



International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research (IJCER)

www.ijcer.net

The Effect of School Transparency on Attitude Towards Supervision

Hüsnü ERGÜN¹

¹Ministry of National Education , Turkey

To cite this article:

Ergün, H. (2020). The effect of school transparency on attitude towards supervision. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 7(1), 114-126. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.652497>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes.

Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

Authors alone are responsible for the contents of their articles. The journal owns the copyright of the articles.

The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of the research material.

The Effect of School Transparency on Attitude Towards Supervision

Hüsnü Ergün^{1*}

¹ Ministry of National Education, Turkey

Abstract

The research was planned to measure the impact of transparency of schools on attitude towards supervision. The research was conducted in state schools in Pamukkale and Merkezefendi district in Denizli. In the study, School Transparency Scale and the Attitude Scale towards Supervision in Education were used. "School transparency scale" was developed by Bozbayındır (2016). "Attitude Scale towards Supervision in Education" was developed by Uğurlu and Usta (2016). The questions in the scales were transferred to the forms prepared e-form and the data were collected with the help of these online forms. In this study, the analyses were made with multiple regression analysis. Only the courtesy dimension was predicted by the transparency dimension in practice. Implications for Research and Practice: Information transparency, evaluation transparency and the transparency in practice variables do not predict the willingness and knowledge dimensions significantly. The courtesy dimension is predicted by the transparency in practice. As the implementation transparency increases, it can be said that the inspectors are seen more kindly. School administrators should demonstrate transparency in particular.

Key words: School, Supervision, Transparency, Attitude towards supervision, School transparency.

Introduction

Supervision is an important factor of management. It is expected from the supervision what to find the missing or incorrect functioning aspects of the organization and indicate what needs to be done to remedy them. However, supervision may not always work as expected. During the supervision process, employees may want to hide information about themselves because of not trusting their organizations, fear of losing their jobs or other reasons. However, the supervision can identify the lacking aspects of the employee and provide them with an opportunity to improve themselves. Thus, the organization, which will be as strong as its weakest personnel, may lose the chance to strengthen its weak personnel. Failure of the personnel to hide information about him will mean that he is transparent about himself. Personnel can request the transparency of their organization before it becomes transparent. Even the process of layoffs in transparent organizations will be carried out transparently. The personnel know how to react from the organization in response to his behavior in transparent organizations. In transparent organizations, rules work and arbitrary behavior decreases. (Cassano, 2017; Geçkil & Tikici, 2015; Karaevli & Levent, 2014). The personnel who know this will be able to take a less negative attitude towards the supervision.

Education is a collection of purposeful activities and these activities are conducted systematically and in a planned way. It can be stated that there should be a positive difference between the condition of the individual before and after the educational process (Baykul, 1992). Planned educational environments are ensured by the school organizations. In these organizations, principals, deputy principals, teachers and auxiliary staff work mostly. As long as the principals improve and strengthen the cooperation among them, the organization will reach its goals. Management is the most important element of the organization. None of the organizations can achieve its aims without a proper management. Therefore, management can be described as the heart of the organization (Nadrifar, Bandani & Shahryari; 2015). In other words, it can be asserted that the new role of the administrator is to be a facilitator for his/her employees (Tengblad, 2006).

In an organization defined as a coalition created by its member (Bursaloğlu, 2002), the duties of each employee are determined. When each employee conducts his/her duties in a harmony, the organization can run like the hour wheels and each of the wheel support the operation of the other one. As a result of the failure in one of the

* Corresponding Author: Hüsnü ERGÜN, husnuergun60@gmail.com

wheels, the harmony in the process of the organization is disturbed. Inspection is carried out in order to prevent the organization be damaged by determining the malfunction in the process of the organization. In order to see the level of reaching its goals, to determine whether the resources are used effectively and to specify the methods improving the quality of the services provided, it is necessary to supervise and assess the educational process (Demirkasımoğlu, 2011). Supervision in educational organizations has impacts on improving the organization and the educational process together with its personnel (Gündüz, 2012). School employees also want to improve themselves, but they do not want to see any harm while doing this. They do not want to be harmed by the supervision, so they may not want to put the cards on the table. School workers want to know that they are transparent from their school and what they will encounter in the way the school works. School workers want to know what they will encounter in the running of the school. For this reason, the level of transparency of the schools was thought to have an effect on the attitude towards the supervision and this issue was investigated.

Problem

In order to the system to renew or replace itself, the power loses should be established. These power losses can be specified by the sub-systems of supervision (Uğurlu, 2015). In educational process, determining and fixing the lateness in reaching the goals and improving the level of attaining the targets can be ensured by a healthy supervision process. In a sense, supervision performs the function of a compass (Erdem, 2006). Supervision can be defined as a process of comprehension of the organizational activities' being in accordance with pre-determined targets, the principles and the rules determined in line with the targets (Aydın, 2000). If each member of the organization performs in tune with the organizational goals, there will be no disruption in the process. The elements of supervision in education are a cycle of actions comprising of determining the situation, evaluation, correcting and improving. While the situation is determined and presented in the element 'situation determination', the determined situation is compared with the criteria and a judgement is made in the element 'evaluation'. In the elements 'correcting and improving', those that turn into decisions from the options ensued with evaluation process are put into effect (Başar, 2000). Supervision is a kind of leadership role. The teacher needs are established through the supervision role, then the teacher is counselled, guided, supported, and given suggestions (Knoll, 1987). Teachers in Turkey find the course supervisions useful and state that the most useful part of the supervision process is to determine the teachers' deficiencies (Yeşil & Kış, 2015). Teachers' sense of organizational trust will decrease if the supervision is carried out to determine the shortage of teachers. It would be appropriate to save the supervision from the teacher center and focus on improving the learning process.

If the educational inspection is conducted with the notion that the teacher is in the center and the principal is the only decision maker, there will be of no use for today's educational organization. It is inevitable for the educational supervision paradigm to change due to the inclusion of the students in the center of learning, the inversion of teacher's responsibilities towards providing guidance for students and the comprehension of the data based decision making (Aseltine, Faryniarz & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2006). The prominent features in the countries which are successful in educational process are the concepts such as trust in teachers, quality enhancement, improving, close supervision, accountability, transparency, peer review and self-evaluation (Gönülaçar, 2018). School principals should pay attention to the fine line between supervision and assessment.

