that teachers' expectations from supervisors are as follows:

- having trust in the teacher and enabling the teacher to share information with feeling of trust;
- being unprejudiced and open minded and encouraging teachers to try new ideas;
- being self-confident, base in content, and having sound information about education and supervision, thus gaining the respect of teachers as a professional;
- using communication skills, such as active listening, and being sensitive and tact; and
- having a sense of humor.

In supervision policies and implementations, bureaucratic, technical-rational, professional and moral authority can be regarded as a source of authority (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). Bureaucratic authority exists in the form of mandates, rules, regulations, job descriptions, and expectations; personnel authority, in the form of leadership style, motivational know-how, and human-relations skills; technical-rational authority, in the form of evidence derived from logic and scientific research in education; professional authority, in the form of experience, knowledge of the craft of teaching, and personal expertise; and moral authority, in the form of obligations and duties derived from widely shared values, ideas, and ideals. According to Sergiovanni and Starratt, each of the sources of authority has place and should be used by supervisors. However, some of the sources should be more dominant than others.

Supervision of education is performed by ministerial supervisors and education supervisors in Turkey (The Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 1993; 1999). Ministerial supervisors supervise high schools. As of 2010, 465 ministerial supervisors work all over Turkey. The number of the high schools they are to supervise is 8913, and the number of teachers working in these schools is 4240139 (MoNE, 2010). With headquarters in Ankara, Ministerial supervisors go to different provinces for a month in groups as planned by their president and supervise the high schools and teachers in these schools. Each teacher is supervised by the supervisor of the same branch, if possible; if there is no supervisor from the same branch, the teacher is supervised by any supervisor appointed by the head of the supervision group. This work carried out by ministerial supervisors is called general supervision. The aim of general supervision is to assess performance of education and management studies in high school, the schools, and school staff (MoNE, 2005). Ministerial supervisors write their observations in the record at the end of the supervision to provide future supervisors with information. They write a general report about educational-instructional conditions in the related province at the end of the supervision period. There is no standard for supervision of a high school. However, it is a mainstream to supervise a school every three years (Memduhoğlu et al., 2007).

Education supervisors working in provincial directorate for national education supervise the schools and the teachers. In Turkey, 3232 education supervisors work in 81 provinces. In academic year 2010, there were 33310 schools and 10916643 teachers to be supervised by education supervisors (MoNE, 2010). It is a general rule that education supervisors supervise elementary schools twice a year: one for professional help and the other for assessment. Under compulsory conditions, supervision can be performed for professional help in a year and for assessment the next year. But a teacher cannot be left without supervision for two years. Education supervisors carry out supervision in groups of 5 to 10 supervisors. Each teacher is supervised by a supervisor of the same branch, or if there is not a supervisor from the same branch, s/he is supervised by a supervisor determined by the head of supervisor group. Education supervisors are to base their studies on the improvement of teacher and learning process (MoNE, 2001a).

As it can be seen, the supervision periods and the supervisors of the teachers working in elementary and high schools are different. Counselors can be appointed to high schools or elementary schools. Accordingly, a counselor appointed to a elementary school is supervised once or twice a year and at least once in two years, and a teacher appointed to a high school is supervised once in three years, and this period can even be longer.

Results of studies on education supervisors indicate that education supervisors are seen as people who always seek to find defects, who do not see good and beautiful behaviors, who do not listen to the their interlocutor, who expect that their ideas be accepted, who try to impose punishment when they find any deficiency, who are unauthorized and ineffective as they cannot keep up to date, who are to be avoided, who do not accept criticisms, who are rigid, and who think that their only duty is to follow rules (Badavan, 1994; Karagozoglu, 1977; Memisoglu, 2007; Polat & Ugurlu, 2008; Unal, 2007; 2010; Unal & Gürsel, 2007; Yaman, Evcek, & İnandı, 2008; Yavuz, 2010; Yılmaz, Taşdan & Oguz, 2009). In a similar way, ministerial supervisors were considered as perfectionist, judgmental, domineering, and incompetent, and the supervision process was viewed as summative

and biased, rather than formative (Collins, 2004). On the other hand, ministerial supervisors are considered to use leadership, helpful/friendly, and strict communication styles more than education supervisors (Cetinkanat & Sagnak, 2010), and they are considered to have higher verbal communication skills and to be more positive than education supervisors (Ozgozgu, 2008).

