THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL INSPECTORS' SUPERVISION STYLES AND THEIR TRUST LEVELS

Gülay Yahyaoğlu
gulayyahyaoglu5@gmail.com

Azmiye Yinal
azmiye.yinal@akun.edu.tr

ABSTRACT
The main focus of this study is to understand the relationship between teachers' perceptions of educational supervisors' supervisory styles and their levels of trust. This quantitative study was conducted on 257 volunteer teachers selected from schools in TRNC using the Supervision Style Scale (SSS) and the Multipurpose Trust Scale. The findings of this study shed light on the relationships between teachers' preferences for supervisory styles and levels of trust depending on their experience, working hours and professional seniority. Regarding working years, it was determined that teachers with long term experience tended to adopt the non-directive style. In the analyses conducted according to professional seniority groups, it was observed that teachers with 21-30 years and 11-20 years of professional seniority adopted the cooperative style more. However, no significant relationship was found between trust levels and other supervision styles. These findings emphasize that there is no significant relationship between teachers' supervision preferences and their trust levels.
Keywords: Teacher, Inspector, Inspection, Trust.

Introduction
Problem Status
An effective supervision system and a safe cooperation with teachers are important for educational institutions to operate successfully, achieve set goals and achieve sustainable development (Öner and Türkoğlu, 2020). Audit processes are carried out by education inspectors and are implemented to improve the quality of education by contributing to the professional development of teachers (Tosun, 2021). Educational supervisors' approaches to teachers and their behaviors affect teachers' motivation, job satisfaction and cooperation skills. These interactions become more effective when educational supervisors exhibit a constructive, supportive and trust-building attitude. Supervisors' effective communication skills, establishing open communication channels and cooperation with teachers play an important role in achieving the goals of educational institutions (Tütüncü, 2021).

The existence of trust can create a positive working environment in educational institutions. It can increase teachers' levels of trust, cooperation, commitment and job satisfaction in administrators, colleagues and the educational institution. At the same time, teachers' tendency to take initiative and responsible behavior become more evident in an environment of trust (Taş and Akın, 2023). This can form the basis of an effective educational process that supports student success. High confidence levels of teachers have a positive effect on organizational variables. When the perception of trust is high, teachers' cooperation and communication skills increase, their stress levels decrease, and their conflict tendencies decrease. This strengthens communication in educational institutions, creates a healthy working environment and reduces resistance to change (Sökmen, 2019).

As a result, safe and supportive relationships that education supervisors establish with teachers are of great importance for the success of educational institutions (Degirmencioglu, Buruk, Kurt & Yinal, 2023). The existence of trust encourages effective communication, increases cooperation and increases the quality of educational processes (Uzun, 2018). This enables teachers to be more motivated, work more effectively, and create an educational environment that supports student success. In this context, the problem statement of the study is "Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the supervision styles of education inspectors and their level of trust?" It was determined as.

Purpose and Importance of the Research
The main purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of education inspectors' supervision styles and their trust levels. The supervision styles applied by educational inspectors may be an important factor affecting the professional development of teachers. In this context, how teachers perceive inspection processes is directly related to inspectors' methods, approaches and communication styles. The importance of the study is to understand how teachers' trust levels are shaped depending on their perceptions of supervision processes and to evaluate the effects of this relationship on cooperation, motivation, and

performance in educational institutions. This research will contribute to a more in-depth understanding of the relationship between the supervision styles of education inspectors and teachers, which is a critical issue in terms of educational management and teacher motivation.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this research are as follows:

1. H_1: There is a significant difference between the variable of working time in the institution and the supervision style scale.
   H_0: There is no significant difference between the variable of working time in the institution and the supervision style scale.
2. H_1: There is a significant difference between the professional seniority variable and the supervision style scale.
   H_0: There is no significant difference between the professional seniority variable and the supervisory style scale.
3. H_1: Multi-purpose trust scale with the variable of working time in the institution there is a significant difference between.
   H_0: Multi-purpose trust scale with the variable of working time in the institution there is no significant difference between them.
4. H_1: Multi-purpose trust scale with professional seniority variable there is a significant difference between.
   H_0: Multi - purpose trust scale with professional tenure variable there is no significant difference between them.
5. H_1: There is a relationship between teachers' perceptions of education inspectors' supervision styles and their trust levels.
   H_0: There is no relationship between teachers' perceptions of education inspectors' supervision styles and their trust levels.
6. H_1: The effect of teachers' perceptions of education inspectors' supervision styles on their trust levels.
7. H_0: The effect of teachers' perceptions of the supervision styles of education inspectors on their trust levels. There is no.

