Perspectives Of Teachers Woring In Trnc Education Institutions And Supervisors Of The Ministry Toward The Current Supervision System In Trnc

Lütfiye FEDAİ

Near East University, North Cyprus

lutfiye_fedai@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to determine the point of views of the teachers who work in Secondary Schools and the auditors in the National Education Supervision Assessment and Steering Committee, on the Control System which is still used in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and to offer solution for the audit system to be more effective and productive according to this data.

With this aim the researcher, established the research in qualitative pattern, and asked open ended questions which are semiestablished in terms of the structure. In this context, the research was carried out by means of interviewing with 25 teachers who work in Secondary Schools and 15 ministry supervisors.

In this study, four sub-problems are asked to understand the problem of ' Do teachers and ministry supervisors perceive the audit system differently?'

1- Do teachers and ministry supervisors know the contents of the audit systems enough and think that it is transparent?

2- Do teachers and ministry supervisors believe that ministry supervisors have necessary competence?

3- Do ministry supervisors think that teachers have necessary competence and knowledge?

4- Do teachers and ministry supervisors think that the audit system is modern and it covers all its shareholders? Do they want to pass to multiple performance system?

The findings obtained from the research state that the teachers are uncertain about the aims of the audit system and that they do not trust the assessment phase adequately. According to the research findings, the teachers are anxious about the aim and the practice of the supervision. The limitedness of the research is the low number of participants and that the findings do not represent the opinions of all the secondary school teachers who work in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The importance of the research is that this research contributes to other researches about the education audit system in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus which are not studied enough till now and this research offers suggestion about the future practice and rules on the education supervision of Ministry of National Education.

Keywords: Education, Auditor, Teacher, Supervision, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

1. INTRODUCTION

Many definitions for education are available. Despite the differences in the definitions available, the main idea that all of them have in common is that education is the process of developing aimed behaviours through planned activities. (TRNC MOE Inspection Office, HANDBOOK OF THE INSPECTOR, 1997) Education tried to make people earn the wanted qualities through learning. Thus, it is crucial is to know what the learning process of humans is and managing the learning according to this process (Başaran, 1994). For education and teaching to meet its aim, certain

standards and quality should be met. In order to improve quality in education, the "supervision" process of schools supervised by themselves or supervision units is very important.

Supervision can be thought as the process of understanding whether organizational activities are appropriate for the determined principles and regulations in the direction of accepted objectives. A healthy and functionally running supervision system is expected to determine deviation intentions from the measures even before they occur and before causing big losses in the organization and offer readjustments. A supervision system with this power can be called as a healthy system (Aydın, 1993). The aim of supervision in education system is to enable and maintain school efficacy. Even if the supervision is done by school administration or superior administrators and supervisors, the goal does not change; school efficacy is what is aimed. The efficacy of the school is dependent on meeting the organizational, administrative and educational objectives (Başar, 2000).

A qualified evaluation system is needed to determine and correct teachers' inadequacies and mistakes. The data collected at the end of the evaluation will direct education, determine the areas open for improvement in education and provide professional development. However, this type of development cannot be expected with the supervision-based evaluation used in the education system of our country.

Supervision and evaluation are the two terms that are often mixed up. According to Knoll (1987), while leadership is in the foreground in supervision; in evaluation, a judgmental role is in the foreground from the perspective of the evaluatee. Evaluation has an important place in education-teaching activities. It is mandatory to do some measurements of a quality in order to make a decision. The evaluations carried out in education supervisions enable to express the quality of the works done in a quantitative way. According to the modern and scientific understanding of supervision, supervision does not solely aim control but is also carried out with the aim of improving the system and education-teaching process. Therefore, it is crucial to consider all inputs of the system for an objective and healthy supervision (Jenkins, 1998). According to Bernardin and Beatty, there are two objectives in evaluating personnel. First one is to develop benefitting from human resources; and the other one forms the basis for personnel affairs (Bernardin and Beatty, 1984). Evaluations do not only improve employee's efficacy but also determined the needs for development. An effective evaluation provides a goal for the personnel. The personnel feel the need to work efficiently to reach that goal. Thus, an efficient evaluation is needed for both catching the total quality as the whole institution and for the personnel to renew themselves.