In all elementary and high schools, “guidance and psychological counseling services” are established to provide guidance and psychological counseling services. In this service, a guidance teacher [counselor] is appointed for every 500 students. Counselors are graduates of guidance and psychological counseling departments of universities. Counselor prepares the educational, professional, and individual guidance plan for the school depending on the school’s characteristics, and they provide guidance to other teachers for the implementation of the plan. A counselor also provides psychological counseling for students in need and provides educational and professional guidance for all the students and keeps records of student development (MoNE, 2001b). Counselors do not teach at schools, they just lead to educational and professional guidance activities. They mostly carry out their studies in guidance and psychological counseling services. Although counselors do not enter courses for teaching, they work as a part of the school’s system, and they try to establish emotional, social, and psychological health by focusing on developmental issues to prevent the possible problems that may be faced by the students. Although the duties and applications of counselors are different from other teachers in this respect, the supervision of counselors will not be different from that of other teachers in terms of the aims and implementation of supervision. However, education supervisors supervising elementary schools consider themselves to be adequate for the supervision of counselors; they regard themselves to be inadequate in terms of psychological counseling, which requires expert knowledge (Dönmez, Kaya & Çivitçi, 2003). Counselors mostly have the opinion that education supervisors’ supervisory practices are inadequate (Yaman & Iskender, 2004). Ministerial supervisors who supervise high schools think that the most common problems are as follows: counselors are supervised by supervisors from other branches, supervision periods are long, and supervision is carried out in a short time and is based on the supervision of documents and records (Güven, 2009).

As it can be seen, supervision of counselors and perceptions with regard to these practices vary. Determination and comparison of the practices with regard to the supervision of counselor is important for the development of counselors’ supervision processes. The aim of this study is to investigate the supervision process of the counselors working in elementary and high schools.

2. Method

2.1 Research Approach

In this study, qualitative research paradigm was used as it is appropriate to determine and to analyze practices of education supervisors and ministerial supervisors during their supervision of counselors.

2.2 Study Group

Table 1. Counsellors in the Study Population

The Number of the Participant	Participant				
	Type of School	Level of the Education	Preference Regarding the School	Gender	Seniority
1	Primary School	Graduate	Low	Female	16
2	Primary School	Master’s Degree	Very	Female	11
3	Primary School	Graduate	Low	Male	9
4	Primary School	Master’s Degree	Very	Male	19
5	Primary School	Doctoral Student	Low	Male	15
6	General High School	Graduate	Low	Female	15
7	Anatolian High School	Master’s Degree	Very	Male	12
8	Anatolian High School	Master’s Degree	Very	Female	15
9	Vocational High School	Graduate	Low	Female	8
10	Vocational High School	Graduate	Low	Male	13

The study group was 10 counselors comprising five elementary school and five high school counselors. The study group was selected by using the maximum variety method, which has been one of the purposive sampling used in 14 high schools and 132 elementary schools audited during 2008-2009 academic year. Elementary school counselors who have been selected were determined according to gender, seniority, educational status, and whether the school in which they work are preferred by parents, and high school counselors who have been selected were determined according to their seniority, educational status, and whether the school in which they work is a general high school, Anatolian high school, or vocational high school. Because similar information is obtained from the 3rd counselor among the ones who have worked for both elementary and high schools, 5 elementary school and 5 high school counselors have been deemed sufficient for the study group in accordance with the suggestion of Merriam (1998). Table 1 shows the interviewed participants and their details.

2.3 Data Collection

The data have been collected using structured interview forms. Three faculty members working at the Department of Educational Sciences, Selcuk University, have been consulted as experts to provide accuracy for the interview form. A pilot study was conducted with two counselors. Considering the relevant feedback, necessary amendments were made on the interview form, and interviews, which has taken an average of 45 minutes, were made with the selected counselors.