Theoretical Background

The aim of the supervision is to improve teacher performance. In evaluation, on the other hand, there are differences between supervision and assessment since teacher performance is aimed to grade. Because assessment requires judgement, it may cause the person to defend himself/herself. However, the employee will be able to look for solutions in order to make up for his/her deficiencies as supervision focuses on improving. When the supervision process concentrates on the notion of improving, there will be no need for the individual to protect himself/herself from the external threats. Supervision is expected to increase teacher motivation, teacher's desire for professional development and the confidence in the inspector (Knoll, 1987). Ethical conducts such as using human relations and communication skills, supervising according to the condition of the environment, supervising depending upon a certain norm, giving suggestion to the teachers for improving themselves, not accepting meals and catering at school, not using the principal's room as their own rooms, allocating sufficient time for the inspection and following the developments are expected from the inspectors (Kayıkçı & Uygur, 2012). When the inspectors do not follow these ethical conducts, negative emotions may occur in the teachers. The teacher expressed that the reasons why they have negative perceptions are the pressure and fear they have experienced and their seeing the supervision process as nitpicking (Özan, & Şener, 2015). Being aware of the objectives of the educational process increases the effectiveness of the supervision.

The realization of the educational goals can be achieved by the realization of the goals of supervision process in ensuring the effectiveness of the organizations. The realization of the goals in supervision can be enabled taking into consideration the principles of supervision such as purposefulness, planning, contingency, obviousness, being democratic, integrity, continuity and taking into account individual differences and establishing human relations healthily will be possible by observing the principles of control (Gökçe, 1994).

For many years, supervision in Turkey is considered generally with the notion of controlling (Memduhoğlu & Zengin, 2012). With the legal regulation made in 2016, Turkish educational supervision was designed to conduct almost exclusively in order to investigate; the investigation was continued to be used as a weapon; the system was organized to supervise tens thousands of educational institutions with just 500 inspectors effectively and to guide one million teachers (Gönülaçar, 2018). However, the expected role of inspectors is not to investigate and control, it is instructional leadership and guidance roles (Memduhoğlu & Zengin, 2012). In such an understanding, the educational supervision can't be expected to detect, evaluate and correct the disruptions. While it can be thought that this shows the system is constructed centrally, it can be interpreted that the increase in the authority of conducting supervision given to the principals in Turkey in recent years means that there is a tendency towards school-centered supervision (Özen & Hendekçi, 2016).

In the studies, it is clear that the inspectors duly perform his duties in school based management (Kapusuzoğlu, 2008) and that primary school administrators do not perform teacher supervision adequately (Akan & Zengin, 2015) although there are findings concerning the fact that primary school inspectors are perceived with negatives feelings compared to the ministry inspectors (Yıldırım, 2012). Moreover, according to the data collected from teachers and administrators, it was found out that course supervision is necessary and this supervision should be performed by inspectors (Köse, 2017). It is obvious that there are differences in the opinion of the supervisors and administrators (Memişoğlu & Ekinci, 2013), and teachers have expectations such as professional development, getting feedback and increasing their motivation in the process of supervision (Köybaşı, Uğurlu & Demir, 2017). On the other hand, it is apparent that there were concerns that the partiality can take place if course supervision is conducted by the school principals, that the current competencies of the principals can't contribute sufficiently to the quality of education and that the teacher find the course supervisions ineffective as the administrators don't have any trainings on in this field (Tonbul & Baysülen, 2017). The supervision sub-system of the education system has changed frequently in recent years; first, the two-headed supervision sub-system structure was merged and then separated. As a result of this, depression (the lack of morale) and different negative emotions showed up causing to concerns such as lack of supervision, professional burnout, financial expectation, loss of status and partial supervision (Kurum & Çınkır, 2017; Ergün & Çelik, 2018).

Supervision in education is a complex art that involves feedback through effective communication (Nwaokugha & Danladi, 2016). According to the Johari window, firstly, it is mentioned that one has to understand himself / herself, his / her beliefs that she/he wants to explain and to conceal, his / her view of life and these situations affect human communication (Ryan & Gottfried; 2012). It will be easier to use communication effectively in supervision and to act in favor of the organization if effective feedback is obtained. One of the most effective ways of receiving and giving feedback is the Johari window (Beganu & Nițan; -). The Johari window is a communication model and this mode was developed in 1950 by American psychologists Joseph Luft and Harry Ingham. This special tool allows us to understand how we see ourselves and how others see us (Saxena, 2015). Johari Window examines the known and shared or unknown and non-shared communication between individuals (Kılıç & Önen, 2011). The Johari window consists of open/free area, blind area, hidden area and unknown area windows (Nofriza, 2017; Osterlund & Mack, 2014; Saxena, 2015).

The Johari Window Model

Open area (Information about you that both you and others know)	Blind area (Information about you that you don't know but others do know)
Hidden area (Information about you that you know but others don't know)	Unknown area (Information about you that neither you nor others know)

Reference: Nofriza, 2017; Osterlund & Mack, 2014; Saxena, 2015

The open area is essentially our conscious self which includes our behavior, attitudes, motivation, values and way of life that we know and are known to others. In this area, one does not mind that the information s/he knows about oneself is known by the others. The hidden area is the information about ourselves that is unknown to others unless we allow. The blind area is the area in which what is known by others about a person is not

known by the person himself. The unknown area is not known by the individual or by the other group members. The unknown information may include skills and attitudes that the individual can be useful to the organization (Saxena, 2015). The purpose of the Johari window is to increase the open/free area (Osterlund & Mack; 2014; Yıldız, 2014). This depends on trust in others (Beganu & Nişan; Luft, 1982). The fact that the open area is large means that self-disclosure and feedback works well (Uysal, 2003).