When Grown refers to the duties of the supervisors, he states that firstly, the supervisor should help the teachers and administrators as the teacher of the teachers; mainly the supervisor should provide professional guidance needed by the teachers in order to enable teachers to conduct the expected teaching and prepare the learning opportunities appropriate for the students (Öz, 1977).

It is a fact that supervisor contact with different groups of people at guidance, on-the-job training, evaluation, investigation and inspection levels during the education supervision process. The development ways of the supervisor actively participating in this busy cooperation and interaction in the supervision process leads to shaping the ethical principles, and forces the supervision area and the supervisor for this (Aksoy, 1998).

The evaluation process is very important in education organizations, similar to all other types of organizations because determining whether the education service meets its goals in education institutions is essential for improving education-teaching activities and providing better education. Another point that determines the significance of evaluation process in educational organizations is the need to transfer or adapt the modern developments into the education process. In that sense, the most important responsibility in improving education-teaching activities falls onto the supervisors, school administrators and teachers; because the centralist education systems the improvement of education-teaching activities is done from the centre and the views of education shareholders are disregarded. In order to prevent this, education shareholders need to send their views on education-teaching, the shortcomings determined, developmental applications and their suggestions to the central organization.

In order for the above mentioned to happen, the beliefs or perceptions of education shareholders related to issues like supervision, education and administration should be in the same direction. This synergy in beliefs should be more in the direction of unifying different views for beneficial works rather than creating a monotype view. In that sense, this study aims to determine the supervision beliefs of supervisors and teachers who can be considered as important shareholders in the supervision process.

2. EDUCATION SUPERVISION SYSTEM IN TRNC

We can explore Inspection in the Education of Turkish Cypriots parallel to the development and evaluation of education. Due to the lack of information on the Ottoman Era Education System, this topic in explored in two parts:

1. Inspection in the British Era Education System (1878 – 16.08.1960)

2. Inspection in the Turkish Cypriot Education (from 16.08.1960 to present):

2.1. Inspection in the British Era Education System

A British Chief Inspector with no real function, two Primary school Chief Inspectors (one Turkish and one Greek) responsible for the administration, supervision and inspection of primary schools, and expert inspectors known as "Organizer" were available under each Chief Inspectorship. There were no special inspector staffs for secondary education.

3 Secondary Education Inspectors (1 Turkish Science inspector, Dr. Hüsnü Feridun and 2 Greek Trade-Economics and History-Geography Inspectors) formed the Secondary Education Inspectorship Unit by connecting to the British Chief Inspector on September 1st, 1954. This formation aimed to closely monitor the secondary education institutions collaboratively with the mixed secondary education inspection group formed by the British Colony Ruling. As a result of this, a Turkish School was going to be inspected by a Greek inspector or a Greek School was going to be inspected by a Turkish inspector. As a result of the reactions, it was divided into two as the Turkish and Greek Chief Inspectorships after two years.

As Cyprus was included in the British Commonwealth, upon his arrival in Cyprus in 1955, Mr. Tudhope, one of Queen's Inspectors linked to the Central Authority of the Ministry in Education in London, rapidly started forming two separate inspection groups for both communities, separate inspection and administration staff from each other, and the primary education and secondary education inspectorships for both communities and came together under their own Chief Inspectorship. Inspectors who were considered appropriate were sent to England through British Council for trips and seminars in order to improve inspection running.

In his 3-years of service as Education System Director in Cyprus, Mr. Tudhope brought a renovation called the "Major Inspection". According to this, every school was subjected to "Major Inspection" maximum every two years and comprehensive reports are prepared in addition to the regular inspections. (KASAPÇOPUR, 2007).