2.4 Data Analysis

The data in this study have been analyzed by using the descriptive analysis method. Analysis procedures have been made according to preparation, organization, and reporting states, which can be used for both deduction and induction course of action stated by Ela and Kyngäs (2007). Elo and Kyngäs describe that process as follows: In the preparation stage, in a representative sample, the individuals to be analyzed and at which precision level the analysis will be made is determined. Organization stage consists of coding, formation of the themes, and summarizing the stages. Works conducted for this purpose have been specified below.

2.4.1 Preparation Stage

Data, obtained from the counselor by means of interviews, have been written down. Each counselor from whom the data were collected was given a number, and therefore, these counselors have been assigned to a number from 1 to 10. Afterward, the 77 opinions of the elementary school counselor and the 75 opinions of the high school counselors regarding the audit practices were coded.

2.4.2 Organization Stage

Opinions of the counselors regarding their own audit practices have been consolidated under 9 themes by considering their common features.

2.4.3 Validity

Miles & Huberman (1994) use credibility and authenticity concepts for internal validity and transferability and fittingness concepts for external validity. These authors have determined 12 questions regarding external validity and 13 questions regarding internal validity. In this study, validity was tested by answering the questions developed by Miles and Huberman. To provide internal validity, 1) the opinions were defined directly with quotes and interpreted. 2) To provide the accuracy of the findings, the consistency of the concepts constituting the themes among each other and with other themes were assessed, and whether these concepts constitute a meaningful coherence was tested. 3) Consistency of the findings with the previous studies was compared. 4) Depending on the situation, the themes were described and analyzed by using deduction or induction methods. 5) Findings were reviewed by two counselors who were interviewed and assessed. 6) Findings of the study were compared with the predictions that were made previously, and they were deemed accurate. To provide the external validity, on the other hand, (1) the method of the study was defined in detail. (2) The study group has been sufficiently large to allow generalization. (3) The findings were compared with related literature, and an attempt to determine the significance of the findings and the validity in practice were made. (4) Explanations regarding the necessity to test the study by means of other studies were provided in detail.

2.4.4 Reliability

A percentage of agreements among coders' reliability was used to ensure the reliability of the results. For our purposes, the formula "reliability = number of agreements/ total number of agreements + disagreements" was used (Miles & Huberman, 1994). An area expert was requested to place the problems in themes after the opinions of the counselors were placed into themes by the researchers to determine consensus among the coders. In comparing the coding made by the researchers and the expert, it was determined that 26 problems were placed

in different themes and a consensus of 86% was determined.

2.4.5 Reporting Stage

At this stage, the themes were presented in an understandable manner, and the opinions of counselors were shown under themes. For a better understanding, quotes from the typical examples of sentences expressed by the counselors were given directly, thus making a contribution for providing the validity and plausibility. Finally, findings obtained from the opinions of the counselors were interpreted by taking the data in literature into consideration.

3. Results

The following are the themes taken from the responses of the counselors.

Time of audits to be made in both elementary and high schools is determined by the auditors. The elementary school counselors may or may not be notified regarding the time when the audits will be conducted. For example, one counselor said “We had not been notified about this. I recognized what was happening when the supervisor came into my room” (2) (The number in parentheses represents the number of the participant counselor). However, the counselors working in high schools are notified about the audit time beforehand. For example, one counselor said, “I had been notified about the audit one month before it was done” (4).

Meeting

Counselors working in elementary schools meet the supervisors when the relevant supervisors enter their rooms. For example, one counselor said, “After talking to the administration, the counseling service room was determined as audit room. I met the supervisors when I came into my room in the morning” (5).

Counselors working in high school, on the other hand, meet the supervisors in the principal’s room or before the audit starts. For example, one counselor said, “I was called to the principal’s room. I met the group chairman first. We talked about my works. After that the group chairman introduced me to the supervisor to audit the counseling service. The supervisor gave me a list of what I should prepare. He said he will come to my room. Later, he came to my room by calling beforehand” (2).

