Saduman Kapusuzoglu[1]
ANALYSIS OF ADOPTABILITY AND APPLICABILITY OF DEVELOPMENTAL SUPERVISION MODEL

The purpose of this study is to analyze the adoptability and applicability of developmental supervision model from supervisors' and teachers' points of view. The sampling of this research covers 22 supervisors and 248 teachers. The data collecting scale consisted of 45 items. In analyzing the data, percent, T-test and two-way ANOVA methods were used. It was found that there are differences in the opinions of supervisors and teachers in general, but both groups accepted the model.

Keywords: developmental supervision; supervisor; teacher.

Садуман Капушуцоглу
АНАЛІЗ СПРИЙНЯТТЯ І ВЖИВАННЯ МОДЕЛІ РОЗВИВАЮЧОГО НАСТАВНИЦТВА

У статті проаналізовано сприйняття і вживання моделі розвиваючого наставництва з точки зору наставників і викладачів. Вибірка дослідження складається з 22 наставників і 248 викладачів. Анкета дослідження містила 45 пунктів. Для аналізу даних застосовано процентний метод, Т-тест і двохфакторний дисперсійний аналіз. Було виявлено відмінності в думках наставників і викладачів, але обидві групи прийняли модель.

Ключові слова: розвиваюче наставництво; наставник; викладач.

Садуман Капушуцоглу
АНАЛИЗ ВОСПРИЯТИЯ И ПРИМЕНЕНИЯ МОДЕЛИ РАЗВИВАЮЩЕГО НАСТАВНИЧЕСТВА

В статье проанализированы восприятие и применение модели развивающего наставничества с точки зрения наставников и преподавателей. Выборка исследования состоит из 22 наставников и 248 преподавателей. Анкета для сбора данных состояла из 45 пунктов. Для анализа данных применены процентный метод, Т-тест и двухфакторный дисперсионный анализ. В результате исследования были обнаружены различия во мнениях наставников и преподавателей, но обе группы приняли модель.

Ключевые слова: развивающее наставничество; супервайзер; преподаватель.

1. Introduction. Numerous supervision approaches are discussed for the purpose to perform effective education. The scientific management dominated by control and command approaches should be counted in stated approaches together with the human affairs approach based on the occupational satisfaction and happiness of teachers, the neo-scientific management in which qualification and performance standards are underlined, and the human resources approach anticipating the creation of suitable and enthusiastic educational averages as teachers take responsibilities for the effective and efficient education.

---

[1] Assoc. Prof. Dr., Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Education, Abant Izzet Baysal University, Golkoy-Bolu, Turkey.

The modern supervision approaches appear during or following the clinical supervisions such as developmental supervision, differentiated supervision, reflective supervision, supervision of colleagues, mentoring and coaching; it is necessary to mention the paradigm change in the occupational development of teachers within the supervision period and the increase of learning by teachers consequently. Based on the continuous development principle, it can be concluded that the essential philosophy of the stated approaches is to improve the status of teachers in respect of occupational development and to ensure students learn more (Ilgan, 2008).

Glickman (1990)'s developmental supervision calls for the instructional leader to use alternative supervisory approaches to help teachers improve their instruction and cognitive growth. In the tactical phase of Glicman's model the supervisor diagnoses the teacher's conceptual level (CL), then selects the most appropriate supervisory approach. The developmental supervisor initially uses a directive approach (directing and standardizing) with low-CL teachers, a colloborate approach (presenting, problem solving, and negotiating) with moderate-CL teachers, and a nondirective approach (listening, clarifying, encouraging, and reflecting) with high-CL teachers. According to Glickman and Gordon (1987), in the stragetic phase of developmental supervision, the supervisor fosters the teacher's growth in CL and problem-solving ability by gradually reducing the structure of interactions with a teacher while gradually increasing the teacher's deceision-making responsibility. Developmental supervisor attempts to move gradually from a directive approach to a collaborative one and from a collaborative approach to a nondirective one (Gordon, 1990).