One of the ways to expand the open area in the Johari window is transparency. Transparency is the fact that all the decisions made concerning the works and operations in the organization are known by everyone affected in the institution (Geçkil & Tikici, 2015). "Transparent schools" can be defined as educational institutions where information is shared in a clear, understandable and accessible manner in a way that is in a line with the requirements of the era and does not harm the security (Karaevli & Levent, 2014). There are some research findings that transparency positively affects employee performance (Kesen, 2015), organizational performance (Berggren & Bernshteyn, 2007), financial performance (Bijalwan & Madan, 2013) and the perception of organizational support (Bakan, Güler & Kara, 2017). However, researches show that transparency nourishes trust (Karaevli & Levent, 2014; Norman, Avolio & Luthans, 2010), that transparency is one of the descriptors of organizational trust (Schnackenberg, 2010), that transparency is a tool to increase trust (Bandsuch, Pate & Thies, 2008), that positive relationship between financial performance and financial performance (Bijalwan & Madan, 2013), transparency in the structure of the organization prevents irregularity and illegal behavior (Gürbüz & Dikmenli, 2009: 232), the importance of transparency for corporate success (Şişman, Yozgat, Abunaz & Özarslan), transparency will negatively affect organizational learning and operational control (Bernstein, 2012), and excessive privacy may cause inefficiency (Crowley, 2012). Of course, there are limits to the transparency. It is of great importance to be transparent about the function of the institution, rather than to share information that will affect privacy, individual or institutional security. In the world, which has become a big village as a result of globalization, enterprise information may not be hidden from employees for a long time. Perhaps transparency has become an imperative of management. As management increases the degree of transparency, it can begin to reduce the hidden area in the employee. It can be said that democratic features weakened and arbitrary behaviors increased in non-transparent organizations. Supervision is vital for organizations to determine whether employees are doing business that is fit for purpose and whether they are acting arbitrarily. Looking at the researches about transparency are concerned, there are no studies investigating the relationship between supervision and transparency. The study fills this gap in the field.

Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to find out how school transparency affects attitudes towards supervision. For this purpose the research questions are formed accordingly is as follows: "1- What are the descriptive statistics of school transparency and attitude towards supervision? 2- What is the impact of school transparency on attitude towards supervision?" The answers to the questions were sought. The attitude towards the supervision will affect the size of the areas in the Johari window. Whether the open area is large or small will be important for the school to achieve its goals. A teacher who has a negative attitude towards the supervision process may not want to expand the open area. Hence, the organization's human resources and other elements will not be able to be improved. If the institutional functioning of the school is transparent, there may not be much information that the teacher would like to hide. In such a case, the teacher will not refrain from the supervision process and will have a positive attitude towards it. The positive attitude of the teachers towards the supervision process will enable the supervision process to function/realize. Knowing the relationship between these two variables will guide administrators to reach effective schools. The lack of studies investigating the relationship between these two variables also increases the importance of this research.

Method

In this section, it is mentioned that sample and data collection, data collection tools and analyzing of data. In this study, relational screening method was used. In the research, multiple regression analysis was employed with the enter method. The variables investigated are school transparency and attitude towards supervision. School transparency is an independent variable, School transparency is an independent variable, while attitude towards supervision is dependent variable.

The research was conducted in Pamukkale and Merkezefendi state schools in Denizli. There are 3629 teachers and administrators in state schools in Pamukkale and 4104 teachers and administrators in Merkezefendi. In the universe of the research, there are 7733 teachers in total. 367 people are included in the study's samples (Bartlett, Kotrlik & Higgins, 2001). The sample was determined by random sampling method. The opinions of 415 teachers and administrators who completed the scale from the teachers determined through random

sampling method were included in the evaluation. 51.4% of the participants were female and 48.6% were male; 71.7% are union members, 2.2% have associate degree, 86.2% have bachelor degree and 11.6% have graduate education. 32.4% of the participants work in primary school, 44% in secondary school, 19.8% in high school and 3.9% in kindergarten.

The questions in the scales were transferred to the forms prepared electronically and the data were collected with the help of these online forms. Schools were visited, school principals were met, a copy of the form was sent electronically to the school principal's mobile phone or e-mail, and the scale was sent to the teachers via the school principal. Teachers were asked to fill in the electronic form at the times in which they are free from their duties.

Instruments

In the study, School Transparency Scale and the Attitude Scale towards Supervision in Education were used. The item pool for the "school transparency scale" developed by Bozbayındır (2016) was created first, followed by content validity, validity and reliability studies, and criterion validity. After the field scanning and teacher interviews, a pool of 35 items was created. The content validity was ensured by the experts in the field and the number of items became 27. In order to evaluate whether the data were suitable for factor analysis, Barlett Sphericity (5088.495; $P = .00$) and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin ($KMO = .95$) tests were performed and exploratory and confirmatory factor analyzes were also performed. In the exploratory factor analysis, one item was removed from "the transparency dimension", and the item load values of this dimension varied between .80 and .62. The value of Cronbach Alpha was found to be .95. The item load values of the second dimension "evaluation transparency" ranged from .51 to .80. Cronbach's alpha value was found to be .83. The item load value of the third dimension, "information transparency" is varied between .64 and .75. Cronbach's alpha value was found to be .83. The first factor explained 34.35% of the total variance of the scale, the second factor explained 14.80% and the third factor explained 12.98%. The scale explains 62.14% of the total variance related to school transparency. The Cronbach's alpha value for the overall scale was found to be .95. Correlation matrices were found to be significant between .33 and .76 for the first factor, between .35 and .77 for the second factor, and between .35 and .73 for the third factor. After confirmatory factor analysis, the Chi-square value ($\chi^2 = 757.38$, $df = 296$, $p = 0.00$) was significant, while the fit indices were calculated as follows $RMSEA = 0.080$, $RMR = 0.077$, $NFI = 0.96$, $CFI = 0.97$, $IFI = 0.97$, and $RFI = 0.95$. Factor load values were found to be between .23 and .76. The correlations between the sub-dimensions were found to be significant. Item discrimination was evaluated and the values were evaluated as significant.