Configuration of Supervision Period

Counselors in elementary school remain as the subject of supervision without knowing what will be done during the supervision period. They act according to the wishes of the supervisor without knowing what will happen in the next step. For example, one of the counselors said, “He requested from me the works I have conducted. I presented him my works. The supervisor was not a person who has had counselor education. He did not any systematic request such as plans and interview records. The supervision was more like a chat” (4).

Most of the counselors working in high school participate in the process without knowing what they will do during the supervision period, but some of them participate in the process aware of what to do. Regarding that issue, a counselor said “He stated his requests in writing during the preliminary interview. (1) Another counselor said, “They did not tell me about their expectations from me, I understood that they only wanted me to bring the files to them and answer their questions” (5).

Focus of Supervision Period

Points that are deemed important during the supervision of both elementary school and high school counselors change according to the supervisor. Both groups have supervisors who give importance to control, considering the supervision as a bureaucratic job, and who care about contributing to solve the relevant problems and developing the counseling service by considering the supervision as an amendment and development. Opinions of the counselors regarding this issue are as follows.

The parent said that they should be informed very frequently. He said that student interviews should be recorded. He focused on the individualized training programs (1).

He asked if I conducted bureaucratic works such as plan and program. He did not ask questions regarding our area since he is not from that area. For example, he did not ask what I did about family seminars, communication methods (2).

I could not even understand what he cares about. He passed to another subject before finishing one. He wanted the other file before even opening up and looking into the previous one I gave him and none of the subjects have been completely finished. We did not make interviews longer than 5 minutes for any of the subjects (5).

He was interested in the discussion of counseling events and especially following up the events. He focused

on following elementary school counseling works. He asked for the most important problem of the school. We talked about smoking issue that we observed among our students. (3)

Communication

Communication between the supervisors and counselors change according to the supervisor both in elementary and high schools. Opinions of the counselors regarding this issue are as follows.

He was open for communication. I felt myself valuable during the supervision. I could easily communicate with him. He was polite when addressing me (3).

He was not open for communication. He focuses on things like orders or advices instead of communication. He should listen first. Since they are not intellectuals, you lose the communication when you mention knowing the world and the book he reads (2).

He was open for communication. He was more like guiding me. It was clear that he was from that field when you consider his talking and expressions. He even gave me his e-mail address for communication. The supervisors had a very good communication among themselves (3).

We had problems with communication. For example, he did not address me politely. We are three counselors in our school. He only communicated with the coordinating counselor. He did not communicate with the remaining two of us. He did not even let the coordinating counselor to speak other than when requesting documents from him (4).

Interaction

Counselors working in elementary schools avoid asking questions because the supervisors do not have knowledge about the counseling service, whereas the counselors in high school ask questions to the supervisors, thinking they know about the subject, and they are either satisfied or not satisfied, depending on the answer they get. The only feature affecting that situation is whether the supervisor had counseling education. Opinions of the counselors regarding this issue are as follows.

I did not ask questions since I knew I could not have a satisfying answer in any case (2).

I am having trouble since the supervisors do not have knowledge about counseling. What I tell them is in vain, they do not understand (1).

I tried to ask questions and explain myself. But he tried to evade the situation. I could not get sufficient and satisfying answers to my questions. It was normal for him to not be able to answer since he is not from the field (2).

Assessment

Supervisors are not objective according to the counselors working in elementary school. They are influenced by the principal when making assessments, and they give points more than what the counselors deserve. Counselors working in high schools, on the other hand, are having uncertainty about how the assessment period progresses. Opinions of the counselors regarding this issue are as follows.

They are affected by the information they took from the principal while they are grading. They are grading with prejudice. School administration has an 80% effect on the grade they are giving. The grade I got was not bad, but it was not objective (1).

I had a good grade. Chief supervisor said good things about the works of counseling service during the assessment meeting. However, the counseling service did not get the certificate of appreciation, whereas some other branches got it (1).

They gave me a good grade but I wonder according to what they gave these grades (3).

Time

Supervision periods of the counselors differ both in elementary and high schools. Whereas the supervision takes from 15 minutes to 60 minutes in elementary schools, that in high schools can take some time between 30 minutes and 5 to 6 hours with intervals. There is not a standard in practice regarding the supervision time. Opinions of the counselors regarding this issue are as follows.

