



## Beyond the Impasse: A Vicious Cycle in Educational Supervision

### Eğitimde Denetim Çıkmazı: Bir Kısır Döngü

Rezzan UÇAR<sup>1</sup>, Ayşegül ATALAY<sup>2</sup>

**Article Type**<sup>3</sup>: Research Article

**Application Date**: 31.03.2023

**Accepted Date**: 02.01.2024

**To Cite This Article**: Uçar, R. & Atalay, A. (2024). Beyond the impasse: a vicious cycle in educational supervision. *Anadolu University Journal of Education Faculty (AUJEF)*, 8(1), 356-375.

**ABSTRACT**: The supervision system is one of the most important pillars of the education system and undoubtedly plays an important role on its development. However, new regulations made almost every year cause constant questioning about whether it works or not in the supervision system and its practices. In this study, it was deemed important to evaluate the supervision system from the perspective of those who directly supervise. Therefore, detailed interviews were held with education supervisors regarding the changes and regulations. It was determined that the majority of the participants evaluated the current structure negatively. The results of constant changes in the supervision structure affect both the supervisors and the whole system, and cause a great deal of damage in many ways. The supervisors mostly stated that there is uncertainty in the supervision system and that it damages the independent structure of the system and so this creates a vicious circle. The fact that changes and innovations made to improve the system are constantly putting the system into a dead end. It is recommended to make changes that will ensure the development of educational supervision in a stable manner.

**Keywords**: Supervision, vicious cycle, education, legislation, supervisor.

**ÖZ**: Denetim sistemi, eğitim sisteminin en önemli ayaklarından biridir ve gelişmesinde şüphesiz önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Ancak hemen hemen her yıl yapılan yeni düzenlemeler, denetim sistemi ve uygulamalarında işleyip işlemediğinin sürekli olarak sorgulanmasına neden olmaktadır. Bu çalışmada denetim sisteminin doğrudan

<sup>1</sup> Associate Prof./Ph.D., Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Department of Educational Administration, ucarrezzan@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-4526-2517

<sup>2</sup> Asst. Prof./Ph.D., Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Department of Educational Administration, atalay.aysgl@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-3079-801X (Corresponding author)

<sup>3</sup> Van Yüzüncü Yıl University Ethics Committee, Date: 10.06.2022, Protocol No: 9405

denetimi yapanlar gözünden değerlendirilmesi önemli görülmüştür. Bu kapsamda taşra ve bakanlık bünyesinde çalışan maarif müfettişleri ile yapılan değişiklikler ve düzenlemeler ile ilgili detaylı görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Katılımcıların büyük çoğunluğunun mevcut yapıyı olumsuz değerlendirdikleri tespit edilmiştir. Denetim yapısındaki sürekli değişikliklerin sonuçları hem denetçileri hem de tüm sistemi etkilemekte ve birçok yönden büyük zararlara neden olabilmektedir. Müfettişler çoğunlukla denetim sisteminde bir belirsizliğin olduğunu ve bunun sistemin bağımsız yapısını bozduğunu ve dolayısıyla sürekli başa dönen bir kısır döngü oluşturduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre sistemi iyileştirmek adına yapılan değişiklik ve yeniliklerin sistemi sürekli çıkmaza soktuğu sonucu çıkmaktadır. Bu kapsamda eğitim denetiminin istikrarlı bir şekilde gelişmesini sağlayacak değişikliklerin yapılması önerilmektedir. Sistemin daha iyi olmasına dönük ve ilgili paydaşların gelişimini gözeterek değişikliklere sadık kalınmasına ihtiyaç olduğu söylenebilir.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** Denetim, kısır döngü, eğitim, yasal düzenleme, müfettiş.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In order to maintain the functionality and increase the quality of educational practices, an effective supervision system is indispensable. In this regard, supervision, which plays a mediating role in the success of the education system, is expected to contribute to the whole system and to the progress of all education stakeholders involved in the system. Supervision, which Aydın (2013) discussed from different perspectives as a managerial perspective, a teaching process, a program development activity, and a human relations process, should be seen as one of the most important issues in achieving the goals of education. It is also important that supervision has a development-oriented function according to the modern education approach (Aydın, 2013). There is a similar purpose throughout the world, and the contents of many scientific studies (Jacobs&Yendol-Hoppey, 2010; Burns&Badiali, 2016; Glanz, 2018; Haberin, 2019; Glanz&Hazi, 2019) published on educational supervision in recent years are also geared this way.

Over the years, it is understood that educational supervision that has been a control mechanism that supervises and restricts teachers so that they do not make mistakes, has turned into practice with an understanding that allows schools to control themselves in cooperation and group dynamics (Beycioğlu & Dönmez, 2009). This changing aspect of supervision takes place to respond to the needs in the best way possible. Educational supervision is affected by the social and educational mobility, and economic and bureaucratic structures of that country in many countries, including Western Europe and the USA, which takes its roots from there (Glanz, 1994). For this reason, the supervision system is affected by many factors in parallel with the education system of the country and becomes open to change. This situation seems to be valid for the supervision system in the Turkish education system as well. Especially in recent years, many changes and modifications have been made in the supervision system, and it has been observed that the duties, roles, and responsibilities of education inspectors have been redefined by various legal regulations.

### 1.1. The Regulations

The educational supervision system in Turkey has a long history and the relevant regulations were started to be made during the Ottoman Empire period. The school inspectorate was first mentioned in 1846 as "muin"; in 1862, the officers assigned to inspect secondary and primary schools were given the title of inspector (Akyüz, 2015; Taymaz, 2005 cited by Memduhoğlu, 2012). The history of supervision in the education system is very old; it is observed that many changes have been made in the supervision system over the years. For example, Uçar (2020) revealed the historical development of the inspectorate and revealed that many legal regulations have been made over the years. Similarly, Şahin et al. (2013) stated that as a result of many changes made during the historical development of inspection, previous laws and regulations were repeated, or what was intended to be done was generally not achieved at the desired level; therefore, they pointed out that the system is in a vicious circle. On the other hand, Kel and Akın (2021), in their study, revealed that the changes made in the supervision system could not go beyond being stylistic and the participant views on the changes made were mostly negative.