Developmental supervision is based on 3 general propositions. First, because of varied personal backgrounds and experiences, teachers operate at different levels of professional development. They vary in the way they view themselves, students and others. Second, because teachers operate at differing levels of thoughts, ability and effectiveness, they need to be supervised in different ways. The third proposition is that the long-range goal of supervision should be to increase every teacher's and every faculty's ability to grow toward higher stages of thought (Glickman and Gordon, 1987). More reflective, self-directed teachers will be better able to solve their own instructional problems and meet their students' educational needs (Murphy and Brown, 1970; Parkay, 1979; Glickman and Gordon, 1987).

The developmental model of Glickman (1990) provides transition between the golden age of technical and didactic models in supervision literature and the emergence of reflective application, since the developmental method operates as an intellectual bridge and includes the elements of both approaches (Pajak, 2000; Ilgan 2008). The important contribution of Glickman's (1990) model is to provide a logical and comprehensible model complying with different parts in respects of cognitive psychology, previous researches on supervision discipline, studies on human behavior and the adult growth and development (Doe, 1995; Ilgan, 2008).

The primary purpose of this study is to determine, interpret and provide suggestions on the adoption levels of teachers and supervisors employed in elementary schools together with the applicability levels in elementary schools.

2. Data and Methodology. The information regarding the method, population and sampling of the study are included in this section together with the data collec-

tion tool, its application and statistical analysis techniques used for the analysis of collected data. The screening model is preferred in this study.

2.1. Problem Statement. What is the level of adoption and applicability of developmental supervision model in public elementary schools?

2.2. Sub-Problems. For educational supervisors and elementary school teachers:

1. At what level the developmental supervision model is adopted?

2. At what level they consider the developmental supervision model as applicable in elementary schools?

2.3. Population and Sampling. The sample of this study consists of teachers and educational supervisors employed in elementary schools located in the city centers within the school year of 2010-2011. The number of supervisors included in the study is 22. Due to the excessive amount of teachers employed in elementary schools, the way of taking samples for teachers has been selected. The teachers in elementary schools have been determined by the stratified sampling in order to ensure the stated teachers are represented and then the applications have been performed in the schools determined by the irrational cluster sampling approach. The number of teachers included in the study is 148.

2.4.Data Collection Tool. The development of data collection tool is started by screening the relevant literature. The data collection tool is developed in 4 independent subscales by means of benefiting from the literature based on Carl Glickman's developmental supervision model.

The data collection tool consists of two sections. In the first section, the questions exist including personal information of the participants and having importance in respect of subpurposes of the study whereas the expressions on 4 independent subscales regarding the determination of adoption and applicability of the model are in the second section. The dimensions developed as subscales in the model are as follows: (1) the expressions on developmental supervision, (2) the supervision approach for teachers in low development levels, (3) the supervision approach for teachers in medium development levels and (4) the supervision approach for teachers in high development levels. By this, the established survey form consists of 45 articles. The 5-point Likert scale and two sections (adoption and applicability) are required to be answered for every statement.

The data collected from educational supervisors and elementary school teachers are analyzed by using the packaged software SPSS 17.0. The data compliance with factor analysis in the first section is checked by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Barlett sphericity test (Bayram, 2004; Buyukozturk, 2002). As the data complies with factor analysis, the exploratory factor analysis is selected to investigate the structural validity and factor nature of the scale with 45 articles formed through using the relevant literature, expert opinion and the views of educational supervisors/teachers whereas the principal components are used as factorizing technique. The factor variance of factors per statement, the factor loads of articles, the expressed variance rates and line chart are examined. The factor loads of the articles are selected as minimum .30. On the other hand, the rotated (varimax) principal component analysis is used to examine the nature of factors.

The measures including the consistency of the articles to be involved in every factor in respects to meaning and content whereas the factor eigenvalues should be equal or more to/than 1 and every article should have ".30" or more factor load per the factor involved, and the difference between factor loads of articles per the factors involved and the load rates should be equal or more to/than ".10" in minimum (Buyukozturk, 2002) have been considered during the conduct of exploratory factor analysis. On the other hand, the reliability analysis has been conducted by the article-total correlation and the calculation of Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient.