It took 15 minutes in total. Compliance with the format were focused on. Documents were requested (2).

It took one hour together with chats (3).

Supervision in my room took about half an hour. But sometimes he called me to the principal's room. He

examined some of the documents and files there (2).

Efficiency

The perception of counselors working in elementary schools regarding the supervision and the supervisor is more negative when compared with the ones working in high schools. However, counselors working in both elementary and high schools think that the supervision does not benefit them in any way. The supervision does not make a difference in subsequent works of the counselors. The counselors keep doing whatever they have been doing before the supervision. Opinions of the counselors regarding this issue are as follows.

He said that I should conduct my works in accordance with the regulations. It was told at random. I am already conducting my works in accordance with the regulation. He did not make me a new suggestion. I keep my works with or without any supervisions (4).

There has not been any change after the supervision since any critics and suggestions have been made. The supervision did not make a contribution to me (4).

4. Discussion

Findings of this study reveal the following: (1) the activities of education supervisors and ministerial supervisors regarding the supervision of counselors are not appropriate for the purposes of the supervision, and (2) the practices and results regarding the supervision of counselors working in elementary and high schools are similar. Considering the fact that the aim of the supervision is to improve education, the potential of the teacher, and the school's ability to develop and transform (Garmston, Lipton & Kaiser, 1998; Nolan & Hoover, 2008; Sullivan & Glanz, 1999; Zepeda, 2007), it is understood that the supervision has not been conducted in a manner that is fit for purpose because there have been no changes in behaviors of the counselors after the supervision. This finding is similar to the results of the studies made about the supervisors (Badavan, 1994; Collins, 2004; Karagozoglu, 1977; Memisoglu, 2007; Polat & Ugurlu, 2008; Unal, 2007; 2010; Unal & Gürsel, 2007; Yaman et al., 2008; Yavuz, 2010; Yılmaz, Taşdan & Oguz, 2009) previously. The fact that similar results have been obtained in all the studies with similar topic reveals that the supervisory practices used in schools are not fit for the purpose, and the supervision system in Turkey works as a closed system without renewing itself.

According to the relevant data that have been obtained, it is revealed that not conducting/ or not being able to conduct the supervision according to its purposes had four basic reasons. First, the supervisors have adopted "scientific managements" theory and use "bureaucratic authority" during supervision. Supervisors with scientific management thinking see the teachers as implementers instruction following the protocols, which should be followed closely to ensure success in education. Supervisors who have that kind of thinking use their bureaucratic authorities; rely on hierarchy, rules, regulations, and mandates; and clearly communicate role expectations as a way to provide teachers combination of bureaucratic authority in implementing the instructional system (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). According to the data, the supervisors are hierarchical superiors and statue leaders who use control, rather than cooperation, when dealing with teachers to provide efficiency and to increase the success rate of students. This finding supports the results of studies made by Cetinkanat and Sagnak (2010), Yavuz (2010), Yılmaz, Taşdan and Oguz (2009).

The fact that supervisors adopted the scientific management theory affects the communication between supervisors and teachers. Although the supervisors and teachers put the communication in the first place when listing the dimension of supervision according to their importance (Pajak, 1990), the teachers do not think that the communication skills of supervisors are sufficient (Ozgozgu, 2008; Unal, 2007). The fact that the supervisors adopted scientific management theory requires them to establish a parent-and-children kind of a relationship with counselors. That is to say, instead of establishing an adult-to-adult relationship, they prefer giving advices and criticizing the teachers because of their insufficiencies. In a study made by Cetinkanat and Sagnak (2010), it has been determined that both education and ministerial supervisors used a leadership style with normativeness, which brings their dominance over the teachers, and their leadership is status leadership. However, it is expected that the supervisors should make the teacher feel comfortable to share his insufficiencies with the supervisor and use good communication skills with the teachers, such as active listening and being sensitive and tactful (Nolan & Hoover, 2008). Today, a supervisor who wants to be efficient should not forget that he is not a technician that transfers his assessments and advices to the teacher but a teacher that contributes to the supervision period (Poole, 1994).