Particularly as of the year 2010, the changes in supervision system have increased, and unstable and different legal regulations have been tried to be made in this regard. It has been observed that the titles of auditors were changed three times in only 4 years (2010-2014) (Gönülaçar, 2018). In addition, it is observed that the inspection boards and supervision areas that are affiliated with the relevant

regulations have changed and been redefined in the process. The changes made within the specified years (2010-2022) are given in Table 1. Table 1 shows some legal regulations made in the supervision system and some prominent principles.

**Table 1.** *Legislation Regarding the Supervision System between 2010-2022 and Some Principles*

Legislation	Some Principles
<b>Official Gazette (2010)</b>	The name of the primary education inspectorate was changed to "education inspector". Additional indicators have been increased to 3600, and high schools and equivalent schools have been included in their task areas.
<b>Official Gazette (2011a)</b>	Departments of education inspectors have been established in all provinces under the provincial directorate of national education. Each province was divided into inspection regions within itself and inspection groups were formed.
<b>Official Gazette (2011b)</b>	The "Inspection Board" was abolished and replaced by the "Guidance and Supervision Department" Inspector titles were abolished and titles of chief national education supervisor, national education supervisor and assistant national education supervisor were given. The titles of education inspector and assistant education inspector within the provincial national education directorates were changed to provincial education supervisor and provincial education assistant supervisor. Guidance, supervision, inspection and investigation duties of all types of education institutions in the province were given to provincial education inspectors/ inspector assistants.
<b>Official Gazette (2014a)</b>	Inspectors working in central and rural areas were united under the provincial national education directorates, and all supervisors were given the title of training inspector. Chief inspectors' duty of class/course supervision duty was abolished.
<b>Official Gazette (2014b)</b>	It was ensured that no more than one hundred people among the training inspectors would be assigned to the Guidance and Supervision Department. The appointments of the training inspectors assigned to the department will be made to the Ankara Provincial Directorate of National Education (Training Inspectors Department).
<b>Official Gazette (2016a)</b>	The number of training inspectors to be assigned in the Guidance and Supervision Department has been increased to three hundred.
<b>Official Gazette (2016b)</b>	The heads of training inspectors in the provinces were abolished; In the provinces, inspectors will perform inspection, research and guidance services and other duties to be assigned by the provincial national education director. The Guidance and Supervision Department will be replaced by the Inspection Board Department, and inspection services will be carried out by ministry-training inspectors under the Inspection Board Department. 50 training chief inspectors, 450 training inspectors, and 250 training assistant supervisors were created by this law.
<b>Official Gazette (2017)</b>	The Inspection Board was subordinated to the Minister again. The Ministry of National Education Inspection Board Department Study Centre will be established with the approval of the Minister, in the provinces deemed necessary for experience and guidance services. Supervision of educational institutions will be carried out periodically every three years.
<b>Official Gazette (2018)</b>	The duty of on-the-job training, which was abolished with the regulations in 2014, has been put back into the legislation.
<b>Official Gazette (2020)</b>	Assistant inspectors will prepare a thesis on the subjects determined by the Ministry within the scope of the training program. Some changes were made for the conditions of appointment and examination to be an inspector.

(Continued) **Table 1.** *Legislation Regarding the Supervision System between 2010-2022 and Some Principles*

<b>Official Gazette (2021)</b>	<p>In the provincial organization, the titles of training inspector and assistant training inspector were revoked; education supervisor and education assistant supervisor will be appointed to their positions according to their staff degrees, without any further processing.</p> <p>Those who are in the positions of Chief Supervisor and Ministry Supervisor will be deemed to have been appointed to the positions of Chief Supervisor and Supervisor according to their rank status.</p>
<b>Official Gazette (2022)</b>	<p>Course supervision will be done by supervisors again.</p> <p>Education supervisors are responsible for a wide range of areas such as guidance, on-the-job training, supervision, monitoring and evaluation, research, research, investigation and preliminary investigation. Duties and responsibilities are defined in more detail.</p> <p>With the regulation, it is ensured that educational institutions should make self-evaluation every year and a copy of the self-evaluation report should be sent to the education inspectors.</p>

Note: This table has been created in line with the information in the relevant legislation.

Table 1 draws attention, especially to the frequency of the regulations made after 2010 and the ongoing changes. In fact, it is clear that new legislation is created almost every year and 13 legal regulations have been made in total in the last 12 years. In addition, it should be considered as an important issue that some principles are removed over the years and brought back later. For example, as of 2014, the provision of abolishing the course supervision made by the inspectors was come into force again as of 2022. Apart from this, it was decided to define the concepts of inspector and auditor instead of abolishing the titles of inspector in 2011, but with the regulation enacted in 2014, it is seen that the title of education inspector is defined for all inspection officers. With the regulation in 2021, the title of "training inspector" was replaced by the title of "education inspector", which was abolished with the regulation in 2010. Similarly, the fact that the Board of Inspection was abolished and replaced by the Guidance and Supervision Department in 2011 draws attention. However, in 2016, it is observed that the Guidance and Supervision Department was changed to the Board of Inspection again in line with the relevant law.

When all the relevant legal regulations are reviewed, it is understood that the duties of the inspectors differ throughout the process and that regulations are also made in the conditions of being an inspector and being elected. Limited studies on the changes in the education supervision system in Turkey necessitate further research on this subject. The regulations which are made almost every year once more again, cause constant questioning whether there is an improvement in the educational supervision system and practices. For this reason, there should be a need for the evaluation of each new legislation and functioning by the relevant persons. In this study, it was considered important to investigate and evaluate the supervision system from the eyes of the people who performed the supervision in the context of legal regulations. Therefore, this study aims to reveal the views of education supervisors, who are directly affected by the relevant legislation, and observe the process most closely about the changes in the supervision system and the functioning of the supervision system. In line with this, answers to the following questions were sought in the study:

1. How does the current supervision in the Turkish education system work? (In terms of reaching its purpose/effectiveness/meeting needs, etc.)
2. What are the views of supervisors regarding the changes and regulations made on the educational supervision system and organizational structure in recent years?

3. According to the opinions of supervisors, what are the reasons for the changes made in the supervision system?
4. What are the views of supervisors on the impact of the changes made in the supervision system on the education system?
5. What should be done for a more effective and efficient supervision system?

## 2. METHOD

This study was conducted in accordance with research and publication ethics. In this section, the methodology of the study is explained.