2.2. Inspection in the Turkish Cypriot Education

2.2.1. Republic of Cyprus Era

Supervision was at the hands of British until 1960 in Cyprus where the whole island was under the control Britain at the beginning of 1900's. When Turks took over the ruling in 1960, they also took inspections at schools under their responsibility. However, there were no definite criterion for teacher and school inspection, these criterion were formed by the inspector based on his/her previous experience and knowledge. The inspector was checking the building first, followed by monitoring the principal and finally lesson inspection, meaning inspecting the teachers. (TAŞKIN, 2011)

The following information was provided in the report written by Dr. Hüsnü Feridun, Science Inspector, on the 1958–1959 Academic Year to the Turkish Federation Presidency:

"Inspection of the primary schools: The inspection team should be made more effective with less staff. A team of total 14 inspectors: 1 Chief Inspector, 6 Inspectors, 7 Special Inspectors (2 for Arts, 2 for Physical Education, 1 for Music, 1 for School Gardens and 1 for Home Economics) were available for primary schools. These people were mainly responsible for seeking advice, guidance as well as writing reports.

Inspection of secondary schools: The Secondary Schools Inspectorship has a team of 5 people consisting of Chief Inspector (Turkish and Philosophy), Science Courses Inspector, History-Geography Inspector and Maths Inspector for its 14 Secondary Schools". (FERİDUN, Boğaziçi Publishing)

According to the Turkish Cypriot Community Council Education Office Organization Regulations that took effect on January 1st, 1961; the education affairs of the Turkish Cypriot Community were to be run by the Education Office. The Education Office was managed by a Director and Vice-Director and it was formed by three branches: Primary Education Branch, Secondary-Vocational-technical Education Branch, and Special Education Branch.

The political head of the Education Office is the related member of the Education Affairs of the Enforcement Council formed from the members of the Turkish Cypriot community Council (KASAPÇOPUR, 2007).

2.2.2. Era of Turkish Community Governing

It is not possible to keep the Turkish Cypriot Education and inspection in education separate from the political life of the Turkish Cypriot community. These issues can only be explored parallel to the political eras. After the Turkish Cypriots were excluded from the Republic of Cyprus on December 21st, 1963; they had to form their own government. The governing eras of the Turkish Cypriot Community until today are as follows:

General Committee Era (21.12.1963 – 28.12.1967) / Temporary Turkish Cypriot Ruling (28.12.1967 –

21.04.1971) / Turkish Cypriot Ruling (21.04.1971 – 01.10.1974) / Autonomous Turkish Cypriot Ruling (01.10.1974 – 13.02.1975) / Turkish Federated State of Cyprus (13.02.1975 – 15.11.1983) / Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (15.11.1983 – to present) .

From the middle of the 1989 "Foundation, Duties and Working Principles Regulations" were started to be designed and forming were started to be based on this regulations.

2.2.3. Legal Foundations of the Current Supervision in TRNC

Basic arrangements have been made regarding education and supervision by stating the following:

1- 59(2). Amendment of TRNC Constitution:

"All teaching and education activities are free under the monitoring and supervision of the Government."

2- 68(1). Amendment of the National Education Law:

"The Ministry is responsible for running, monitoring and supervising education and teaching services under the name of the government. The Ministry fulfils these duties with the organization and institutionalizing within its structure."

3- 23(2). Amendment of the National Education Law:

"Education and teaching activities can be run in relation to the rules of the 53rd Amendment under the monitoring and supervision of the government, with the hands of real people and private law legal entities".

The Inspection Office of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is formed based on the Law of National Education Supervision, Assessment and Direction Board (Founding, Duties and Working Principles) dated May 2nd, 2006. In the structure of this board, division of duties have been done among the levels of the Ministry, District and Schools.

It is said that "The duties stated in this law are carried out by the supervision and assessment boards listed below and the hand of the Education Chief Supervisor and Education Supervisors related to these boards"; and is made up of organs like:

1- **Supreme Board:** Supreme Board of Education Supervision, Assessment and Direction

2- **General Board:** General Board of Education Supervisors

3- **District Boards:** District Education Supervision, Assessment and Direction Boards, and

4- **School Boards:** School Education Supervision, Assessment and Direction Boards.