The second one is that supervisors and counselors cannot cooperate in determining the conduct of supervision processes. It is understood from the findings that the supervision time has not been decided together with the counselors, and counselors are generally informed about the supervision time. The counselors participate in the

process without knowing what to do and what exactly is expected from them, and thus, they act in accordance with the wishes of the supervisors. This application shows that, although the supervision needs to be applied as a cooperation that is based on the trust between the teacher and the supervisor (Acheson & Gall, 1997; Pajak, 1990; Sergioivanni, 1982), it is conducted in accordance with bureaucratic supervision belief. However, according to Bulumberg (1987), teachers expect a problem-solving approach from the supervisors, which is based on cooperation and which suggests the sense of "we are in this together" (as cited in Nolan & Hoover, 2008). In this case, it is not possible for the supervisors to play the roles (Olivia & Pawlas, 2001; Wiles & Bondi, 1996) expected from them.

In a Turkish school, an institutional supervision report is written after the supervision of all the staff. Teacher supervision report filled in by the relevant supervisor is attached to this report. In other words, the supervisor inspects the teacher according to the points specified in a form and turns what he determined into a point over 100 (MoNE, 2001a; 2005). Institutional supervision report is sent approximately one month after the supervisors left the school. The teachers do not know about the assessment made by the supervisor regarding their personal performances until that report is submitted to the school. This assessment is used only for providing feedback to the teacher. However, not making cooperation during supervision periods makes the teacher not to trust in the assessment of the supervisor. As a result, counselors working in both elementary and high schools think that the assessments of the supervisors are not objective.

Third, the time allocated by the supervisors for the supervision of the counselor is insufficient. This finding supports the findings obtained by Guven (2009). Supervision times of the counselors working in elementary and high schools differ; some elementary school teachers state that supervision took 15 minutes, whereas some high school teachers state that it took 30 minutes. The time allocated for the supervision is not enough in both cases. Besides, it is essential for a teacher to be inspected for at least 90 minutes (MoNE, 2001a). According to this, the supervisors do not abide by the rule for the supervision time because they have an excess workload or they do not have the sufficiency to inspect the counselor.

Fourth reason is that the supervision is made by supervisors who have not worked as counselors or who have not had counseling education. Counselors who work in elementary schools avoid asking questions and interacting with the supervisors because they think that the supervisor does not have knowledge about the work of counseling service. This situation is not the same for high school counselors, but these teachers also are not pleased with the approaches of supervisors who do not have a sufficient education in a relevant area. These findings support the results of studies that have been (Dönmez et al. 2003; Guven, 2009; Yaman, 2009; Yaman & Iskender, 2004) conducted previously. Also, the supervisors think that the supervision that is conducted in an area, for which they are not specialized, is not efficient (Unal & Kantar, 2011). According to the findings that Agaoglu (2001) obtained, it increases the efficiency of the supervision if supervisors are specialists in the area they are inspecting. According to Olivia and Pawlas (2001), it is necessary for the supervisors to specialize in an area for the supervision to be efficient.

Because the supervisors and supervision periods are different for elementary and high schools, the practices regarding the supervisions of the counselors are expected to be different. According to the data that have been obtained, the practices and supervision processes regarding the supervision of the counselors working in elementary and high schools and efficiency of the supervisions are similar in both elementary and high schools. The only factor that makes the supervision efficient and improves the supervision processes for both elementary and high schools is whether the supervisor had an education in the relevant area. If the supervisor has had a counseling education and has knowledge of counseling, the supervision process is perceived in a more positive manner, and the supervision becomes more efficient. However, the counselors working in elementary and high schools perceived the supervisors differently because the ministerial supervisors—not the supervisors who inspect the elementary schools—have counseling education. The reason for the difference is that the elementary schools are inspected at least once a year, so the counselors know the supervisors closely, they know the insufficiencies of the supervisors and, as a result of being inspected once in three years, the high school counselors do not know the ministerial supervisors and they do not know the insufficiencies or sufficiency.

5. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the present study, two suggestions can be made for both counselors and other teachers to be inspected in a more efficient manner. The first is providing a good education to the supervisors in the area they will inspect. Second, it is necessary for both education supervisors and ministerial supervisors to specialize in an area and conduct their supervision works in the areas they specialize in.

6. Limitations

It has been determined in this study that the practices made for the supervision of the counselors have not been effective. This determination is based on the perception of the counselors. According to the studies made by Moris Cogan (1961), Blumberg (1974), and Wiles (1967), the supervision, almost in an inevitable manner, is an activity, which psychologically endangers the occupational position of a teacher and damages his self-confidence. The teachers consider the supervision as a part of the system, which does not play an important role in their occupational life, and as an organizational ceremony, which is no longer required, and they do not perceive the supervisors as the source of new ideas (as cited in Acheson & Gall, 1977). According to Staller (1996), many teachers react against the supervision in a defensive and hostile manner. When the teachers interact with supervisors, they consider the supervision as a threat and worrisome situation (as cited in Cetinkanat & Sagnak, 2010). The data obtained in this study may not be reflecting the real situation because of the negative feelings that teachers feel regarding supervision. Besides, the principals want the supervision to be conducted by supervisors even if they criticize these supervisors in many aspects (Yavuz, 2010). Limitations of this study are as follows: only the counselors were interviewed to collect data but education supervisors and ministerial supervisors weren't included the study and, the supervisory practices weren't observed.

References

- Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1997). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers* (4th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Agaoglu, E. (2001). Primary school supervisors' as experts in specific subject areas. *Çağdaş Eğitim [Contemporary Education]*, 282, 17-20.
- Aydın, M. (1986). *Çağdaş eğitim denetimi* [Contemporary educational supervision] (2nd ed.). Ankara: IM Eğitim Araştırma Yayın Danışmanlık A.Ş.
- Badavan, Y. (1994). Innovative behaviour and primary school supervisors in Turkey. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10, 31-34.
- Cetinkanat, A. C., & Sagnak, M. (2010). A comparison of the primary education and ministry supervisors' communication styles. *H. U. Journal of Education*, 38, 35-43.
- Collins, A. B. (2004). Teacher performance evaluation: a stressful experience from a private secondary school. *Educational Research*, 46(1), 43-54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0013188042000178818>
- Daresh, J. C. (1989). *Supervision as a proactive process*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Dönmez, B., Kaya, A., & Çivitçi, A. (2003). İlköğretim Müfettişlerinin Rehber Öğretmenlerin Denetimine İlişkin Yeterlik Algıları [Primary education inspectors' perception on efficacy of counselors' supervision]. *VII. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi Bildiri Özetleri*, Ankara: Cantekin Matbaası.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2007). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Garmston, R. J., Lipton, L. E., & Kaiser, K. (1998). The psychology of supervision. In F. Gerald & E. Pajak (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp.242-286). NY: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2004). *Supervision and instructional leadership: a development approach* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Güven, M. (2009). The opinions of the ministry of national education inspectors about school guidance services and supervision of these services. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 2(9), 171-179.
- Karagozoglu, G. (1977). *İlköğretimde teftiş uygulamaları* [Practices in elementary education supervision]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Memduhoğlu, H. B., Aydın, İ., Yılmaz, K., Güngör, S., & Oguz, E. (2007). The process of supervision in the Turkish educational system: purpose, structure, operation. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 8(1), 56-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF03025833>
- Memisoglu, S. P. (2007). The supervision of information technology classrooms in Turkey: A nationwide survey. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 23(4), 529-541.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Miles M. B., & Huberman A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications.