### 2.1. Research Model

In this study, which aims to reveal the opinions of the supervisors on the legal regulations and related changes made in educational supervision in Turkey, the case study pattern, which is one of the qualitative research methods, was applied. With this design, it is planned to make a detailed and in-depth analysis of the subject. It was considered important to study the legal regulations and to interpret the opinions about them together. A case study refers to a pattern that assumes that “knowledge about phenomena can be obtained through intensive study of a single case or situation” (Fidel, 1984). In other words, this type of design provides an opportunity to make a detailed analysis of the subject that is planned to be examined by one or a group of people or phenomena (Fraenkel, et al., 2012). Therefore, the purpose of this type of research is to investigate a limited situation in depth, to describe the data obtained in detail, and to make inferences accordingly (Creswel, 2015). In this study, in-depth interviews were conducted in accordance with the purpose of the research design since it was decided that revealing supervisors’ perceptions, reactions, descriptions and experiences on changes in existing law, and regulations would be best revealed with this approach.

#### 2.1.1. Participants

In order to diversify the views of the participants included in the research, the maximum diversity sample was taken as the basis, and it was aimed to reach the supervisors who are working in the provinces and the center. Meriam (2013) states that when to end data collection depends on the theoretical and practical nature of the research. Accordingly, it is suggested that a very small increase in knowledge compared to the effort given to gather information can be taken as a criterion for saturation (Meriam, 2013). Charmaz (2006), on the other hand, states that if the researcher found the data sufficient, it would not be correct to talk about a specific sample number in the collection of qualitative data. For this reason, it was decided that the research questions were answered in detail and adequately as a result of the opinions of a total of 12 supervisors, six from the local provinces and six from the ministry. In the research, it was decided that the number of participants was sufficient when similar opinions started to come from the participants. Some personal information about the supervisors included in the study is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** *Personal information about supervisors included in the study*

<b>Participant Code</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Educational background</b>
<b>P1</b>	Male	Central	Master's degree
<b>P2</b>	Male	Provincial	Bachelor's degree
<b>P3</b>	Male	Central	Master's degree
<b>P4</b>	Male	Central	Master's degree
<b>P5</b>	Male	Provincial	Master's degree
<b>P6</b>	Male	Central	Master's degree
<b>P7</b>	Male	Provincial	Master's degree
<b>P8</b>	Male	Central	Master's degree
<b>P9</b>	Male	Provincial	Bachelor's degree
<b>P10</b>	Male	Provincial	Bachelor's degree
<b>P11</b>	Male	Provincial	Bachelor's degree
<b>P12</b>	Male	Central	Bachelor's degree

### **2.1.2. Data Analysis/Validity and Reliability**

A semi-structured interview form was developed to reveal the inspector's views. The obtained data were analyzed through content analysis. After the open-ended questions were asked to the participants, drilling questions were asked to provide detailed information and a rich description. The answers given to each question in the interview form were analyzed separately by two researchers for the reliability of the research; codes were created and completed (Creswell, 2015). In addition, in line with the auditing technique suggested by Lincoln and Cuba (1985 as cited in Meriam, 2013), the research findings were verified by an independent reader; in this way, it is aimed to establish internal validity and consistency.

In the study, the relevance of the codes and themes created for the validity of the data analysis was examined. In the study, direct quotations were frequently included to support the created categories with the opinions obtained. In addition, strategies that support participant honesty were used in order to increase the credibility of the research. For this, research was conducted only with people who were ready to contribute freely; each of the participants was given the opportunity to refuse, and it was ensured that the data were obtained from sincere and honest opinions (Shenton, 2004 as cited in Arastaman et al., 2018). Coding was done for the supervisors involved in the study as P1, P2, P3...

## **3. FINDINGS**

In the following parts, relevant findings are given in accordance with the sub-questions.

### **3.1. Assessment of the Current Supervision Structure**

Supervisors' responses regarding the current supervision structure are presented in Table 3. The supervisors participating in the research made mostly negative assessments when evaluating the current supervision structure (see Table 3).

**Table 3.** Current Supervision Structure

Category	Code	n
<b>Negative Assessments</b>	Far from scientific criteria	2
	Supervision that does not improve and support the education system	1
	No sound setup in the recruitment and training of supervisors	1
	Unsystematic structure	2
	Shaped by periodic policies	1
	Limited supervision, far from meeting needs	4
	Control focused rather than development	3
	Non-independent supervision, under the influence	1
	A structure that cannot put the changes into practice	2
	A non-institutionalized system with constant change	1
<b>Positive Assessments</b>	Opportunity to monitor supervision activities via electronic-based structure.	1
	Ensuring unity of practice between the central organization and the provincial organization	1

The supervisors mostly evaluated the structure as follows; supervision is far from scientific criteria, does not contribute to the education and training process, does not have a sound setup in the recruitment and training process, does not have a systematic structure, is oriented to periodic policies, and is far from meeting the needs. Also, supervisors are under the influence and cannot be independent, and the changes and developments may affect the practices of the supervisors and these may not be reflected in practices. Moreover, there is a non-institutionalized supervision system due to constant changes. Emphasizing that the supervision structure is restricted and far from meeting the needs, two supervisors expressed their thoughts as follows;

While the number of teachers and personnel of the Ministry of National Education is around 1.300.000, the number of central and provincial inspection personnel is around 1500. With the current number, it is not possible to carry out the guidance, research, audit, investigation and preliminary examination practices effectively and in accordance with the purpose. (P2)

I'm not sure whether the supervision we do actually achieves its purpose. What's worse is that sometimes I'm not sure if they really take what we do seriously and if it provides a real benefit for the quality of education. Continuous change made the control mechanism even more dysfunctional and reduced the trust in supervision in education. (P11)

A supervisor who stated that the functioning of the supervision in the Turkish education system is similar to the functioning of the general bureaucratic structure and again emphasized that it does not meet the needs, expressed his thoughts as follows;

The supervisory system is in a position to act in accordance with periodic policies rather than contributing to the education system, giving feedback and solving problems. The supervision seems very restricted and far from meeting the needs. (P5)

Some supervisors positively assess the current structure of the supervision. The supervisors, who made positive assessments about the current structure, highlighted the electronic-based supervision activities and the implementation of unity between the central and provincial organizations. A supervisor expressed his views as;

With the latest changes, the effectiveness of the provincial organization has increased as it is directly connected to the head of the Inspection Board, which is located in the central



organization. For this reason, a unity of practice was achieved between the central organization and the provincial organization. I view this situation as a positive (P6)”.