The coverage and duties of the boards formed are explained in detail in the law; and the duties and authorities of the **Education Supervisors** are listed as follows:

— Education Supervisors report the results of their supervision, assessment, research and evaluation carried out under the supervision of the Education Chief Supervisor in charge, as well as the shortcomings, flaws, inadequacies and inappropriateness to the Presidency of the Supreme Board through the Education Chief Supervisor in charge;

⸺ Guides, directs and trains the teachers on the job within the framework of principles and measures determined during lesson, teacher and institution education supervisions and evaluations;

— Fulfils the duties given to him/her by the President of Education Supervision Board, Vice-President (Vice-Principal) or the Education Chief Supervisor in charge and have to conclude the duties with a report;

— Is responsible to for fulfilling the duties to the President of Supreme Board and Vice-President (Vice-Principal) and related Education Chief Supervisor and fulfilling other duties given by his/her superiors.

2.3. Main Differences between the Old Inspection System and the New Education Supervision System

Comparing the main differences of the Old Inspection System and the New Education Supervision System in structural, functional, objective, Assessment-Evaluation and Guidance aspects will help to perceive the current situation better and interpret the findings of the study related to the perceptions of supervisors and teachers toward the supervision system in a healthier manner.

TABLE-1: Main differences between the Old Inspection System and the New Education Supervision System

Structural Aspects	
Old	Head of Inspection Unit and Inspectors
New	Supreme Board, General Board, District Boards and School Boards
Functional Aspects	
Old	Evaluation solely based on inspector findings Teacher Supervision
New	A board structure where duties and responsibilities are shared (multi-supervision multi-evaluation)
	Evaluation based on multi-performance analysis
	Indication of Success (The difference of the level of students/institution reached from the previous level)
Assessment-Evaluation and Guidance Aspects	
Old	Curriculum-focused (Which topics are covered? In how much time?)
	The effort of teacher transferring information and the amount of knowledge transferred
	Precautions only at the event of a problem
New	Focused on Student, Teacher and School Performance (What subjects-skills are acquired? At what level?)
	"What" and "how well" students/school learn is in the foreground
	Continuous guidance External Supervision (Once every one or two years) District Supervision Boards (Periodic and continuous local supervision and guidance) School Education Evaluation Boards, with Expert-Guidance-Formatter teachers (Continuous internal supervision and guidance)

3. AIM OF RESEARCH

The aim of this study to collect the opinions of teachers working in Secondary Schools and of supervisors working in the National Education Assessment and Guidance Board on the current Supervision System in TRNC; suggest possible solutions; and shed a light for the future studies.

4. SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH

The lack of information caused by the low number of studies carried out on this topic in TRNC and the importance of supervision in education field have formed the basis for the significance of this study.

Finding out the perceptions of teachers working in State Secondary Schools and supervisor toward supervision, determining the differences in these perceptions and exploring the reasons behind these differences, what can be done to eliminate such differences is crucial for health running of the supervision process and reaching organizational goals.

It is an important step for the organizational aims of education-teaching activities and reaching the general objectives of National Education to show mutual approaches by teacher and supervisors during the supervision

process.

5. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Do teachers and supervisors perceive the supervision system in different ways?

In order to help understand the problem better and take a more detailed look, four sub-problem questions have been formulated:

1- Are teachers and supervisors sufficiently informed about the contents of the supervision system and do they consider the system to be transparent?

2- Do teachers and supervisors think the supervisors possess sufficient resources for this duty?

3- Do supervisors believe that teacher have sufficient field knowledge and resources?

4- Do teachers and supervisors think that the current supervision is modern and it covers all shareholders? Do they want to move to the multi-performance system?

6. METHODOLOGY

6.1. RESEARCH MODEL

The research is designed as qualitative model based on the review of related literature and expert opinions. Qualitative research is based on interpretative approach. Qualitative research is defined as the research during which qualitative data collection methods such as observation, interview and document analysis is used, and that follows the process of putting perceptions and events forward in a realistic and wholly way in natural setting. In other words, it is an approach that considers researching and understanding social concepts in their related setting on the basis of forming a hypothesis (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2004).

6.2. DATA COLLECTION

Semi-structured interview techniques from qualitative research techniques have been used in this study. Semi-structured interviews are techniques in the middle of two extremes, and they give the researcher the needed flexibility and convenience. (Karasar, 1999).