- Ministry of National Education. (1993). *Milli eğitim bakanlığı teftiş kurulu tüzüğü* [Ministry of National Education supervision council boards rules]. Official Gazette No. 21501. Ankara: MoNE., 20 January.
- Ministry of National Education. (1999). *İlköğretim müfettişleri başkanlıkları yönetmeliği* [Elementary school supervision council boards regulation]. Official Gazette No. 23785. Ankara: MoNE., 13 August.
- Ministry of National Education. (2001a). *Millî eğitim bakanlığı ilköğretim müfettişleri başkanlıkları rehberlik ve teftiş yönergesi* [supervision in elementary education council boards guidance and counselling directive]. Official Gazette No. 2521. Ankara: MoNE., 21 February.
- Ministry of National Education. (2001b) *Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışma Hizmetleri Yönetmeliği* [Guidance and Counseling Services Regulation]. Official Gazette No. 23476. Ankara: MoNE., 17 April.
- Ministry of National Education. (2005). *Ortöğretimde denetim ve performans değerlendirme esasları* [Principles of Supervision and Performance Assessment in High school]. Retrieved December 25, 2010, from <http://www.meb.gov.tr>
- Ministry of National Education. (2010). *Milli eğitim istatistikleri, 2009-2010* [National education statistics, 2009-2010]. Retrieved October 25, 2010, from <http://www.meb.gov.tr>
- Munson, B. R. (1998). *Peers Observing Peers*. Compantary Education. Winter
- Nolan, J. F., & Hoover, L. A. (2008). *Teacher Supervision & Evaluation: Theory into Practice* (2.nd ed.). Hoboken, N. J.: Wiley.
- Olivia, P. F., & Pawlas, G. E. (2001). *Supervision for today's schools* (6th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ozgozgu, S. (2008). Perceptions and expectations of primary and secondary school teachers of their supervisors on oral communication Skills, *Education Science Society Journal*, 6(23), 70-93.
- Pajak, E. (1990). Dimensions of supervision. *Education Leadership*, 48(1), 78-80.
- Polat, S., & Ugurlu, C. T. (2008). Primary school teacher's inspection in Turkey: Primary school teacher's expectations about inspectors' guidance roles and the realisation level of these expectations. *Further Education in the Balkan Countries: Education and Pedagogy in Balkan Countries*. 9(1), 529-534. Konya: Eğitim Kitabevi.
- Poole, W. L. (1994). Removing the "super" from supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 9, 284-309.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1982). Toward a theory of supervisory practice: Integrating scientific, clinical, and artistic approaches. In T.J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), *Supervision of teaching* (pp.67-78). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: a redefinition* (7th. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (1999). *Supervision that improves teaching*. Los Angeles, CA: Corwin Press.
- Unal, A., & Kantar, Ş. (2011). Problems of assistant supervisors in primary education. *Elementary Education Online*, 10(1), 180-196. Retrieved February 25, 2011, from <http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr>
- Unal, A. (2007). İlköğretim denetçilerinin rehberlik rolünü gerçekleştirme yaklaşımları (Konya ili Örneği) [Primary school supervisors' types of fulfilling their guidance roles (Example of Konya Province)]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23, 9-22.
- Unal, A. (2010). Analysis of perception on supervisors in primary education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 5028-5033. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.815>
- Unal, A., & Gürsel, M. (2007). Evaluation of primary school inspectors concerning of learning organization. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 18, 463-482.
- Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (1996) *Supervision: A guide to practice*. Columbus, OH: C. E. Merrill.
- Yaman, E., & Iskender, M. (2004). İlköğretim Müfettişlerinin Rehber Öğretmenlere Yönelik Rehberlik Rollerini [Roles of Guiding Primary Education Supervisors' for Counselors]. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8, 398-414.
- Yaman, E. (2009). Guidance teachers evaluate the guidance role of supervisors. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1(1), 106-123.

- Yaman, S., Evcek, E., & Inandı, Y. (2008). Inspection in elt: the attitudes of english language teachers towards inspectors. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(35), 38-49.
- Yavuz, M. (2010). Effectiveness of supervisions conducted by primary education supervisors according to school principals' evaluations. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 103(6), 371-378. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220670903385338>
- Yılmaz, K., Taşdan, M., & Oguz, E. (2009). Supervision beliefs of primary school supervisors in Turkey. *Educational Studies*, 35(1), 9-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03055690802288502>
- Zepeda, S. J. (2007). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (2nd ed.). NY: Eye on Education.

Note

Note 1. This manuscript was presented at 2nd Supervision of Education Conference with International Participation at Dumlupınar University, June 23-25, 2010. Kutahya, Turkey.