A 48-item item pool was made up by searching the literature for "the Attitude Scale of Supervision in Education" developed by Uğurlu and Usta (2016). As a result of the opinions of the experts in the field, the number of items was reduced to 32. According to the preliminary data, KMO value was .91; Barlett sphericity test results ($X^2(120) = 3296.009$; $p < .01$) were found to be significant. Exploratory factor analysis was performed and items with less than .30 factor load values and items with less than .10 factor load value considered as overlapping factor, were excluded from the scale. As a result, the number of items in the scale changed to 16. In the second step of the study, the scale was applied to 270 teachers for exploratory factor. Depending on the obtained data, exploratory factor analysis was performed and according to the exploratory factor analysis results, another group of teachers ($n = 350$) was reapplied in order to perform confirmatory factor analysis. The total variance explained by the three-dimensional structure is 73.05%. It was established that 29.06% of the first factor, 23.79% of the second factor, 19.75% of the third factor contributed to the common variance in the analysis made for three factors; it was seen that factor load values for the first factor was between .57 and .87; the second factor between .67 and .89; the third factor was between .65 and .84. After the confirmatory factor analysis, Chi-square value ($\chi^2 = 282.07$, $df = 98$) was found to be significant, while fit indexes were calculated as $RMSEA = 0.080$, $NFI = 0.97$, $CFI = 0.98$, $RFI = 0.96$ and $IFI = 0.98$ and $AGFI = 0.86$. The Cronbach Alpha value of the information dimension was found to be .93. The Cronbach's Alpha value of the kindness dimension was .91. The Cronbach's Alpha value of the willingness dimension was found to be .87. The overall Cronbach's alpha value of the scale was found to be .93.

Data Analysis

The reliability and validity studies of the scales were examined and then it was decided to use them in the study since the values were considered appropriate. Since the data were collected with the help of electronic forms, it was thought that the participants were not affected by the researcher's bias. A sufficient number of samples were taken to represent the population in the study. Care has been taken to collect data from different school types. In order to determine whether the data show normal distribution, the skewness and kurtosis coefficients were

examined. VIF values were examined to determine whether there are multiple connection problems between variables.

The arithmetic mean of the dimensions of the scales was taken in order to find out whether the data showed normal distribution, and the skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the data consisting of these mean values were examined. It is seen that the skewness values of School Transparency Scale were between $-.785$ and $-.933$, kurtosis values were between $.188$ and $.338$; the Attitude Scale towards Supervision in Education had skewness values between $-.112$ and $.154$, and kurtosis values between $-.994$ and $.140$. On one hand, Bayram (2010) states that as a rule of practicality, the distribution can be considered as normal distribution when discrete data (categorical and sorting data) have low asymmetry and kurtosis (within ± 1.5 range) values on the other hand, Kunnan (1998) and Karagöz (2016) express that it can be considered as normal distribution when skewness and kurtosis values between $+ -2$ values (Bayram, 2010; Kunnan, 1998; Karagöz, 2016). Therefore, it was accepted that the data showed normal distribution.

VIF values were examined to see if there was a multiple linear connection between the data. To find the VIF value, the attitude towards supervision dimensions, which are dependent variables, were made dependent variables, respectively, the regression model was estimated with other variables and VIF values were found. These values were calculated to be between 3.89 and 6.96 and all VIF values were found to be less than 10 which is the problematic critical value (Kleinbaum et al. 1988 quoted in; Gujarati and Porter, 2009, p.340; Chatterjee and Price, 1991 quoted in; Stine, 1995, p.54). It is found with the formula $VIF = 1 / (1 - r^2)$. If we write the VIF value as 10 , it has a value of about 0.94 . In the formula when the value of r^2 is 1 , VIF value is expressed as an infinite (Gujarati and Porter, 2009). It can be said that as VIF value exceeds 10 value, the problematic area is approached. Multidimensional regression analysis was used to determine the extent to which teachers' scores on the Attitude Scale of Supervision in Education were predicted by school transparency.

Results and Discussion

Before starting Multiple Regression Analysis, relationships between variables were examined. Correlation coefficients were considered in order to examine the relationships between variables. The relationships between the study variables and descriptive statistics are shown in Table 1. In the interpretation of the mean scores obtained from the scales, the points between $5.00-4.20$ were taken as "high", the points between $4.19-3.40$ "above average", the points between $3.39-2.60$ "medium", the points between $2.59-1.80$ "below medium", and the points between $1.79-1.00$ "low".

As seen in Table 1, the arithmetic mean values of the variables discussed in the study ranged from 2.90 to 4.03 . Given the arithmetic means of the dimensions of teachers' perceptions regarding school transparency; it is seen that the transparency dimension is above the medium ($\bar{x} = 4.03$) level in practice, the evaluation transparency dimension is above the medium level ($\bar{x} = 3.91$), and the information transparency dimension is above the medium level ($\bar{x} = 3.97$). In other words, it can be said that teachers' perceptions about school transparency are not low and they find their schools transparent even if there are deficiencies. Given the arithmetic means including the dimensions of teachers' attitudes towards supervision, it was found that the willingness dimension to be in medium level ($\bar{x} = 2.94$), the information dimension to be in medium level ($\bar{x} = 2.90$), and the kindness dimension to be in medium level ($\bar{x} = 3.05$). In other words, it can be said that teachers' attitudes towards supervision are moderate and there are areas that can be hidden in the Johari window. The need for teachers to hide information about themselves; may be due to their desire not to lose prestige among parents, school management and other teachers.

When correlation coefficients are taken into consideration, it is clear that there is a significant relationship between all variables. Correlation coefficients, which are found significant at the 01 level, for the dimensions of school transparency scale vary between ($r = .81$ and $r = .90$). Correlation coefficients related to the dimensions of the Attitude Scale towards Supervision in Education, which is seen significant at the $.01$ level vary between ($r = .56$ and $r = .71$). Correlation coefficients between the two scales' dimensions, which were found to be significant at the $.01$ level, ranged from ($r = .24$ to $r = .43$).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the research and the relationships between variables (n = 414)

Variables	\bar{x}	Sd	The transparency in Practice	The transparency in evaluation	The transparency in Knowledge	Willingness	Knowledge	Kindness
The transparency in Practice	4.0314	.873	1	.855**	.903**	.360**	.248**	.439**
The transparency in evaluation	3.9130	1.080	.855**	1	.819**	.345**	.260**	.402**
The transparency in Knowledge	3.9729	.9232	.903**	.819**	1	.362**	.243**	.429**
Willingness	2.9438	.7599	.360**	.345**	.362**	1	.713**	.564**
Knowledge	2.9037	1.219	.248**	.260**	.243**	.713**	1	.666**
Kindness	3.056	1.088	.439**	.402**	.429**	.564**	.666**	1

** p=.01

For multiple regression analysis, the arithmetic mean of the dimensions in the scales was taken and it was examined whether they predicted the willingness, knowledge and courtesy dimensions of the Scale of Attitude towards Supervision in Education (See Table 2 and Table 3).