The underlying situation will be explored healthier rather than superficial through the interview technique used in this research. Suitable for this model, semi-structured, open-ended questions were asked to supervisors and teachers. The most significant benefit of semi-structures interviews for the researcher is that they provide more systematic and comparable results due to following the pre-structured protocols. (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2004)

6.3. POPULATION AND SAMPLE

This study was carried out with 25 teachers working at Secondary Schools in Nicosia from branches like Physical Education, English, Biology, Turkish, Computer, Science and 15 Ministry supervisors. Research was done through purposeful sampling on limited number of people throughout the study.

6.4. DATA ANALYSIS

This study is a field study as it tries to identify the thoughts of supervisors and teachers related to an issue (supervision system). Descriptive method has been adopted because an assessment is considered. At the description stage, the researcher identifies the data collected in a comprehensive way and by doing this; the researcher aims the reader to get the information from first-hand related to the data collection environment, details of the data, opinions of the participants and the research process. (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005) The implementation of the research is in a way of data collection through interview questioned formed by the researchers after literature review. 14 questions have been formed for the supervisors and 13 questions were formed for the teachers. Frequency values of the data collected in the research have been calculated. Additionally, supervisor and teacher opinions have been quoted for internal reliability and validity of the research findings.

A research frame appropriate for the qualities of supervision principles have been formed for data collection through interviews and analysis of the collected data.

7. FINDINGS

7.1. Findings related to the first sub-problem

After the analysis made upon the question on the transparency of the system and if it is sufficiently known to the supervisors and the teachers, it is understood that they meet at a common point that the system is well-known and transparent. This is shown in Table 2.

TABLE–2: Are the teachers and supervisors sufficiently informed about the contents of the supervision system and do they consider it to be transparent?

Supervisor	Have you sufficiently informed the teachers under your responsibility about the supervision criterion you will implement?		
		f	%
	Yes	13	86,67%
	No	1	6,67%
	Partly	1	6,67%
	What do you think about the current supervision system? Do you consider it to be transparent and scientific?		
		f	%
	Yes	3	20,00%
	No	5	33,33%
	Partly	7	46,67%
Teacher	Do you believe that your supervisor evaluates your performance transparently enough?		
		f	%
	Yes	15	60,00%
	No	8	32,00%
	Partly	1	4,00%
	Don't Know	1	4,00%
	Does your supervisor provide sufficient information on the criterion to be implemented and what is expected of you?		
		f	%
	Yes	15	60,00%
	No	10	40,00%
	What do you think about the current supervision system? Do you consider it to be transparent and scientific?		
		f	%
	Yes	10	40,00%
	No	12	48,00%
	Partly	3	12,00%

7.2. Findings related to the second sub-problem

Based on the answers gathered from supervisors and teachers, it is determined that supervisors are perceived to have enough resources for the supervision responsibility. This is shown in Table 3.

TABLE–3: Do teachers and supervisors believe that supervisors are sufficiently equipped?

		f	%
Supervisor	Do you consider the time allocated to evaluating teachers is enough?		
	Yes	4	26,67%
	No	9	60,00%
	Partly	2	13,33%
	Do you contribute to the professional development of the teachers under your responsibility? Do you find their general knowledge and pedagogical field knowledge satisfactory?		
	Yes	12	80,00%
	No	2	13,33%
	No Answer	1	6,67%
	Do you believe that you have enough resources while evaluating your teachers?		
	Yes	15	100,00%
	No	0	0,00%
	Do you explain your views on the lesson after finishing the observation of a teacher's lesson?		
	Yes	15	100,00%
	No	0	0,00%
Teacher	Do you consider the time allocated to evaluate you is enough?		
	Yes	12	48,00%
	No	13	52,00%
	Do your supervisors contribute to your professional development? Do they provide enough help to make various teaching programs and work planned?		
		f	%

Yes	15	60,00%
No	9	36,00%
Partly	1	4,00%

Do you believe that supervisors have enough resources while evaluating you?		
	f	%
Yes	15	60,00%
No	8	32,00%
Partly	2	8,00%

Do you receive feedback from your supervisor after they finish observing your lesson?		
	f	%
Yes	21	84,00%
No	1	4,00%
Partly	1	4,00%
No Answer	2	8,00%

7.3. Findings related to the third sub-problem

While the supervisors believe that teachers possess sufficient resources; the teachers reflected that they do not have sufficient resources through the behaviour they showed within the supervision system. This is shown in Table 4.