Assumptions

It is assumed that research participants gave their answers to the scale questions sincerely.

Limitations

Research;

- With the teachers who participated in the research,
- With the resources used,
- The scale used in the research is limited to the questions.

Definitions

Audit: Evaluating, controlling and reviewing the compliance of a process, an activity or an organization with established standards, rules, policies and procedures (Öner and Türkoğlu, 2020).

Inspector: A person who supervises, examines or controls a specific activity or process within or outside an organization or institution (Aydın, 2021).

Trust: It is defined as the belief, sincerity and sense of security that an individual or a group of individuals has in another or a system (Sökmen, 2019).

Theoretical Framework

Educational Audit

Educational auditing is a process carried out to evaluate the quality, effectiveness and suitability of an educational institution or educational program. This audit generally occurs in two main categories: internal and external audit. Internal audit is an evaluation process implemented within the educational institution itself. During this process, internal factors such as the institution's educational goals, curriculum, teaching methods, student achievements and student satisfaction are reviewed. Internal audit is carried out to determine the strengths of the institution, identify its weak points and develop improvement strategies (Çetin and Konan, 2020).

External auditing is usually carried out by independent organizations or the state. External audit of educational institutions usually aims to assess their compliance with certain standards and quality assurance. These audits are important to objectively evaluate the overall performance of institutions and determine their compliance with

quality standards. Educational supervision is an important tool to provide students with a better education, improve the quality of educational institutions and contribute to the development of the education system in general. This process encourages continuous improvement and helps educational institutions respond more effectively to the needs of society (Öner and Türkoğlu, 2020).

Educational supervision also includes a number of factors such as student success, faculty performance, resource management, physical infrastructure and management processes. Rigorous evaluation of these elements plays an important role in determining the overall effectiveness and sustainability of educational institutions. The data obtained during the education audit process is used to inform decision makers and make necessary improvements. This process ensures transparent management of internal processes and creates trust among stakeholders (Hajiyev, 2021).

Thanks to external audits, educational institutions can increase their reputation in society by proving their compliance with general standards. Educational supervision is a critical mechanism for the education system to continually evolve and adapt to changing needs. This process highlights the strengths of educational institutions and directs them to sustainable success, while also helping them identify their weak points and create development opportunities. Therefore, educational supervision is one of the cornerstones of a quality education system (Çetin and Konan, 2020).

Organizational Trust
Organizational trust refers to the belief of employees and stakeholders within an organization in each other, in the leadership level, and in the overall organizational goals. This trust is based on core values such as transparency, honesty, fairness and reliability. Organizational trust strengthens relationships within the organization, encourages cooperation and teamwork, and supports effective communication. Intrinsic trust includes the trust employees have in each other, in managers, and in the values of the organization. This environment of trust encourages open communication and allows conflicts to be resolved in a healthier way. The existence of trust increases employees' courage to make suggestions and creates an effective culture of collaboration within the organization. Consistency, transparency and fairness exhibited by leadership form the cornerstones of organizational trust. When managers lead with reliable and open communication, it increases employees' trust in the leadership level. This allows employees to feel more committed to the goals of the organization and establish a long-term business relationship (Sökmen, 2019).