2.5. The Results of Factor Analysis regarding the "Sub-Scale of Developmental Supervision. 12 variables are included in the application form of developmental supervision subscale. The structural validity of the scale is tested by the factor analysis. For this reason, the compliance of the data collected for the subscale of developmental supervision with the factor analysis is considered primarily.

Indicating the compliance of the data collected from the "adoption" part of the scale with the factor analysis, the results of KMO compliance value (,904) and Barlett sphericity test (.000) calculated by the analysis of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett tests are found significant ($p<.001$). Therefore, the acquired values point out the data collected from the application should be subject to factor analysis.

According to the results, the factor analysis is applied for 12 variables by the principal components method. Thus, it is realized for 12 variables included in the analysis gathered under a single factor with the eigenvalue above 1 (in other words, the single dimensional status of the scale), whereas the factor load rates of the variables range between .539 and .851 and the total correlation values of the variables range between .48 and .81. Since 59% of the total variance is declared, the scale shall be regarded as single dimensional. Nevertheless, the scale has the reliability coefficient and Cronbach alpha internal consistency at the rate of .93.

Indicating the compliance of the data collected from the "applicability" part of scale with the factor analysis, the difference between KMO compliance value (,945) and Barlett sphericity test (.000) calculated by the analysis of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett tests are also found significant ($p<.001$). Therefore, the acquired values point out the data collected from the "applicability" part shall be subjected to the factor analysis.

The factor analysis is applied for the data collected from the "applicability" part of scale and 12 variables through the principal components method. Thus, it is realized for 12 variables included in the analysis gathered under a single factor with the eigenvalue above 1 (in other words, the single dimensional status of scale) whereas the factor load rates of variables range between .735 and .896 and the total correlation values of the variables range between .69 and .87. Since 70% of the total variance is declared, the scale shall be regarded as single dimensional.

Nevertheless, the reliability coefficient and Cronbach alpha internal consistency rate of the scale's "applicability" part is .96. According to this result, it should be mentioned the scale is fairly reliable. The results of factor and variable analyses applied for the "adoption" and "applicability" parts of scale are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. **The Results of Factor and Variable Analyses for the Subscale of Developmental Supervision Statements**

Adoption		Sub-Scale of Developmental Supervision	Applicability	
Factor Load Rate	Total Variable Correlations		Factor Load Rate	Total Variable Correlations
,539	,48	1. Changing supervision from a terrifying process for teachers to a process having better compliance with the needs of teachers	,735	,69
,677	,63	2. Determining the actual needs of teachers in supervisions and ensuring the most suitable assessment for self-development	,866	,84
,696	,64	3. Inspecting teachers with various approaches with regard to motivation levels, cognitive skills and experiences	,848	,82
,801	,75	4. Analyzing the development levels of teachers and performing the most suitable supervision act for development levels	,855	,82
,831	,79	5. Assessing of development, specialty and loyalty levels of teachers by a supervisor in order to decide on the supervision approach to be used	,809	,77
,847	,81	6. Selecting the data to be collected and focused before or during observation	,831	,80
,793	,74	7. Observing teaching processes and cooperation with colleagues of teachers in order to determine the development, specialty and loyalty levels	,817	,78
,810	,76	8. Using observation techniques such as frequency diagram or interaction analysis by a supervisor in order to define what is actually happening in a class	,839	,81
,851	,81	9. Discussing with teacher on personal opinions regarding students, teaching and educational development in order to determine the developmental, specialty and loyalty levels of teacher	,896	,87
,716	,67	10. Performing of supervisions by well-trained supervisors holding senior development level in order to determine the development levels of teachers accurately	,835	,80
,719	,66	11. Assisting teachers to think in higher abstract levels by introducing constrained knowledge and experiences in supervisions	,842	,81
,837	,79	12. Aiming to increase the capacities of teachers in supervisions in order to reach higher levels of thinking	,879	,85
Declared Total Variance: 58,531			Declared Total Variance: 70,338	
α : ,934			α :, 961	

3. Results of Analysis.

3.1. Findings on Personal Information. The data regarding personal information of teachers and educational supervisors on gender, assignment type and occupational

seniority are included in this section. The acquired data are shown in frequencies and percentages on the following table.