TABLE–4: Do supervisors believe that teachers have enough field knowledge and resources?

	Do teachers show the expected qualities?		
Inspector		f	%
	Yes	1	6,67%
	No	2	13,33%
	Partly	3	20,00%
	No Answer	9	60,00%
Teacher	What kind of attitude do you develop if you are unprepared when the supervisor comes to observe you? Would you do any preparations?		
		f	%
	Yes	11	44,00%
	No	14	56,00%

Do you feel uncomfortable while being observed by a supervisor?		
	f	%
Yes	23	92,00%
No	2	8,00%

7.4. Findings related to the fourth sub-problem

It is understood from the analysis results that teachers have partly different opinions of moving towards the multi-performance system compared to the supervisors; though the current system is considered to be transparent it still has some flaws. This is shown in Table 5.

TABLE–5: Do teachers and supervisors consider the current supervision system as modern and covering all shareholders, would they prefer to move to multi-performance system?

	Do you believe that you are able to fully measure teachers' performance with the criteria you are implementing?		
		f	%
	Yes	2	13,33%
	No	7	46,67%
	Partly	6	40,00%
	If you are asked to choose between the multi-performance system (supervisor, principal, unit, student, parent) which is aimed at and the current supervision system, which one would you prefer? Would you want multi-performance system?		
		f	%
	Yes	14	93,33%
	No	0	0,00%
	In-between	1	6,67%
	How would you evaluate the teachers' interest toward supervision? Is it positive?		
		f	%
	Yes	11	73,33%
Inspector	No	2	13,33%
	Partly	2	13,33%
Teacher	If you are asked to choose between the multi-performance system (supervisor, principal, unit, student, parent) which is aimed at and the current supervision system, which one would you prefer? Would you want multi-performance system?		

	f	%
Yes	11	44,00%
No	12	48,00%
Partly	1	4,00%
No Answer	1	4,00%
How are the supervisor-teacher relationships within the supervision system?		
	f	%
Positive	16	64,00%
Negative	8	32,00%
Partly	1	4,00%

8. IMPLICATIONS AND RESULTS

Under the light of the finding related to the research carried out in order to find out if there are any differences in the perspectives of teachers and supervisors toward the TRNC education supervision system and if there are any, what kind of a difference is it; it was found that there is no totally unrelated perception related to the system, similar perceptions and judgments exist; however, it is needed to clarify the boundaries and what exactly is the system and what it should be for parties but mostly for teachers. According to this, it is understood that:

1- Though the current system is considered to be transparent and scientific, there are still problems and flaws,

— From supervisor statements like*, in-service training should be improved, supervisor reports should be valued, and inspections should come to a conclusion,*

— *Being scientific should be given priority, rather than political concerns,*

— *Evaluation Reports should be shown to the teachers,*

— *It should be open and sharing*,

— Also from teacher statements like*, there is no briefing,*

— *Criterion is not mentioned.*

2- Some aspects of the system are not understood either by the supervisors or the teachers,

— From supervisor statements like, *I'm not sufficiently informed on some parts,*

— *We can't measure enough even when we use the criterion fully,*

— *Information gathered from administrative staff may not be unbiased,*

— *It is difficult to observe in one or two days' time,*

— Also from teacher statements like, *Transparency is dependent on the supervisors,*

— *It changes from one supervisor to the other,*

— *There should be at least 2 evaluations in 1 semester.*

3- The old "inspection" understanding is still on-going and the new "supervision" concept and its contents are not yet to be internalized,

— From teacher statements like, *supervisor-teacher relationship should be friendly,*

— *Should not express a dominant quality,*

— *Performance cannot be evaluated in 40 minutes,*

— Also from supervisor statements like*, the relationship should be appropriate for the stats of both sides.*

4- There are differences in the supervisor practices during supervisions,

— From teacher statements like, *teachers are not receiving enough help,*

— *Supervisor exchanges perspectives and informs,*

— *They do not stick with the criterion they announce at the beginning of the year.*

5- Teachers feel uncomfortable about supervision,

— From the answer YES that 92% of the teachers gave to the question: *"Do you feel uncomfortable while being observed by a supervisor?"*