Organizational trust covers not only relationships between employees but also customers, suppliers and external stakeholders. Trust in an organization contributes to the establishment of reputation and sustainable success towards the outside world. When trust is lacking, negative effects may occur within and outside the organization and long-term success may become difficult to achieve. Organizational trust is one of the cornerstones of an organization and contributes significantly to the creation of a healthy working environment. This atmosphere of trust increases employee motivation, strengthens business performance and supports the sustainable success of the organization. In the continuation of organizational trust, we also see factors that cause a series of positive effects to emerge within and outside the organization. Trust encourages employees to be more likely to take risks and share innovative ideas. This can increase the organization's capacity for continuous improvement and innovation (Sakalli and Örücü, 2019).

Organizational trust can help an organization manage change processes more effectively. When employees trust the leadership and the organization's strategies, they have a more positive attitude towards change. This can strengthen the organization's competitive advantage by increasing its adaptability. Organizational trust also has an economic impact. By encouraging trust, collaboration and teamwork, it can make business processes more efficient. This can lead to cost savings and increase the competitiveness of the organization. Organizational trust stands out as a critical element that positively affects the internal dynamics of an organization and strengthens its relationships with external stakeholders. An atmosphere of trust increases employee motivation, facilitates communication and creates a fundamental basis for long-term success. Therefore, leaders and managers making a conscious effort to establish and maintain organizational trust can make significant contributions to the sustainable success of the organization (Çelik and Gencer, 2019).

Method
Research Method
This research is a quantitative study. Quantitative research is often conducted using surveys, measurements, tests, questionnaires, databases containing numerical data, or other standardized measurements. This type of research tends to generalize over large groups of participants and aims to make sense of the findings using statistical analysis (Büyüköztürk et al., 2008) .

Population and Sample
The population of the study consists of 2000 teachers working in schools in Nicosia, Kyrenia, Famagusta, Iskele and Güzelyurt districts of TRNC. In this context, the sample of the study was determined by the simple non-elite sampling method. Simple non-elite sampling is a sampling method consisting of randomly selected individuals or units from a universe. In this method, each individual or unit has equal probability of being selected. Therefore, since each unit has a chance to be selected, the sample is likely to be representative (Büyüköztürk et al., 2008). In this context, 257 teachers who volunteered to participate in the study were included.

Data Collection Tools
Research data were collected with the Control Style Scale (WHO) and the All-Purpose Trust Scale.
Supervision Style Scale (WHO) is a measurement tool developed by Balcı (2012) and is designed to determine teachers' perceptions of the supervision style used by inspectors in the supervision process. The scale consists of three different dimensions: cooperative, non-directive and directive, and contains 21 items in total. WHO uses a 5-point Likert-type rating system to evaluate participants' perceptions of the audit process. Participants are asked to choose a value between 1 (Never) and 5 (Always) for each item. This rating system allows teachers to evaluate the style used by the inspector during the supervision process. There are a total of 8 items in the WHO's collaborative style subscale. The highest score that can be obtained from this dimension is 40 and the lowest score is 8. There are 7 items in the non-directive style dimension. The highest score that can be obtained from this dimension is 35 and the lowest score is 7. The directive style subscale consists of 6 items and the highest score that can be obtained from this dimension is 30 and the lowest score is 6. The response time of the scale is stated as approximately 10 minutes. WHO is used as a tool to understand and evaluate teachers' supervision styles in the supervision process.

Multi-Purpose Trust Scale; "The Omnibus T-Scale" is a measurement tool developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003) and was used in this study to determine the confidence levels of teachers in primary schools. The original scale consists of three different dimensions: trust in the principal, trust in the colleague, and trust in the student-parent.

This scale was used as a reliable tool to evaluate teachers' organizational trust levels and was supported by internal consistency coefficients. Cronbach's Alpha value for the Control Style Scale is 0.831 and the number of items is 21. This value indicates that the scale generally shows good internal consistency. Above 0.70 is generally considered an acceptable level of reliability. For the Multi-Purpose Trust Scale, Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.942 and the number of items is 20. This suggests that it shows a very high internal consistency and that the scale is reliable.