Table 2. The Level of variables' predictivity power for the dimensions of the Scale of Attitude towards Supervision in Education

	R	R ²	Corrected R ²	The standart error in predicitivity
Willingness	.374	.140	.134	.70
Knowledge	.266	.071	.064	1.18
Kindness	.447	.200	.194	.97

By applying linear multiple regression, in what level the willingness dimension predicts the dimensions; information transparency, evaluation transparency and the transparency in practice was determined and R = .374; R² = .134, was calculated. It is seen that 14% of the total variance in the willingness dimension was

explained by these variables. However, it is seen that these variables do not predict the willingness dimension significantly.

Applying linear multiple regression, the extent information dimension predicts evaluation transparency, application transparency and the information transparency was determined. $R^2 = .064$, 7% of the total variance in the willingness dimension was explained by these variables. However, it is seen that these variables do not predict the knowledge dimension in a meaningful way.

Table 3. The level of Transparency in practice dimension predict the level of Kindness Dimension

	R	R^2	Corrected R^2	The standart error in predicitivity
Kindness	.439	.193	.191	.97

By applying linear multiple regression, the extent the kindness dimension predicted information transparency, evaluation transparency and transparency in practice was determined and as a result of this process, $R = .447$; $R^2 = .194$ was calculated; 19.4% of the total variance in the willingness dimension was explained by these variables. However, it is seen that evaluation and information transparency dimensions of these variables do not predict the courtesy dimension significantly while predicting the dimension of transparency in practice significantly. As can be seen in Table 3, the extent to which transparency dimension predicts the kindness dimension was determined and $R = .43$; $R^2 = .191$ was calculated; 19.1% of the total variance in the willingness dimension was explained by this variable.

Table 4. B and Beta Correlation Coefficients and Significance Levels of the Variables

	Predictors	B	Std. error	B	t	p
Willingness	Fixed (a)	1.689	.167		10.138	.000
	Transparency in practice	.099	.105	.114	.944	.346
	Evaluation transparency	.075	.064	.106	1.178	.240
	Information transparency	.141	.090	.172	1.572	.117
Knowledge	Fixed (a)	1.563	.278		5.622	.000
	Transparency in practice	.073	.176	.053	.419	.676
	Evaluation transparency	.189	.106	.167	1.779	.076
	Information transparency	.077	.150	.058	.515	.607
Kindness	Fixed (a)	.853	.230		3.703	.000
	Transparency in practice	.296	.145	.237	2.033	.043
	Evaluation transparency	.072	.088	.071	.817	.415
	Information transparency	.184	.124	.156	1.480	.140

As it is clear in Table 4, the positive (+) direction of the Beta value, which affects the transparency dimension in the kindness dimension in practice, indicates that there is a direct relationship between these two variables; It can be said that increasing transparency in practice has a positive effect on the kindness dimension.

Table 5. The level the Transparency in practice predict the attitude towards Supervision in Education

Transparency in practice	R	R^2	Corrected R^2	The standart error in predicitivity
	.370	.137	.135	.88

By applying linear multiple regression, the level to which the transparency dimension of school transparency predicts the attitude towards supervision in education was determined and as a result of this process $R = .370$; $R^2 = .135$ was calculated; 13% of the total variance of the attitude towards supervision was explained by the transparency dimension in practice.

Table 6. B and Beta Correlation Coefficients and Significance Levels of the Variables

Predictors		B	Std. error	β	t	p
Supervision in education	Fixed (a)	1.344	.205		6.570	.000
	Transparency in practice	.401	.050	.370	8.089	.000

As it is seen in Table 6, the positive (+) direction of Beta value which the transparency dimension of school transparency in practice affect the attitude towards supervision in education indicates that there is a direct relationship between these two variables; it can be said that increasing transparency in practice positively affects the attitude towards supervision. In general, in order to find out how the attitude of supervision in education affects school transparency, a regression process was performed on total scores (See Table 7 and Table 8).

Table 7. The level the school transparency predicts the attitude towards Supervision in Education

School transparency	R	R ²	Corrected R ²	The standard error in predictivity
	.381	.145	.143	.87

By applying linear multiple regression, the extent to which school transparency predicted the attitude towards supervision in education was determined and as a result of this process, R = .381; R² = .143 was calculated; 14% of the total variance of the attitude towards supervision accounted for school transparency.

Table 8. B and Beta Correlation Coefficients and Significance Levels of the Variables

Predictors		B	Std. Error	β	t	p
Supervision in education	Fixed (a)	1.329	.200		6.638	.000
	School transparency	.408	.049	.381	8.352	.000

As it is clearly seen in Table 8, the positive (+) direction of Beta value which school transparency affects the attitude towards supervision in education indicates that there is a direct relationship between these two variables; it can be asserted that increasing school transparency positively affects the attitude towards supervision.

Conclusion

The first question to be answered in the research; what are the descriptive statistics of school transparency and attitude towards supervision? According to the findings obtained from the research, it can be said that school employees see their schools transparently, although there are deficiencies, and their attitudes towards supervision are at a moderate level. In the research conducted by Serhan (2016), it was found that information transparency and administrative transparency are at moderate level in secondary schools in Jordan. Moderate level attitudes towards supervision may also indicate that school employees have negative feelings towards supervision. It can be asserted that the reasons for the teachers' negative perceptions are that teachers perceive the supervision process as nitpicking and experience it as a source of pressure and fear (Özan, & Şener, 2015); that supervision in Turkey recognize prevalently as a way of disciplining process (Memduhoğlu & Zengin, 2012); that the system restructure depending on the mindset of investigation/interrogation in 2016 (Gönülaçar, 2018); that inspectors expect to conduct their instructional and guidance roles (Memduhoğlu & Zengin, 2012); that inspectors fail to fulfill their roles regarding school based management (Kapusuzoğlu, 2008); that the teachers and administrators expect the inspectors to perform course supervision (Köse, 2017); and moreover that the teachers have some expectations regarding to the process such as contributing to their professional development, increasing their motivation and getting feedbacks (Köybaşı, Uğurlu & Demir, 2017).