Table 2. **Distribution of Teachers and Educational Supervisors with regard to Gender**

Gender	N	%
Female	85	50.0
Male	85	50.0
Total	170	100.0

The distribution of teachers and educational supervisors by gender is shown in Table 2. Accordingly, 50.0% of the participants are female and 50.0% are male.

Table 3. **Distribution of Teachers and Educational Supervisors by the Assignment Variable**

Assignment	N	%
Educational Supervisor	22	12,9
Class Teachers	56	32,9
Branch Teachers	92	54,1
Total	170	100.0

As shown in Table 3, 12.9% of the participants are educational supervisors, whereas 32.9% are class teachers and 54.1% are branch teachers.

Table 4. **Distribution of Teachers and Educational Supervisors by Educational Background**

Educational Background	N	%
Associate	11	6,5
Bachelor	133	78,2
Master	25	14,7
PhD	1	0,6
Total	170	100.0

According to Table 4, 6.5% of the teachers and educational supervisors hold associate degree and 78.2% hold bachelor degree, whereas 14.7% hold master's degree and 6% hold PhD. This distribution indicates the opinions of the participants graduated after 4 years on the faculty are mainly reflected in the study.

Table 5. **Distribution of Teachers and Educational Supervisors by Occupational Seniority**

Occupational Seniorities	N	%
1-5 years	33	19,4
6-10 years	37	21,8
11-15 years	30	17,6
16-20 years	19	11,2
21-25 years	18	10,6
26 years and more	33	19,4
Total	170	100.0

The distribution of teachers and educational supervisors by working experience is shown in Table 5. Accordingly, 19.4% of the participants have 1-5 years of occupa-

tional seniority, whereas 21.8% have 6-10 years, 17.6% have 11-15 years, 11.2% have 16-20 years, 10.6% have 21-25 years and 19.4% have 26 years or more of seniority.

3.2.Findings on the Developmental Supervision Statements. The descriptive statistics on the adoption and applicability levels of developmental supervision statements of teachers and educational supervisors participated in the study are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. **The Descriptive Statistics on the Adoption and Applicability Levels of Developmental Supervision Statements with regard to the Assignment Variable**

Adoption			Developmental Supervision Statements	Applicability		
Assignment	$\overline{X}$	S		Assignment	$\overline{X}$	S
Educational Supervisors	4,55	,60	1. Changing supervision from a terrifying process for teachers to a process having better compliance with the needs of teachers	Educational Supervisors	3,77	,92
Class Teachers	4,64	,67		Class Teachers	3,61	1,12
Branch Teachers	4,48	,88		Branch Teachers	3,43	1,16
Total	4,54	,79		Total	3,54	1,12
Educational Supervisors	4,32	,72	2. Determining the actual needs of teachers in supervision and ensuring the most suitable assessment for self-development	Educational Supervisors	3,50	,67
Class Teachers	4,46	,95		Class Teachers	3,54	1,26
Branch Teachers	4,51	,79		Branch Teachers	3,16	1,11
Total	4,47	,84		Total	3,33	1,13
Educational Supervisors	4,36	,58	3. Inspecting teachers by various approaches with regard to the motivation levels, cognitive skills and experiences	Educational Supervisors	3,68	,89
Class Teachers	4,23	1,10		Class Teachers	3,41	1,23
Branch Teachers	4,39	,90		Branch Teachers	3,10	1,12
Total	4,34	,94		Total	3,28	1,15
Educational Supervisors	4,45	,51	4. Analyzing the development levels of teachers and performing the most suitable supervision act for the development levels	Educational Supervisors	3,64	,58
Class Teachers	4,32	,94		Class Teachers	3,29	1,19
Branch Teachers	4,24	,91		Branch Teachers	2,99	1,14
Total	4,29	,87		Total	3,17	1,12
Educational Supervisors	4,36	,58	5. Assessing the development, specialty and loyalty levels of teachers by supervisors in order to decide on the supervision approach to be used	Educational Supervisors	3,73	,83
Class Teachers	4,27	,92		Class Teachers	3,23	1,01
Branch Teachers	4,20	,95		Branch Teachers	3,10	1,03
Total	4,24	,90		Total	3,22	1,01
Educational Supervisors	4,23	,69	6. Selecting the data to be collected and focused before or during observation	Educational Supervisors	3,59	,91
Class Teachers	4,36	,90		Class Teachers	3,48	1,21
Branch Teachers	4,38	,86		Branch Teachers	3,36	,97
Total	4,35	,85		Total	3,43	1,04