Analysis of Data
The data collected in the study was analyzed using SPSS 28.00 program. First, normal distribution test was performed. In each case, the hypothesis that the variable has a normal distribution is rejected because the p value (Sig.) is less than 0.05. In this case, it is concluded that the data is not normally distributed. In this case, nonparametric statistical tests can be used. These tests evaluate differences between groups using medians, percentiles, or ranks. Some common nonparametric tests include: Mann-Whitney U Test: Used to test the difference in means between two independent groups. It makes comparisons based on the sorted form of the data. Kruskal-Wallis H Test: Used to test the difference between means among three or more independent groups. Evaluates median differences between groups by sorting the data.

Findings
Demographic features
Demographic variables of the participants are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Information of Teachers

		N	%
Gender	Woman	151	58.8
	Male	106	41.2
marital status	Married	150	58.4
	Single	107	41.6
Age	22-26 years old	42	16.3
	27-35 years old	142	55.3
	36-45 years old	41	16.0

	46 and above	32	12.5
Working time in the institution	more than 1 year	45	17.5
	1-5 years	one hundred	38.9
	6-9 years	90	35.0
	10 years and above	22	8.6
professional seniority	1-10 years	11th	4.3
	11-20 years	104	40.5
	21-30 years	137	53.3
	more than 30 years	5	1.9
	Total	257	100.0

According to this data set, which includes a total of 257 teachers, the rate of female teachers is 58.8% while the rate of male teachers is 41.2%. The rate of married teachers was 58.4% and the rate of single teachers was 41.6%. Looking at the age distribution, it is seen that the majority of teachers are between the ages of 27-35 (55.3%). In addition, it is seen that teachers vary in terms of working hours and professional seniority in the institution.

Descriptive Analysis Results of Scales

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis of Control Style Scale and Multi-Purpose Trust Scale

	Min.	Max.	mean	Ss.
Collaborative Style	7.00	30.00	25.7588	3.30780
Non-Directive Style	11.00	20.00	16.9805	2.33427
Router Style	9.00	20.00	16.6965	1.94688
Control Style (General)	53.00	103.00	88.1051	9.14428
Trust in Colleagues	16.00	30.00	20.6576	5.90348
Trust in Student-Parent	17.00	37.00	29.7782	4.86231
Trust the Manager	15.00	21.00	20.2685	1.01257
Trust (General)	52.00	88.00	70.7043	11.35395

The descriptive analysis conducted on the Control Style Scale and the Multiobjective Trust Scale provides basic statistics for the subscales and general scales of both measurement tools. While the minimum score of 7.00 and the maximum score of 30.00 was obtained under the Collaborative Style, the average score of this style was determined as 25.76. While a minimum score range of 11.00 and a maximum of 20.00 was observed under the Non-Directive Style, the average score for this style was calculated as 16.98. Under Directive Style, a minimum score of 9.00 and a maximum score of 20.00 were obtained, and the average score was found to be 16.70. While a spread between minimum 53.00 and maximum 103.00 points was observed in the Supervision Style (General) evaluation, the average score was determined as 88.11.

Within the scope of the All-Purpose Trust Scale, the mean score corresponding to the minimum score range of 16.00 and maximum 30.00 obtained under Trust in Colleagues is 20.66. The scores under Student-Parent Trust are minimum 17.00, maximum 37.00, and the average is calculated as 29.78. In the evaluation under Trust in the Principal, a distribution between minimum 15.00 and maximum 21.00 points was observed and the average score was determined as 20.27. While a spread between minimum 52.00 and maximum 88.00 points was observed in the Trust (General) measurement, the average score was calculated as 70.70.

Difference Analysis
H_1: There is a significant difference between the variable of working time in the institution and the supervision style scale.
H_0: There is no significant difference between the variable of working time in the institution and the supervision style scale.