The second question to be answered in the research; what is the impact of school transparency on attitude towards supervision? Relationships between variables were examined before performing regression analysis to

find answers to the second question of the research. As a result of the correlation analysis, since there was a significant relationship between the dimensions of the two variables, the predictive level between these two variables was wondered and multiple regression analysis was performed. For multiple regression analysis, the arithmetic mean of the dimensions in the scales was calculated and whether they predicted the willingness, knowledge and kindness dimensions of the Scale of Attitude towards Supervision in Education is searched. By applying linear multiple regression, it is seen that the dimension of willingness is not predicted through the dimensions of information transparency willingness, evaluation transparency and transparency in application significantly. Increased school transparency does not make school personnel to be more eager to supervision process. The information dimension is not significantly predicted by the variables. It can be said that there is no information about supervision process among practices related to school transparency. The courtesy dimension was only predicted by the dimension of transparency in practice.

As a result of the regression analysis, it is seen that willingness and knowledge dimensions were not significantly predicted by the dimensions of information transparency, evaluation transparency and transparency in practice. It is also seen that kindness dimension is not predicted by information transparency and evaluation transparency. However it has been seen that kindness dimension is predicted by transparency in practice. It can be said that transparency in practice is perceived by employees as a kind behavior. In addition, it can be said that school transparency has a positive effect on the attitude towards supervision. In schools, which are the institutions in which countries shape their future, conducting private affairs is not included in the expectations of states from schools. In non-transparent schools, it can be said that administrators want to avoid accountability. Transparency is related to accountability in these terms. The one of the concepts with which accountability is associated is “transparency” (Serhan, 2016; Himmetoğlu, Ayduğ & Bayrak, 2017; Suharyono, 2019). Institutions that are open to accountability will have a positive attitude towards supervision process. The school’s being transparent in practice can be considered as the acceptance of accountability by the administrators. In the study conducted by Kalman and Gedikoğlu (2014), it was found that the accountability of administrators/principals positively affected organizational justice. School employees who have a positive attitude towards organizational justice will not hesitate to be supervised and they will not fear that their deficiencies will come out when they are being supervised. However, in a study conducted in Turkey, while teachers and school administrators feel the necessity of accountability concerning students’ successes in a low level to the school stakeholders, they feel the necessity of accountability in a high level to the bureaucracy (Erdağ & Karadağ; 2018). Since school employees consider supervision as an obligation, they may consider transparency in practice as transparency in bureaucratic practices. Due to the fact that the supervision is performed within the bureaucratic process, it can be said that when the school employees hear the word “supervision”, they occur to their mind the bureaucratic procedures. For this reason, school staff may not want to expand their open area hierarchically against those in the upper position.

One of the ways to improve the open area in the Johari window is “transparency”. Transparent schools can be defined as educational institutions where information is shared in a clear, understandable and accessible manner in a way that does not harm the requirements of the era and does not harm the security (Karaevli & Levent, 2014). When the individual feels that there is no danger or any harm for himself or when he has trust in the school, he will not hesitate to be supervised and will perceive the supervision process as an opportunity to develop. There is evidence concerning the fact that the transparency of the organization fosters organizational trust (Bandsuch, Pate & Thies, 2008; Norman, Avolio & Luthans, 2010; Schnackenberg, 2010; Karaevli & Levent, 2014). When the school principal shares information about the functioning of the school with the employees and increases the transparency of the school, the employee will also have confidence in the school. Therefore, the school worker will not want to hide the information about him from the school principal. The open area in the Johari window will expand. As the open area in the Johari window expands, the knowledge of the school employee will increase and the information he / she would like to hide in the supervision process will decrease. Thus, the guidance activity will be performed in a right way since the accurate data will be inferred from the supervision process and the employees’ development will be ensured by orienting them into the right conditions. At the same time, the school principal will benefit from this information in human resources planning by seeing the superior aspects of his employee. For his development in the weak areas of the employee, the school principal will be able to make efforts and provide trainings.

Recommendations

The fact that school transparency will improve the open area in the Johari window will help the supervision process fulfill its improving function. School employees want transparency especially in practice. Transparency in application affects the kindness dimension of the attitude towards the supervision. As the transparency in application increases, it can be said that the inspectors are seen gentler. School administrators should increase

transparency, particularly transparency in practice. Thus, especially the guidance/orienteering function of the supervision will work properly. Employees' hiding information from the supervisor/inspector will cause the supervisor to guide the employee depending on the inaccurate data, and the contribution of the supervision process to the proper function of the system will be limited. The paper is based on the authors' research and learning from working in this field. Further research in the field of school transparency as a means to drive attitude towards supervision is suggested. The research is limited to transparency, which is one of the variables thought to affect the attitude towards the supervision. It is also possible to work on different variables that can cause negative attitudes towards the supervision. The research is limited to data from pre-school, primary, secondary and high school schools. Different studies should be conducted for higher education institutions.