Another supervisor expressed his views as follows; *...In terms of monitoring supervision activities and simplifying processes, good practices based on electronic media have been started.* (P3)

### 3.2. The Impacts of the Changes Made in the Supervision System

The responses regarding the results of the continuous changes in the supervision structure are given in Table 4.

**Table 4.** *The Consequences of Continuous Changes in the Supervision Structure*

Category	Code	n
<b>Consequences affecting the supervision system</b>	Uncertainty	2
	Failure to reach the goal or deviate from purpose	3
	Deviation/far from being scientific	1
	Putting personal benefit first	2
	The culture of the supervision system gets damaged	1
	Being away from a permanent and legal structure	1
	The independent structure of the supervision system gets damaged	2
	Making the supervision system non-functional	3
	Vicious cycle	4
<b>Consequences affecting supervisors</b>	Insufficient number of supervisors	1
	Exclude supervisors from continuous in-service training	1
	Causing burnout	2
	Weakness in organizational commitment among supervisors	1
	To become discredited	2
	Differences in the title and personal rights of supervisors who are doing the same job	2
<b>Consequences affecting the education system</b>	Many institutions cannot experience the supervision process	3
	Failure to solve problems in schools due to lack of supervision	2

Some supervisors participating in the research stated that the changes made in the supervision system damaged the audit system, did not increase its quality, but removed it from functionality (see Table 4). The supervisors focused mostly on uncertainties, creating a vicious circle due to the repetition of the changes made on the same plane, and damaging the independent structure of the system under the title of consequences affecting the supervision system. A supervisor stated his views as;

I have worked as Assistant Primary Education Supervisor, Primary Education Inspector, Education Inspector, Provincial Education Supervisor, Education Inspector, and Education Supervisor within the supervision system that I have been working in since 2007. However, I can say that I always do the same job with these titles. The changes and arrangements made in the supervision system and the organizational structure of the supervisors did not change the perspective of the education system. There is no systemic change. It was a complete

morphological change and a structuring that affected the quality could not be made. The changes, which I can describe as a vicious circle, were only changes aimed at eliminating the ongoing guidance and inspection works. (P7)

With reference to the consequences affecting the supervisors, it draws attention that there are only changes in the title and personal rights but supervisors are doing the same job. On the other hand, the categories that the statements that the supervisors were negatively affected by the changes became discredited, experienced burnout, and weakened organizational commitment are also noteworthy. One supervisor said; *“In recent years, uncertainties in the supervision system and the organization of supervisors have caused us to burn out.”* (P6) Another supervisor expressed the situation of being excluded from in-service training to improve themselves as a result of the changes, with the following words:

Supervisors long for the understanding of guidance, which keeps their mind antennas constantly open in the way of self-realization, adapts innovations, accepts criticism, can find solution to problems, and turn problems to advantage. So, the reason that the task could not reach its purpose is the lack of regular continuous in-service training of education supervisors. Supervisors who are deprived of changing and developing training opportunities (since there is no in-service training) will not be able to provide training in terms of guidance, and their efforts will consist of a vicious circle. (P7)

Another view is that the changes made in the supervision system affect the education system. A supervisor expressed the effect of continuous change on the problems in schools as follows;

Since the changes in the legislation were made without considering the personnel regime, the number of personnel, the qualifications of the personnel and the needs of the provinces, the structural problems could not be resolved, and the problems that emerged among the teachers in the schools due to the inability to manage many institutions by qualified institution principals due to lack of supervision. Lack of the leadership competencies of the school principals increases the workload of the investigations in schools and, it has become mandatory for the supervisors to work more investigation-oriented and they fail to fulfill their main duties of guidance and on-the-job training. I believe that the legislative changes made have not reached their purpose. (P2).

### 3.3. The Reasons for Changes in the Supervision System

The supervisors' responses regarding the rationale for the changes made in the supervision system are given in Table 5.

**Table 5.** *Rationale for Changes Made in the Supervision System*

Category	Code	n
<b>Inadequacy in the existing system</b>	Structural problems which become incapable of resolutions	3
	The supervision that couldn't be systematically structured	2
	A supervision that is built according to the periodic policies.	1
	A structure that cannot put the changes into practice	2
<b>Effect of bureaucracy / Foreign interventions</b>	The demand for improvement in the personal rights of the supervisors in the provinces	1
	Creating an image of establishing a new supervision structure	2
	Political pressure	3

<b>To increase the quality</b>	To obtain an effective, standards-formed supervision system	3
	To prevent arbitrary staffing	1
<b>New solutions</b>	Searching for a consistent system	2
	Ensuring unity of practice between the central organization and the provincial organization	1

In the category of inadequacy in the existing system, the most emphasis was placed on the supervision structure, which could not be systematic. The inability to solve structural problems, periodical policies, and a structure that cannot put the changes into practice are other themes in the category of inadequacy of the system. While a supervisor's response in this category reveals the reason for the changes, it is striking that he emphasizes that these changes do not go beyond a supervision structure that cannot be systematic and in which there are repetitions in the form of a vicious circle.

With the pacified and minimized structural change in 2017, schools were isolated. Teachers are isolated. The isolated school culture has become a part of the vicious circle while continuing its activities away from the external point of view. Problems have multiplied. Problems that can be easily solved have become a burden. School administrators came across investigations that turned into a gigantic task. The administrators handle many issues outside of their main duties which disrupt their work. The cost of this disruption has qualitatively reduced the quality of education. It is clear that we cannot achieve the desired success in education. This is only a problem reflected in education because the supervision system is not systematic. (P7)

The effect of the bureaucracy/foreign interventions category includes preventing arbitrary staffing, creating an image of establishing a new supervision structure, and political pressures. In this context, a supervisor expressed his thoughts as follows;

As a result of the thought that the supervision activities would limit the arbitrariness in the administration, an effort was made to make it dysfunctional. On the other hand, due to the problems encountered over time, the need for control was felt again. It was desired to create a dependent supervision structure. This led to further problems in the system. An image of a new control structure is being set up, and as if they are not responsible for the growing problems, as if they have found a solution to the problems. (P4)