The End of *Table 2*

Adoption			Developmental Supervision Statements	Applicability		
Assignment	$\overline{X}$	S		Assignment	$\overline{X}$	S
Educational Supervisors	4,27	,55	7. Observing teaching processes and cooperation with colleagues of teachers in order to determine the development, specialty and loyalty levels	Educational Supervisors	3,86	,77
Class Teachers	4,14	1,03		Class Teachers	3,16	1,19
Branch Teachers	4,32	,92		Branch Teachers	3,11	1,00
Total	4,25	,92		Total	3,22	1,06
Educational Supervisors	4,05	,79	8. Using of observation techniques such as frequency diagram or interaction analysis by supervisor in order to define what is actually happening in a class	Educational Supervisors	3,50	1,06
Class Teachers	4,00	1,04		Class Teachers	3,05	1,13
Branch Teachers	4,11	,99		Branch Teachers	2,99	1,10
Total	4,06	,98		Total	3,08	1,11
Educational Supervisors	4,14	,77	9. Discussing with teachers on personal opinions regarding the students, teaching and educational development in order to determine the developmental, specialty and loyalty levels of teachers	Educational Supervisors	3,50	1,10
Class Teachers	4,20	,96		Class Teachers	3,21	1,26
Branch Teachers	4,28	,88		Branch Teachers	3,09	1,01
Total	4,24	,89		Total	3,18	1,11
Educational Supervisors	4,32	,58	10. Performing of supervisions by well-trained supervisors holding senior development level in order to determine the development levels of teachers accurately	Educational Supervisors	3,45	1,01
Class Teachers	4,50	,76		Class Teachers	3,57	1,06
Branch Teachers	4,52	,78		Branch Teachers	3,13	1,10
Total	4,49	,75		Total	3,32	1,09
Educational Supervisors	4,23	,75	11. Assisting teachers to think in higher abstract levels by introducing constrained knowledge and experiences in supervisions	Educational Supervisors	3,60	,91
Class Teachers	4,29	1,06		Class Teachers	3,30	1,22
Branch Teachers	4,29	,87		Branch Teachers	3,04	1,10
Total	4,28	,92		Total	3,20	1,13
Educational Supervisors	4,23	,53	12. Aiming to increase the capacities of teachers in supervisions in order to reach higher levels of thinking	Educational Supervisors	3,55	,80
Class Teachers	4,46	,95		Class Teachers	3,54	1,21
Branch Teachers	4,47	,80		Branch Teachers	3,14	1,12
Total	4,44	,83		Total	3,23	1,12
Educational Supervisors	51,50	4,25	The developmental supervision statements (All of the dimensions).	Educational Supervisors	43,36	7,46
Class Teachers	51,88	8,61		Class Teachers	40,39	11,66
Branch Teachers	52,18	8,34		Branch Teachers	37,64	10,99
Total	51,99	7,99		Total	39,28	10,97

The Adoption Level: As total values of the dimension are analyzed in Table 6, it is realized that the developmental supervision statements are adopted "entirely" by the

educational supervisors ($\bar{X}$= 4,29 / 51,50), class teachers ($\bar{X}$= 4,32 / 51,88) and branch teachers ($\bar{X}$= 4,35 / 52,18). It appears that the most adopted developmental supervision statements by educational supervisors and teachers are: "Changing supervision from a terrifying process for teachers to a process having better compliance with the needs of teachers" ($\bar{X}$= 4,54), "Performing supervisions by well-trained supervisors holding senior development level in order to determine the development levels of teachers accurately" ($\bar{X}$= 4,49) and "Determining the actual needs of teachers in supervisions and ensuring the most suitable assessment for self-development" ($\bar{X}$= 4,47).