References

- Akan, D. & Zengin, M. (2015). İlkokul yöneticilerinin öğretmen denetim uygulamalarının değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of teacher supervision practices of primary school administrators]. *Eğitime Bakış*, 33, 89 - 95.
- Aseltine, J. M., Faryniarz, J. O., & Rigazio-DiGilio, A. J. (2006). *Supervision for learning*. Virginia: ASCD Publications.
- Aydın, M. (2000). *Çağdaş eğitim denetimi [Modern educational supervision]*. Ankara: Hatipoğlu Yayınları.
- Bakan, İ., Güler, B. & Kara, E. (2017). Örgütsel demokrasinin örgütsel adalet ve örgütsel destek algıları üzerine etkileri: Otel çalışanlarına yönelik bir araştırma [The effects of organizational democracy on organizational justice and support perceptions: A research devoted to hotel staff]. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22 (4), 1031-1048.
- Bandsuch, M., Pate, L., & Thies, J. (2008). Rebuilding stakeholder trust in business: An examination of principle-centered leadership and organizational transparency in corporate governance. *Business & Society Review*, 113, 99-127.
- Bartlett, J. E., Kotrlik, J. W., & Higgins, C. C. (2001). Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 19 (1), 43-50.
- Başar, H. (2000). Eğitim denetçisi [Education Inspector]. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Baykul, Y. (1992). Eğitim sisteminde değerlendirme [Evaluation in education system], *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7, 85-94.
- Bayram, N. (2010). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesine giriş Amos uygulamaları [Introduction to structural equation modeling AMOS applications]*. Bursa: Ezgi Kitapevi.
- Beganu, C. N. & Nişan, M. M. (--). *The Johari Window: A Model of Feedback and Selfdisclosure in Training*. (Erişim Tarihi: 14.05.2019). <https://studylib.net/doc/8072222/the-johari-window--a-model-of-feedback-and-selfdisclosure-in>.
- Berggren, E. & Bernsheteyn, R. (2007). Organizational transparency drives company performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(5), 411-417. doi:10.1108/02621710710748248.
- Bernstein, E. S. (2012). The transparency paradox: A role for privacy in organizational learning and operational control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 57, 181-216.
- Bijalwan, J. G. & Madan, (2013). Corporate Governance Practices, Transparency and Performance of Indian Companies. *IUP Journal of Corporate Governance*, 12, 45-79.
- Bozbayındır, F. (2016). Developing of a school transparency scale: A study on validity and reliability. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 8 (4), 46-58.
- Bursalioğlu, Z. (2002). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış [New structure and behavior in school management]*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Cassano, R. (2017). Transparency and Social Accountability in School Management. *Symphony Emerging Issues in Management*, 2, 19-30.
- Crowley, P. J. (2012). The rise of transparency and the decline of secrecy in the age of global and social media. *Penn State Journal of Law & International Affairs*, 1, 241-255.
- Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2011). Türk eğitim sisteminde bir alt sistem olan denetim sisteminin seçilmiş bazı ülkelerin denetim sistemleri ile karşılaştırılması [The comparison between Turkish Supervision System as a sub-system of educational system with some selected countries]. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2 (23), 23-48.
- Erdağ, C. & Karadağ, E. (2018). Okullarda Hissedilen Hesap Verebilirlik Baskıları ve Öğretmen Tepkileri Üzerindeki Muhtemel Bireysel ve Kurumsal Etkiler [Exploration of Possible Individual and Institutional Effects on School Accountability Pressures and Teacher Responses]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 24 (1), 93-142.
- Erdem, A. R. (2006). Öğretimin Denetiminde Yeni Bakış Açısı Sürekli Geliştirme Temeline Dayalı Öğretimin Denetimi [New Perspectives in Control of Instruction, Control of Instruction Based on Continuous Improvement]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16, 275-294.

- Ergün, H., & Çelik, K. (2018). Maarif müfettişlerinin füzyon ve fisyon sürecinde yaşadıklarına ilişkin nitel bir araştırma [A Qualitative Research on the Experience of Education Inspectors in the Process of Fusion and Fission]. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 6(3), 410-426. DOI:10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.6c3s19m.
- Geçkil, T. & Tikici, M. (2015). Örgütsel demokrasi ölçeği geliştirme çalışması [A Study on developing the organizational democracy scale], *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 48 (4), 41-78
- Gökçe, F. (1994). Eğitimde denetimin amaç ve ilkeleri [Objectives and principles of supervision in education]. *Hacettepe University journal of Education*, 10, 73-78.
- Gönülaçar, Ş. (2018). Eğitim denetiminde dönüşüm sancısı [Transformation pains in educational supervision]. *Eğitime Bakış*, 43, 88 - 97.
- Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D.C. (2009). *Basic econometrics (Fifth Edition)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gündüz, Y. (2012). Eğitim örgütlerinde denetimin gerekliliği: Kuramsal bir Çalışma [Inspection requirement in educational organizations: A theoretical study]. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 34, 1-6.
- Gürbüz, S. & Dikmenli, O. (2009). Örgütsel açıdan yolsuzluk: kavramsal yönü, özelliği, işletme çevresi, örgütsel davranış ve örgüt mimarisi bağlamında bir inceleme [Organizational perspective of corruption: an exploratory study in the context of its concept, its nature, organizational environment, organizational behavior and organizational architecture]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 22, 119- 237.
- Himmetoğlu, B., Ayduğ, D. & Bayrak, C. (2017). Eğitim örgütlerinde hesap verebilirliğe ilişkin okul yöneticilerinin görüşleri [Opinions of school administrators about accountability in educational organizations]. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 8 (1), 39-68.
- Kalman, M. & Gedikoğlu, T. (2014). Okul yöneticilerinin hesap verebilirliği ile örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [An investigation of the relationship between school administrators' accountability and organizational justice]. *Hacettepe University journal of Education*, 29(2), 115-128.
- Kapusuzoğlu, Ş. (2008). Okula Dayalı Yönetimde Denetim Sisteminin İşlevselliği ve Katkısının Değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of functional and contribution of inspection system in school based management]. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1 (16), 143- 155.
- Karaevli, Ö. & Levent, F. (2014). Okul yönetiminde şeffaflığın farklı kariyer evrelerinde bulunan öğretmenler üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi [Investigation of effect of transparency in school administration on teachers who are in different career phases]. *Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 40, 89-108.
- Karagöz, Y. (2016). *SPSS ve AMOS 23 uygulamalı istatistiksel analizler* [SPSS and AMOS 23 applied statistical analysis]. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Kayıkçı, K., & Uygur, Ö. (2012). İlköğretim okullarının denetiminde mesleki etik (Bir durum çalışması) [The Professional Ethics of Primary School Supervision (A Case Study)]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi* [Educational Administration: Theory and Practice], 18(1), 65-94.
- Kesen, M. (2015). Örgütsel Demokrasinin Çalışan Performansı Üzerine Etkileri: Örgütsel Özdeşleşmenin Aracılık Rolü [The effects of organizational democracy on employee performance: The mediating role of organizational identification]. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(2): 535-562
- Kılıç, E. D. & Önen, Ö. (2011). Öğrenen örgütlerde Johari Penceresi Burdur örneklemi [Johari window in learning organizations the case of Burdur]. *Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2 (5), 1-13.
- Knoll, M. K. (1987). *Supervision for better instruction*. USA. Prentice Hall.
- Köse, A. (2017). Problematic Course Supervision within Turkish Education System. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 46(2), 298-367.
- Köybaşı, F., Uğurlu, C. T. & Demir, D. (2017). Çağdaş Eğitim Denetimi Modeli Olarak Okullarda Farklılaştırılmış Denetim Uygulamalarına İlişkin Bir Araştırma [A study on the differentiated supervision practices in schools as Contemporary Education Supervision Model]. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15 (1), 43- 57.
- Kunnan, A.J. (1998). An introduction to structural equation modelling for language assessment, *research. Language Testing*, 15 (3), 295-332.
- Kurum, G. & Çınkır Ş. (2017). Cehennemde evlilik: Türkiye'de eğitim denetiminin birleştirilmesi üzerine maarif müfettişlerinin görüşleri [Marriage made in Hell: Views of education supervisors on the unification of education supervision in Turkey]. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 192, 35-57.
- Luft, J. (1982). *The Johari Window, a graphic model of awareness in interpersonal relations*. NTL, Reading book for Human Relations Training, NTL Institute, (Erişim tarihi: 06.05.2019), https://c.yimcdn.com/sites/fridayfellowship.siteym.com/resource/collection/D1FD72B3-693E-4EE5-AB18-B1233BBE9C51/JohariWindow_JLuft.pdf
- Memduhoğlu, H. B. & Zengin, M. (2012). Çağdaş eğitim denetimi modeli olarak öğretimsel denetimin Türk Eğitim Sisteminde uygulanabilirliği [Implementability of instructional supervision as a contemporary