Some participants assessed the rationale for the changes in the context of new solutions. The opinions of the supervisors have been gathered under the codes of the changes made to bring the electronic-based supervision structure to the forefront and this will facilitate the monitoring of the supervision activities, the effort to obtain an efficient, powerful and effective supervision system, the search for a consistent system, the politicians' search for the personnel uniformity, the implementation unity between the central and provincial organizations. In this context, a supervisor expressed his thoughts as;

Considering the changes such as the title change, the restrictions on the powers of the supervisors in the provinces and the employment of a small number of supervisors in the central, it strengthens the idea that the changes were made by considering political preferences rather than scientific requirements. (P8)

### 3.4. The Suggestions of the Supervisors for a more Efficient Supervision

The suggestions of the participants for a more effective supervision are given in Table 6. The suggestions of the supervisors are gathered under four categories (see Table 6). In the suggestions for

legal regulations, legislation containing comprehensive, protective, clear and understandable concrete provisions and standards determined with the participation of stakeholders were emphasized by the supervisors. Two supervisors' views were as follows;

Committees consisting of teachers, school administrators, Provincial and District Managers, experts from universities and supervisors, who are the stakeholders of the supervision system, should be established based on the report to be prepared, setting up standards for supervision and guidance that will cover each educational institution, determining the working principles of supervisors, inspection in education councils. It is necessary to establish a single supervision system that can be accepted by most of the unions and non-governmental organizations that are suitable for the education system of our country, to equalize the personnel and financial rights among the supervisors, to establish a supervision system that is open to development with the standards determined, and to increase accountability by ensuring transparency. (P2)

I have really run out of my hopes regarding this system. Many of my colleagues are also tired of this dual structure and the involvement of bureaucracy in the process. First of all, the supervision profession should be seen as a career and the dual structure should be ended. In addition, more serious steps should be taken in terms of supervisor training and this issue should be taken seriously. (P12)

**Table 6.** *Suggestions for a More Effective Supervision.*

Category	Code	n
<b>Suggestions for legal regulations</b>	Legislation containing inclusive, protective, clear and understandable concrete provisions	3
	Standards set with the participation of stakeholders	2
<b>Recommendations for those who carry out supervision activities</b>	Changes in supervision recruitment criteria	4
	Supervision selection free from politics	3
	Inspector selection system based on merit	1
	Developing the supervision training process	5
	Career advancement opportunity	1
	Increasing the number of supervisors	1
<b>Suggestions for the functioning of the supervision</b>	Separation of the duties of the central and provincial supervision activities	1
	An open, transparent and accountable management approach	2
	To supervise teachers, administrators and institutions simultaneously	2
	Supervision that takes into account contemporary inspection principles	1
	Making guidance, inspection, investigation activities functional	1
	To separate the duties of supervision and investigation duties	1
	Monitoring the supervised institution for a certain period of time	1
<b>Suggestions for supervision structure</b>	Supervision structure organized in the province	2
	Developing e-supervision module	1
	End of dual structure	3
	Supervision structure at the district-level	2
	Establishing a committee/commission to evaluate the supervision process	1

It seems that the development of the supervisor training process is mostly emphasized. This is followed by a proposal to change the supervisor recruitment criteria. Suggestions for the selection of supervisors free from politics, the supervisor selection system based on merit, offering career advancement opportunities to supervisors and increasing the number of supervisors are also included in this category. A supervisor stated his opinion as follows;

Managing the supervisor training system with complex processes integrated with legal compliance, performance measurement, modern report writing techniques and a high-level corporate culture. (P3)

For the functioning of the supervision, there are some suggestions such as separation of the duties of central and provincial supervision activities; an open, transparent and accountable supervision approach; simultaneous supervision of teachers, administrators and institutions; functionalization of supervision, guidance, inspection and investigation activities that take into account modern supervision principles; the separation of supervision and investigation duties, and holding the supervisor responsible for a certain period of time from the supervised institution.

#### **4. DISCUSSION, RESULT and RECOMMENDATIONS**

The majority of the participants assessed the current supervision structure negatively. Within the scope of negative assessments, the following were mostly expressed; a limited supervision structure that is far from meeting the most needs and a control-oriented structure instead of development. Supervision is a process that helps to determine the degree of attainment of the predetermined goals related to education and training and to improve the education and training process (Aydın, 2000). In addition, a supportive, teacher-enhancing and collaborative understanding stands out in the contemporary supervision approach. In this context, it seems that the current supervision structure is far from contemporary supervision and is control-oriented. Similar findings have been reached in various studies in the literature (Memduhoğlu&Zengin, 2012; Tosun & Ordu, 2020; Kel&Akın, 2021).

It is seen that supervision is far from scientific criteria, does not contribute to the education process, does not provide order in the recruitment and training of supervisors, does not have a systematic structure, is shaped by periodic policies, is not independent of the fact that supervisors are under the influence, the changes and developments that are not reflected in the practices of the supervisors, and are not institutionalized due to constant changes. In the educational supervision within the Turkish education system, constant changes have been made in terms of structuring, title and functioning for years (Durnalı&Limon, 2018; Köse, 2017). This situation can be interpreted as a seeking for better educational supervision. However, this seeking is considered negatively by the supervisors. Participants emphasized mostly the negative aspects of the supervision system and this can be evaluated there are some deficiencies and mistakes in the system. On the other hand, there are few positive assessments regarding the current supervision structure. The transfer of reports about supervision activities to the electronic media has been considered positive in terms of monitoring. In addition, the existence of a unity of practice between the central organization and the provincial organization is another aspect that has been considered positive.