6- The number of supervisors is low and supervisions cannot be done on time,

— from the *answer NO given by 60.00% of the supervisors on the question: "Do you consider the time allocated for evaluating teachers is enough?"* and

— from statements like *Only new teachers are evaluated.*

7- Supervisors are not effective enough,

— From statements like, *Supervisors have too many responsibilities, they are low in number, there is to initiative for school autonomy,*

— *In-service training should be improved, supervisor reports should be valued, and inspections should come to a conclusion.*

8- Supervisors find teachers partly adequate,

— From the answer *PARTLY given by 20.00% of the supervisors to the question: Do teachers show the necessary qualities?* and

— From statements like, *Teachers should be able to think outside the course book with classroom management and material development skills,*

— *They should be aware of current developments, be devoted and open to team-work.*

9- Teachers want to see Supervisors as 'Guide',

— From the answer *GUIDE given by 56.00% of the teacher to the question: 'In your opinion, what should be the role of supervisors in the TRNC Supervision system?'*

10- The 'Multi-Performance System' which is what is aimed, is generally seen appropriate but it still evokes some suspicions amongst teachers,

— from the answer *NO given by 48.00% and the answer YES gıven by 44.00% of the teachers to the question: 'If you are asked to choose between the multi-performance system (supervisor, principal, unit, student, parent) which is aimed at and the current supervision system, which one would you prefer? Would you want multi-performance system?'*

9. SUGGESTIONS

1- Supervisors should be put into continuous in-service training on the modern supervision methods and techniques.

2- Supervisors should be given the opportunity to improve themselves. For this, they should be encouraged for post-graduate study and follow the researches in their field.

3- Transportation problems of the supervisors should be solved. It should be made easier for supervisors to benefit from state vehicles.

4- Number of supervisors should be increased to reduce the teacher ratio per supervisor.

5- Supervisors who supervise education should not also be given inspection duties. Inspection supervisors should be employed separately.

6- Precautions should be taken for the betterment of positions and status of supervisors.

7- People who studied Education Management and Supervision as undergraduate and/or post-graduate

should be employed as supervisors.

8- In-service training programs should be developed to inform the teachers and change their perceptions on supervision.

9- Precautions should be taken to inform teachers during and after the supervision process on the criterion and supervision results.

10- The not-yet-finished parts of the education supervision (district boards and school boards) should be finished as soon as possible.

REFERENCES

AKSOY, A.H.(1998). *Eğitim Denetiminde Etik*, Yayımlanmış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İnönü Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

AYDIN, M. (1993). *Çağdaş Eğitim Denetimi*. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

BAŞAR, H. (2000) *Eğitim Denetçisi,* Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

BAŞARAN, İ. E. (1994) *Eğitim Yönetimi,* Ankara: Kadıoğlu Matbaası.

BERNARDİN, H.J. and Beatty, Richard W.(1984). Performance Appraisal: Assessing

FERİDUN, Hüsnü(Dr.), EĞİTİMLE BİR ÖMÜR, Boğaziçi Yayınları

JENKINS, Lee. İmproving Student Learning. (Çev: Gönül Yenersoy), (1998)İstanbul, Kalder Yayınları

KARASAR, Niyazi. (1995) *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi,* Ankara: 3A Eğitim Araştırma Danışmanlık Ltd.

KASAPÇOPUR, Ahmet (2007), *Avrupa Birliği Ülkelerinde Eğitim Denetimi*, TC MEB Teftiş Kurulu Başkanlığı.

MÜFETTİŞİN EL KİTABI (1997), KKTC MEB Teftiş Dairesi.

KNOLL, K.(1987).Supervision for Better Supervision (Practical Techiqes for

ÖZ, F.(1977). *"Türk Eğitim Sisteminde İlköğretim Müfettişlerinin Rolü"*. Yayımlanmamış

Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi.

TAŞKIN İley, KKTC Denetleme Değerlendirme Yönlendirme Kurulu Müdür Muavini,(2011), Yayınlanmamış Makale.

YILDIRIM, A., ŞİMŞEK,H.(2004) *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri,* Ankara-Seçkin Yayıncılık