Table 3. Supervision Style Scale with Working Time Variable in the Institution

Scale dimensions	Working time in the institution	N	Cover.	Comparison Between Groups
Collaborative Style	more than 1 year	45	128.62	
	1-5 years	one hundred	126.50	χ^2= 1.073; p=0.784
	6-9 years	90	129.70	
	10 years and above	22	138.27	
Non-Directive Style	more than 1 year	45	135.53	
	1-5 years	one hundred	125.20	χ^2= 23.001; p = **0.031**
	6-9 years	90	126.74	10 years and above > 1-5 years
	10 years and above	22	142.18	
Router Style	more than 1 year	45	136.81	
	1-5 years	one hundred	129.39	χ^2= 4.563; p=0.287
	6-9 years	90	126.38	
	10 years and above	22	121.98	
Control Style (General)	more than 1 year	45	133.86	
	1-5 years	one hundred	127.17	χ^2= 3.002; p=0.391
	6-9 years	90	126.61	
	10 years and above	22	137.16	

p>0.05

In the intergroup comparisons made in the dimensions of Collaborative Style, Directive Style and Control Style (General), no significant difference was detected in relation to different working periods (p > 0.05). These results show that there is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' working hours and supervision style preferences. However, a significant difference was detected between the working time groups in the non-directive style, indicating that teachers' tendency to prefer this style may be related to their working time (p<0.05). In particular, it has been observed that teachers who have worked for 10 years or more have a higher average score than those who have worked for 1-5 years. This suggests that teachers with long-term experience may tend to prefer non-directive style more.

H_1: There is a significant difference between the professional seniority variable and the supervision style scale.
H_0: There is no significant difference between the professional seniority variable and the supervisory style scale.

Table 4. Supervision Style Scale with Professional Seniority Variable

Scale dimensions	professional seniority	N	Cover.	Comparison Between Groups
Collaborative Style	1-10 years	11th	122.64	χ^2= 22.725; p = **0.047**
	11-20 years	104	129.25	21-30 years > More than 30 years
	21-30 years	137	129.98	11-20 years > More than 30 years
	more than 30 years	5	111.00	
Non-Directive Style	1-10 years	11th	116.50	
	11-20 years	104	129.39	
	21-30 years	137	129.98	χ^2= .469; p=0.926
	more than 30 years	5	121.50	
Router Style	1-10 years	11th	126.86	χ^2= .296; p=0.961
	11-20 years	104	127.57	

	21-30 years	137	129.91	
	more than 30 years	5	138.60	
Control Style (General)	1-10 years	11th	131.73	χ^2= 1.774; p=0.621
	11-20 years	104	129.65	
	21-30 years	137	129.18	
	more than 30 years	5	104.50	

As a result of the analysis, a significant difference was detected between professional seniority groups in collaborative style (p<0.05). This shows that, according to the Collaborative Style scores, teachers with 21-30 years and 11-20 years of professional seniority prefer a higher collaborative style than teachers with more than 30 years of professional seniority. No significant difference was detected between professional seniority groups on other supervisory style dimensions and general supervisory style (p>0.05).

H_1: Multi-purpose trust scale with the variable of working time in the institution there is a significant difference between.
H_0: Multi-purpose trust scale with the variable of working time in the institution there is no significant difference between them.

Table 5. Multi-Purpose Trust Scale with the Variable of Working Time in the Institution

Scale dimensions	Working time in the institution	N	Cover.	Comparison Between Groups
Trust in Colleagues	less than 1 year	45	126.88	χ^2= 1.902; p = **0.044**
	1-5 years	one hundred	126.05	10 years and above > Others
	6-9 years	90	127.83	
	10 years and above	22	151.55	
Trust in Student Parents	less than 1 year	45	126.44	χ^2= 1.450; p=694
	1-5 years	one hundred	126.91	
	6-9 years	90	130.79	
	10 years and above	22	136.41	
Trust the Manager	less than 1 year	45	130.39	χ^2= .477; p=0.924
	1-5 years	one hundred	129.46	
	6-9 years	90	127.31	
	10 years and above	22	131.02	
Trust (General)	less than 1 year	45	130.59	χ^2= .630; p=0.890
	1-5 years	one hundred	126.39	
	6-9 years	90	127.87	
	10 years and above	22	142.25	

Analysis results show that there is a significant difference in the "Trust in Colleagues" dimension in the "Multi-Purpose Trust Scale" depending on the working period (χ^2=1.902, p=0.044). According to these findings, it has been determined that teachers who have been working in the same institution for 10 years or more have a higher level of trust in their colleagues than other working tenure groups. It is thought that the experience gained during the working period and long-term relationships within the institution may be effective in increasing the trust in colleagues. However, no significant difference was found in the dimensions of trust in student-parent, trust in the principal and general trust depending on the duration of study. This means that the duration of teachers' employment in their institutions did not create a statistically significant change in the levels of trust in students-parents, principals and in general (p values are 0.694, 0.924, and 0.890, respectively).