In terms of the results affecting the supervision system, the supervisors mostly stated that uncertainties occur, the independent structure of the supervision system gets damaged and it is constantly going back to the beginning and finally a vicious circle. Inputs, processes and outputs of schools should be checked according to a certain program and the results should be reviewed to determine the extent to which schools, the dominant elements of educational organizations, have

achieved their goals (Kel & Akın, 2021). Uncertainty in the structure of educational supervision may adversely affect the education system. In addition, supervision activities are not individual or institution-specific activities. Supervision is carried out within the framework of legal regulations. Therefore, it seems that the supervision is dependent on the Ministry but has an independent structure within itself. Many changes have been made regarding educational supervision since the Republic Period in 1925. The current dual structure in the system dates back to 1961. The supervision organization is structured from time to time within the Ministry, in the Provincial (Uçar, 2020). The negative effects of dual structuring have been stated in many studies (Burgaz, 1995; Doğanay, 2006; Korkmaz, 2007; Memduhoğlu, et al., 2007) however, this structuring has not been abandoned for years. As a result of the dual structuring, the supervision structure within the provincial national education directorates may be subjected to some pressures while continuing its operation. On the other hand, it seems that there is no progress on supervision structure, the title of supervisors, functioning, etc.; stability is not achieved because the same changes are made continuously and the changes are repeated cyclically, so uncertainty arises and this situation may damage the supervision structure.

Considering the changes' effect on the supervisors, the participants stated that there are differences on the title and personnel rights of the supervisors who do the same job, mostly due to the dual structure. The duties and authorities of the supervisors seem similar and they all carry out the duties specified in Article 17 of Law No. 652. In this context, it can be stated that both sides (supervisor in province or central) perform similar duties, but there are differences in terms of financial and personal rights (title, salary, etc.). This situation has also been considered as a problem in some studies (Ceylan, 2015; Yalçın, 2015).

Other issues stated by the participants regarding the impact of the changes made are the inadequacy of the number of supervisors, the lack of in-service training for the supervisors, the discredited of the supervisors, leading to burnout and a decrease in organizational commitment. The Ministry of National Education has not recruited any supervisor since 2011. This situation has caused supervisors who have many responsibilities such as guidance, inspection, investigation, preliminary examination, research, monitoring-evaluation, on-the-job training (Official Gazette, 2017; Official Gazette, 2022) to perform different roles at the same time, and their numbers have not been enough to perform these roles. Participants assessed the lack of in-service training as a result of the changes that were made. The lack of a stable structure and the absence of a legal basis for the supervisors working in the provinces may cause this issue to be expressed, but in the regulation published on March 1, 2022, in-service training for education supervisors working in the provinces was mentioned, and in article 59, It is stated that they can receive in-service training in order to renew and develop the professional knowledge and to increase their expertise (Official Gazette, 2022). As in every occupational group, supervisors need to be aware of the changes and developments and improve themselves. In this context, we may interpret that in-service training will be given in line with the new regulation.

Another point emphasized by the participants is that the supervisors are getting discredited as a result of the changes made, which reduces their organizational commitment. In 2014, the Ministry of National Education Guidance and Supervision Presidency Regulation was published, and with this regulation, the guidance and supervision presidency was established in the center and the education supervision presidency in the provinces. In the regulation, it was stated that the guidance, inspection, research, examination and investigations of the institutions in the provinces would be carried out by the education supervisors. In this context, the supervisory roles are not included (Official Gazette 2014). In

2016, with the Regulation on the Amendment of the Regulation on the Guidance and Inspection Directorate of the Ministry of National Education and the Education Inspectorates, the supervisors working in the provinces carried out their duties in personal positions in the provincial national education directorate (Official Gazette, 2016). This situation can be interpreted as causing the supervisors to think that they are discredited because they do not comply with the job descriptions presented to them at the time of their employment. The participants focused on the effects of the continuous changes made on the education system, and that many institutions cannot experience the supervision process and that the problems are not solved in schools due to lack of supervision. With the Regulation Amending the Regulation on the Guidance and Supervision Directorate of the Ministry of National Education and Education Inspectorates in 2016, a staff of 500 supervisors was held in the central and responsible for the supervision of all schools in Türkiye. However, it does not seem very possible to ensure the supervision of all schools in Türkiye with 500 supervisors. Teacher supervision in most schools has been left to the responsibility of school principals in line with legal regulations.

Supervision aims to determine the degree of achievement of the organization's goals, to take the necessary measures to get better results and to improve the process (Aydın, 2000). It is not possible for the organization to survive without supervision. Dysfunction of the supervision system causes administrative paralysis (Arabacı, 2010). The supervisors also stated that they encountered problems due to the lack of supervision in schools. On the other hand, in the 2021 activity report of the Ministry of National Education, it is stated that a total of 1978 supervision activities were carried out, and the majority of these supervisions were carried out in special education and rehabilitation centers (1339 special education and rehabilitation centers, 99 teacher's lodges and evening art schools), and the number of schools supervised was 540 (MNE [Ministry of National Education], 2022a). Considering that there are 70,383 schools in Türkiye (MEB, 2022b), this number is quite low, supporting the research finding.

Most of the supervisors stated that changes were made due to the inadequacy of the current system. In this category, it has come out ahead that supervision practices are not transformed into a systematic structure, that there is a structure that cannot solve structural problems, and a structure that is oriented to periodic policies and cannot transfer the experienced changes into practice. The supervision system can achieve the expected acquisition when it is cleared of structural problems. Therefore, in order to eliminate these problems, the system may need to be redesigned, renewed, and its structure and functioning changed (Durnalı and Limon, 2018), but the fact that this change does not solve the structural problems and is directed towards periodic policies may adversely affect the operation and achievement of the purpose of the supervision system. Instead of superficial changes, changes focused on eliminating the existing problems in order to increase the quality of teaching activities that cover long periods that are comprehensively programmed can be beneficial. In the category of the effect of bureaucracy/foreign interventions, the participants included the expressions of the demand for improvement in the personnel rights of the provincial supervisors, creating a new image of supervision structure being established, and political staffing. In line with Law No. 6764 on the Amendment of the Decree-Law on the Organization and Duties of the Ministry of National Education and Some Laws and Decree-Laws, some additions were made to Law No. 652, and within this scope, the directorate of educational supervision in the provinces was abolished, and It has been stated that the education supervisors will carry out examination and research guidance services in the provinces and other duties assigned by the provincial director (Uçar, 2020). In this context, there has been a contraction in the roles of supervisors working in the provinces. In this context, provincial supervisors may have requested improvement in their personal rights and gaining their former roles.

On the other hand, it has been stated that the changes made in the supervision system are superficial and this situation has been criticized in many studies (Bozak, 2017; Şahin, 2017; Şahin&Avan, 2020; Kel&Akın, 2021).