- educational supervision model in Turkish Education System]. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi*, 5(1), 131-142.
- Memişoğlu, S. P. & Ekinçi, Z. (2013). General problems encountered in general inspections of primary schools according to the views of inspectors and principals. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 4 (3). 139- 147.
- Nadrifar, A., Bandani, E. & Shahryari, H. (2015). An overview of classical management theories: A review article. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 5 (9), 83-86.
- Nofriza, F. (2017), Development of training guide johari windows in improving student self-disclosure. *Indonesian Journal of School Counseling*, 2 (1), 41-47.
- Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2010). The impact of positivity and transparency on trust in leaders and their perceived effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21 (3), 350-364.
- Nwaokugha, D. O. & Danladi, S. A. (2016). Language and communication: Effective tools for educational supervision and inspection in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7 (3), 420- 428.
- Osterlund, C. L. & Mack, M. (2014). Graduate counseling student's personal relationships need intentional consideration for success. *Vistas Online*, 1-12.
- Özan, M. B. & Şener, G. (2015). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin denetim sürecine ilişkin algı ve beklentilerinin metaforlar aracılığı ile belirlenmesi [Examination of supervision-related perceptions and expectations of classroom teachers through metaphors]. *Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 41, 19-33.
- Özen, F. & Hendekçi, E., A. (2016). Türkiye'de Eğitim Denetimi Alanında 2005–2015 Yılları Arasında Yayımlanan Makale ve Tezlerin Betimsel Analizi [The descriptive analysis of academic studies published in Turkey about education supervision between the years of 2005-2015]. *OPUS – Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(11), 619-650.
- Ryan, T. G. & Gottfried, J. (2012). Elementary supervision and the supervisor: Teacher attitudes and inclusive education. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 4(3), 563-571.
- Saxena, P. (2015). Johari Window: An effective model for improving interpersonal communication and managerial effectiveness. *SIT Journal of Management*. 5 (2). 134-146.
- Schnackenberg, A. (2010). The constitutive role of transparency in organizations. Case Western Reserve University Working Paper No. 09, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland. Scholtens.
- Serhan, K. (2016). Administrative Transparency in Public Secondary Schools in Jordan. *European Scientific Journal*, 12 (13), 157-167.
- Stine, R. A. (1995). Graphical interpretation of variance inflation factors, *The American Statistician*, 49 (1), 53-56.
- Suharyono, S.. (2019). The Effect Of Accountability, Transparency, And Supervision On Budget Performance By Using The Concept Of Value For Money In Regional Business Enterprises (Bumd) Of Riau Province. *International Journal of Public Finance*, 4, 236-249.
- Şisman, F. A., Yozgat, U., Abunaz, E. & Özarslan, T. (2015). Importance of Transparency on Sustainable Success Orientation. *Research Journal of Business & Management*, 2 (3), 366-379.
- Tengblad, S. (2006). Is there a 'New Managerial Work'? A comparison with Henry Mintzberg's classic study 30 Years Later. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43 (7). 1437- 1461.
- Tonbul, Y. & Baysülen, E. (2017). Ders Denetimi ile İlgili Yönetmelik Değişikliğinin Maarif Müfettişlerinin, Okul Yöneticilerinin ve Öğretmenlerin Görüşleri Açısından Değerlendirilmesi [An Evaluation of the course inspection regulation according to the views of supervisors, teachers and principals]. *İlköğretim Online*, 16(1), 299-311.
- Uğurlu, C. T. (2015). Farklılaştırılmış Denetim ve Mentörlük [Differentiated supervision and mentoring]. *Eğitime Bakış*, 33, 11 - 16.
- Uğurlu, C. T. & Usta, G. (2016). Eğitimde Denetim Tutum Ölçeği Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması [A study of supervision attitude scale's validity and reliability]. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18 (1), 137-159.
- Uysal, G. (2003). Rol Farklılaşmasının İletişime Etkisi ve Johari Modeli [Effects of Role Differences in Communication and Johari Awareness Model]. *C.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 4 (1). 137-148.
- Yeşil, D. & Kış, A. (2015). Okul Müdürlerinin Ders Denetimine İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi [Examining the views of teachers on school principals' classroom supervision]. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2 (3), 27-45.
- Yıldırım, N. (2012). Eğitim denetmeni ve bakanlık denetmeni imajları üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir Çalışma [A comparative study of education supervisor and ministry supervisor images]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 18 (1). 143-166.
- Yıldız, F. F. (2014). Johari Penceresi ve otantik liderlik: Geri bildirim ve kişisel açılım ile kişisel farkındalık ve ilişkilerde şeffaflık [In feedback and personal initiative, personal awareness and relationships transparency]. *Örgütsel Davranış Kongresi, Melikşah Üniversitesi*, 6-8 Kasım 2014, Kayseri (s.313-322).