H_1: Multi-purpose trust scale with professional seniority variable There is a significant difference between .
H_0: Multi - purpose trust scale with professional tenure variable There is no significant difference between them.

Table 6. Multi-Purpose Trust Scale with Professional Seniority Variable

Scale dimensions		N	Cover.	Comparison Between Groups
Trust in Colleagues	1-10 years	11th	156.50	
	11-20 years	104	115.85	χ^2= 9.076; p = **0.028**
	21-30 years	137	134.62	1-10 years > 11-20; 21-30; more than 30 years
	more than 30 years	5	188.00	
Trust in Student Parents	1-10 years	11th	138.32	
	11-20 years	104	116.07	χ^2= 4.833; p=0.184
	21-30 years	137	136.42	
	more than 30 years	5	174.00	
Trust the Manager	1-10 years	11th	82.55	
	11-20 years	104	129.02	χ^2= 1.818; p=0.611
	21-30 years	137	132.50	
	more than 30 years	5	135.00	
Trust (General)	1-10 years	11th	131.18	
	11-20 years	104	117.29	χ^2= 5.057; p=0.168
	21-30 years	137	135.99	
	more than 30 years	5	176.10	

A significant difference was detected between professional seniority groups in the Trust in Colleagues dimension (χ^2=9.076, p=0.028). This shows that teachers with 1-10 years of professional seniority have a higher level of confidence than other groups. On the other hand, no significant difference was found between professional seniority groups in the dimensions of Trust in Student-Parent, Trust in Principal and General Trust (p=0.184, p=0.611, p=0.168, respectively). These results show that teachers do not experience a significant change in their levels of trust in students-parents, principals and in general depending on their professional seniority.

The Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Education Inspectors' Supervision Styles and Their Trust Levels

H_1 : There is a relationship between teachers' perceptions of education inspectors' supervision styles and their trust levels .

H_0: There is no relationship between teachers' perceptions of education inspectors' supervision styles and their trust levels .

Table 7. The Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Education Inspectors' Supervision Styles and Their Trust Levels (Spearman Correlation Analysis)

		Trust in Colleagues	Trust in Student Parents	Trust the Manager	Trust (General)
Collaborative Style	r	-0.050	-0.065	-0.010	-0.052
	p.	0.424	0.296	0.879	0.410
Non-Directive Style	r	-0.046	-.128 [*]	0.035	-0.061
	p.	0.462	0.041	0.574	0.334
Router Style	r	-0.095	-0.107	-0.076	-0.119
	p.	0.130	0.086	0.223	0.057

Audit (General)	r	-0.067	-0.105	0.010	-0.074
	p.	0.282	0.092	0.873	0.240

According to the results of this analysis, there are generally low or weak negative correlations between teachers' perceptions of education inspectors' supervision styles and their trust levels. However, these correlations are not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). This shows that there is no significant relationship between teachers' supervision styles and their trust levels.

The Effect of Teachers' Perceptions of Education Inspectors' Supervision Styles on their Trust Levels
H_1: The effect of teachers' perceptions of education inspectors' supervision styles on their trust levels.
H_0: Teachers' perceptions of education inspectors' supervision styles have no effect on their trust levels.

Table 8. The Effect of Teachers' Perceptions of Education Inspectors' Supervision Styles on their Trust Levels (Regression Analysis)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B.	Std. Mistake	Beta	t	p.
Still	93,177	3,597		25,905	0.000
Trust (General)	-0.077	0.054	-0.089	-1.428	0.154

According to the analysis results, the constant value was found to be 93.177 and this value represents the starting point of the regression equation. The standardized coefficient (Beta) obtained for the "Trust (General)" variable is -0.077. This coefficient shows that perceptions of supervision styles affect the overall level of trust. However, the p-value for the "Trust (Overall)" variable is 0.154, indicating no statistically significant effect. In other words, no significant effect could be detected between teachers' perceptions of education inspectors' supervision styles and their general trust levels.