Political pressure is seen as another reason in the category of the effect of bureaucracy/foreign interventions expressed by the participants. Similar findings were reached in the study conducted by Kurum and Çınkır (2017). In the category of increasing quality, the participants emphasized obtaining an effective, effective, efficient, standards-formed supervision system and preventing arbitrary staffing. Supervision is an integral part of every managerial process. The reason for supervision is to improve the process. Providing more effective, more functional and more qualified output can be achieved with supervision (Gündüz, 2012). In this context, the establishment of effective and standardized supervision is important for the development of the education system. However, it can be stated that staffing should not be arbitrarily made within the supervision mechanism, and qualified individuals should take part in this process.

The changes are aimed at seeking quality and can also be interpreted as a quality problem in the current situation. In the new solutions category, the codes of seeking a consistent system and ensuring unity of practice between the central organization and the provincial organization are included. In the study conducted by Altınok et al. (2020), it was stated that the objectives and policies in the supervision change according to the politicians, and are not long-term and consistent. It seems this finding supports the expression of supervisors' search for a consistent system.

Considering the findings obtained from the study, it draws attention to some studies that overlap with the international literature and are very similar to today's supervision problems. For example, when Glanz's (1977, 1990, 1991, 1995, 1998) studies are examined, it is revealed that there were conflicts and problems in the past years regarding the professionalization of the supervision in education, bureaucratization, administrative expectations for inspectors and the desire of inspectors for supporting teachers. Gordon (2019), on the other hand, claims that Glanz's findings eerily overlap with current supervision studies and there is a lot of evidence to support this. The purpose of school supervision is to contribute to the creation of a suitable environment in teaching and learning processes with a developing and encouraging understanding. The ultimate goal is to raise academic standards in schools by increasing overall efficiency. It is ensured that the society develops and has a better education system. However, frequent changes have the power to affect the performance of the entire education system (Adu et al., 2014). For this purpose, the changes and regulations made continuously and repetitively may have much deeper consequences than it is thought.

For the supervisors, the participants mostly expressed the need for improvement of the supervisor training process. They also stated that the supervisor recruitment criteria should be changed. The supervisor selection system that is free from politics, based on merit, offering career advancement opportunities to supervisors and increasing the number of supervisors is suggested by the participants. The suggestions made are as follows; separation of duty areas of central and provincial supervision activities, an open, transparent and accountable supervision approach, simultaneous supervision for teachers, administrators and institutions, functionalization of the inspection, guidance, examination, investigation activities that take into account modern supervision principles, and segregation of supervision and investigation duties and monitoring of the supervised institution for a period of time. In the suggestions for the structure of the supervision, it was emphasized that the structure organized in the provinces, the development of the e-supervision module, the termination of the bilateral structure,



the supervision structuring at the regional level and the establishment of a board/commission to evaluate the functioning.

Like every organization, educational organizations and management processes need to adapt to the changes and develop. Supervision is important in education management in terms of understanding whether the system functions in line with its objectives. The control structure needs to have the structure required by the times. When the changes made in education supervision from the past to the present are examined, it can be stated that there is a vicious circle. If the change is in a way to improve the application that will enable innovation beyond names and titles, it may contribute to the solution of problems. When the changes made in education supervision are examined, it is seen that there is no consistency. This situation harms educational supervision, and schools, which are educational organizations, remain unsupervised. In this context, it is recommended to make changes that will ensure the development of educational supervision in a stable manner. For future research, it is recommended to seek the views of other stakeholders (teachers and administrators) regarding the continuous changes in the supervision system. In addition to this, conducting studies that will reach a wide participant group may prove the validity of the research. For this reason, it is also recommended to reach more supervisors regarding the ongoing changes in the supervision system.

## REFERENCES

- Adu, E. O., Akinloye, G. M., & Olaoye, O. F. (2014). Internal and external school supervision: Issues, challenges and wayforward. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(2), 269-278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09751122.2014.11890189>
- Altınok, V., Tezel, M. ve Güngör, S.,(2020). Okullarda denetimin gerekliliği üzerine öğretmen görüşleri. *Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40(1), 225-253.
- Arabacı, İ.B. (2010). Yenidataymaz<en yapılanma sürecinde eğitim denetimi ve kaotik durum yeni bir model önerisi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 40(187), 311-327.
- Arastaman, G., Fidan, İ. Ö., & Fidan, T. (2018). Nitel araştırmada geçerlik ve güvenilirlik: Kuramsal bir inceleme. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1), 37-75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.23891/efdyu.2018.61>
- Aydın, M. (2000). *Çağdaş eğitim denetimi*, Ankara: Hatipoğlu Yayınevi.
- Aydın, İ. (2013). *Öğretimde Denetim: Durum Saptama, Değerlendirme ve Geliştirme* (4. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.
- Beycioğlu, K., & Dönmez, B. (2009). Rethinking educational supervision. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(2), 71-93.
- Bozak, A. (2017). Maarif müfettişlerinin denetim sistemi hakkında yapılan yasal düzenlemelere ve müfettişlik mesleğine ilişkin görüşleri. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14(38), 90-110.
- Burgaz, B. (1995). İlköğretim kurumlarının denetiminde yeterince yerine getirilmediği görülen bazı denetim rolleri ve nedenleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11, 127-134.
- Burns, R. B., & Badiali, B. J. (2016). Unearthing the complexities of clinical pedagogy in supervision: Identifying the pedagogical skills of supervisors. *Action in Teacher Education*, 38(2), 156-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2016.1155097>
- Ceylan, D. (2015). Müfettiş sorunları. *Eğitime Bakış Dergisi*, 11(33), 48-55.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Sage Publications.
- Creswel, J. W. (2015). *Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri, Beş Yaklaşımına Göre Nitel Araştırma ve Araştırma Deseni*. (Çev. Ed. M. Bütün ve S.B. Demir). (2. Baskı). Siyasal Kitapevi.
- Doğanay, E. (2006). *Taşra birimlerindeki ilk ve ortaöğretim kurumlarında yürütülen teftiş hizmetlerinin karşılaştırılması (Van ili örneği)*. [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Van.
- Durnalı, M. ve Limon, İ. (2018). Çağdaş Türk Eğitim Denetimi Sistemi (Değişimler ve Yasal Dayanakları). *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 26(2), 413-425. DOI: 10.24106/kefergi.389801
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th Ed.). McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.
- Glanz, J. (2018). Chronicling perspectives about the state of instructional supervision by eight prominent scholars of supervision. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 1(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.1.1.1>
- Glanz, J., & Hazi, H. M. (2019). Shedding light on the phenomenon of supervision traveling incognito: A field's struggles for visibility. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 2(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.1.1>
- Gordon, S. P. (2019). Educational Supervision: Reflections on Its Past, Present, and Future. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 2(2), 27-52. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.2.3>
- Gönülaçar, Ş. (2018). Eğitim denetiminde dönüşüm sancısı. *Eğitime Bakış*, 43, 88-97.
- Gündüz, Y. (2012). Eğitim örgütlerinde denetimin gerekliliği: Kuramsal bir çalışma. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 34, <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/55810>
- Haberlin, S. (2019). Something always works: A self-study of strengths-based coaching in supervision. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 2(1), 38-57. <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.1.3>
- Korkmaz, M. (2007). *İlköğretim müfettişlerinin rehberlik görevlerini yerine getirme düzeyleri*. [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale.

- Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2010). Supervisor transformation within a professional learning community. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 37(2), 97-114.
- Kel, M. A., & Akın, U. (2021). Değişim sürecindeki eğitim denetimi: Müfettişler, okul yöneticileri ve öğretmenlerin görüşleri. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 19 (1), 219-243. <https://doi.org/10.37217/tebd.851827>
- Köse, A. (2017). Türk eğitim sisteminde ders denetimi sorunsalı. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 46(2), 298-367.
- Kurum, G.ve Çınkır, Ş.(2017). Cehennemde evlilik: Türkiye’de eğitim denetiminin birleştirilmesi üzerine maarif müfettişlerinin görüşleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 42(92), 35-57.
- MEB, (2022a). 2021 yılı idare faaliyet raporu. [https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/2022\\_03/01003833\\_MEB\\_2021\\_YYIY\\_Ydare\\_Faaliyet\\_Raporu.pdf](https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2022_03/01003833_MEB_2021_YYIY_Ydare_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf) (Erişim Tarihi: 22 Kasım 2022).
- MEB, (2022b). Milli eğitim istatistikleri 2021/22. [https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/2022\\_09/15142558\\_meb\\_istatistikleri\\_orgun\\_egitim\\_2021\\_2022.pdf](https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2022_09/15142558_meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2021_2022.pdf) (Erişim Tarihi: 22 Kasım 2022).
- Memduhoğlu, H.B. ve Zengin, M. (2012). Çağdaş eğitim denetimi modeli olarak öğretimsel denetimin Türk eğitim sisteminde uygulanabilirliği. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi*, 5(1), 131-142.
- Memduhoğlu, H. B., Aydın, İ., Yılmaz, K., Güngör, S. ve Oğuz, E. (2007). The process of supervision in the Turkish educational system: Purpose, structure, operation. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 8(1), 56- 70.
- Merriam, S.B. (2013). *Nitel araştırma: Desen ve uygulama için bir rehber* (S. Turan, çev.). Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Official Gazette (2010). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığının Teşkilat ve Görevleri Hakkında Kanun ile Devlet Memurları Kanununda Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Kanun. (04. 06. 2010). Kanun No: 5984.
- Official Gazette (2011a). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Eğitim Müfettişleri Başkanlıkları Yönetmeliği. (24. 06. 2011) Sayı: 27974
- Official Gazette (2011b). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığının Teşkilat ve Görevleri Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararname (14. 09. 2011). Sayı: 28054
- Official Gazette (2014a). Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu ile Bazı Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamelerde Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Kanun (01. 03. 2014) Sayı: 28941
- Official Gazette (2014b). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Rehberlik ve Denetim Başkanlığı ile Maarif Müfettişleri Başkanlıkları Yönetmeliği (24. 05. 2014). Sayı: 29009
- Official Gazette (2016a). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Rehberlik ve Denetim Başkanlığı ile Maarif Müfettişleri Başkanlıkları Yönetmeliğinde Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Yönetmelik. (24.03. 2016). Sayı: 29655
- Official Gazette (2016b). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığının Teşkilat ve Görevleri Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararname ile Bazı Kanun ve Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamelerde Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Kanun. (02. 12. 2016). Sayı: 29913
- Official Gazette (2017). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Teftiş Kurulu Yönetmeliği (20.08.2017). Sayı: 30160
- Official Gazette (2018). Cumhurbaşkanlığı Teşkilatı Hakkında Cumhurbaşkanlığı Kararnamesi (10.07.2018). Sayı: 30474
- Official Gazette (2020). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Teftiş Kurulu Yönetmeliğinde Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Yönetmelik (14.01.2020). Sayı: 31008
- Official Gazette (2021). Cumhurbaşkanlığı Teşkilatı Hakkında Cumhurbaşkanlığı Kararnamesinde Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Cumhurbaşkanlığı Kararnamesi (03.12. 2021). No: 87
- Official Gazette (2022). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Eğitim Müfettişleri Yönetmeliği (01.03.2022). Sayı: 31765
- Şahin, S.; Elçiçek, Z. ve Tösten, R. (2013). Türk Eğitim Sisteminde Teftişin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Bu Gelişim Süreci İçerisindeki Sorunlar. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 6(5), 1105-1126.
- Şahin, S. (2017). Öğretmen ve müfettiş penceresinden rehberlik ve denetim çalışmalarına bakış. *Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim Dergisi*, 10(2), 251-273.

- Şahin, S. ve Avan, Y. (2020). Değişim yönetimi bağlamında Türk eğitim denetim sistemindeki değişimlere ilişkin maarif müfettişlerinin görüşleri. *Çağdaş Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(1), 110-122.
- Tosun, A. ve Ordu, A. (2020). Okul yöneticilerine göre değişen denetim uygulamaları: Karşılaştırmalı bir analiz. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 48, 303-320. doi: 10.9779/pauefd.544220
- Uçar, R. (2020). Müfettişlerin hak ve sorumlulukları, T. Aytaç (Ed.) *Eğitim hukuku içinde* (s.209-226), Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Yalçın, A. (2015). Denetimin unvan, imkân ve yetki sorunu. *Eğitime Bakış Dergisi*, 11(33), 1-3.