Conclusions And Recommendations
The results of this research reveal important findings regarding teachers' perceptions regarding working hours, professional seniority groups and supervision styles. Regarding study times, a significant difference was detected between study time groups, especially in the non-directive style, indicating that teachers with long-term experience tend to prefer this style. In the analyzes made according to professional seniority groups, significant differences were found in collaborative style; It was determined that especially teachers with 21-30 years and 11-20 years of professional seniority preferred a higher collaborative style than those with more than 30 years of professional seniority. This shows that it is possible for experienced teachers to adopt a collaborative approach. In addition, a significant difference was found in the "Trust in Colleagues" dimension in the "Multi-Purpose Trust Scale" depending on the working period, showing that teachers who have worked for 10 years or more have a higher level of trust in their colleagues. However, no significant relationships were found in other trust dimensions (student-parent, principal and general trust) and between supervision styles and trust levels. This indicates that there is no significant connection between teachers' supervision styles and confidence levels. At the end of the research, the following recommendations were developed:

- Training programs and guidance can be provided to teachers to improve their leadership and direction skills.
- A collaborative learning environment can be encouraged by creating programs where experienced teachers can mentor new teachers.
- Activities and regular communication platforms can be created to increase trust within the institution.
- Participation in programs to develop general leadership skills may be encouraged.
- Teachers' needs can be better addressed by regularly conducting employee satisfaction surveys.

References
Aydın, S. K. (2021). Üniversitelerde iç denetim ve misyon sorunu. *Ünye İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, *4*(2), 9-22.
Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. İstanbul: Nobel Yayınları.
Çelik, K., & Gencer, M. (2019). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel güven algılarının değişime ilişkin tutumlarına etkisi. *Trakya Eğitim Dergisi*, *9*(1), 108-124.

Çetin, R. B., & Konan, N. (2020). Farklı ülkelerin eğitim denetimi sistemlerine ilişkin bir inceleme. *Scientific Educational Studies*, *4*(1), 45-77.

Degirmencioglu, E., Buruk, Z., Kurt, H. İ., & Yinal, Y. D. D. A. (2023). The Impact Of Digital Market On Consumer Purchasing Behavior. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education-July*, *13*(3).

Hajiyev, N. (2021). *Azerbaycan'da Iç Denetimin Gelişimi Ve Türkiye Ile Karşılaştırılması*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Universitesi Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Öner Ö. & Türkoğlu, M. E. (2020). Eğitim denetimi alanındaki lisansüstü tezlerin incelenmesi. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *19*(39), 1265-1285.

Sakalli, S. Ö., & Örücü, E. (2019). Örgütsel adalet ile örgütsel güven ilişkisinde kişilik özelliklerinin düzenleyici rolü ve bir alan araştırması. *Journal of Academic Value Studies*, *3*(16), 214-236.

Sökmen, A. (2019). Etik liderlik, örgütsel güven, iş tatmini ve işten ayrılma niyeti ilişkisi: bir hastane işletmesinde araştırma. *Third Sector Social Economic Review*, *54*(2), 917-934.

Taş, H., & Akın, E. (2023). Ortaokul Öğretmenlerinde Örgütsel Güven ve Okul İklimi Arasındaki İlişkinin Belirlenmesi: İkizce Örneği. *Social Sciences Studies Journal (Sssjournal)*, *9*(110), 6373-6378.

Tosun, A. (2021). Muhasebe denetimi ve denetim türleri. *Balkan & Near Eastern Journal of Social Sciences (BNEJSS)*, *7*.

Tütüncü, İ. (2021). *Okul müdürlerinin ders denetimi ile ilgili görüşleri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gelişim Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Uzun, T. (2018). Okullarda algılanan örgütsel destek, örgütsel güven, duygusal bağlılık ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı arasındaki ilişkiler. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, *8*(15), 958-987.