On the other hand, the less adopted statement by educational supervisors and inspectors between the statements refers to: "Using observation techniques such as frequency diagram or interaction analysis by a supervisor in order to define what is actually happening in a class" ($\bar{X}$= 4,06).

The Applicability Level: As total values of the dimension are analyzed in Table 6, the developmental supervision statements are found "highly" applicable by the educational supervisors ($\bar{X}$= 3,61 / 43,36) whereas the class ($\bar{X}$= 3,37 / 40,39) and branch teachers ($\bar{X}$= 3,14 / 37,64) found the applicability at medium level. It appears the most adopted developmental supervision statements by educational supervisors and teachers are: "Changing supervision from a terrifying process for teachers to a process having better compliance with the needs of teachers" ($\bar{X}$= 3,54) and "Selecting the data to be collected and focused before or during observation" ($\bar{X}$= 3,43).

On the other hand, the statements found less applicable by educational supervisors and inspectors between the developmental supervision statements refer to: "Using observation techniques such as frequency diagram or interaction analysis by a supervisor in order to define what is actually happening in a class" ($\bar{X}$= 3,08) and "Analyzing the development levels of teachers and performing the most suitable supervision act for the development levels" ($\bar{X}$= 3,17).

3.3. The Comparison between the Opinions of Educational Supervisors and Teachers in Overall and Subdimensions of Developmental Supervision Model. The results of analyses on whether the common factor is significant in adoption and applicability levels are provided in Table 7 together with the comparison of opinions of supervisors and teachers in stated levels within the overall developmental supervision model and its subdimensions.

As it is seen in Table 7, the entire developmental supervision model and its subdimensions are adopted more by educational supervisors and teachers whereas the model is found less applicable accordingly to the opinions of educational supervisors and teachers.

While comparing the opinions of educational supervisors and teachers in the overall adoption level of developmental supervision model and its subdimensions through the analysis of Table 7, the opinions of educational supervisors and teachers are failed to differ in the overall adoption level. In other words, the educational supervisors and teachers adopt the overall developmental supervision model and its subdimensions in similar levels. On the other hand, the opinions of educational supervisors and teachers fail to differ in the statements regarding developmental supervision and the supervision approach for teachers at the medium development level while comparing the opinions of educational supervisors and teachers on the applicability level of developmental

supervision model and its subdimensions. Nevertheless, the opinions of educational supervisors and teachers appear to be different in the overall developmental supervision model and the statements regarding the supervision approaches for the teachers in low and high development levels. According to this finding, the supervisors find the overall developmental supervision model applicable rather than the teachers as well as the supervision approaches for the teachers at low and high development levels.

Table 7. **Comparison of Educational Supervisors' and Teachers' Opinions on the Overall Developmental Supervision Model and its Subdimensions**

Developmental Supervision Model		Adoption Level			Applicability Level			Difference between the Adoption and Applicability Levels		Difference between the Groups (teacher-supervisor) in Adoption Level		Difference between the Groups (teacher-supervisor) in Applicability Level	
Dimension	Assign-ment	N	$\overline{X}$	S	N	$\overline{X}$	S	t	p	t	p	t	p
Develop-mental Supervision Statements	Super-visor	22	51,5	4,25	22	43,4	7,46	1,223	,224	,310	,757	1,882	,062
	Tea-cher	148	52,1	8,41	148	38,7	11,29						
Supervision Approach for the Teachers at Low Development Levels	Super-visor	22	48,1	4,71	22	41,9	6,28	2,425	,017	1,104	,271	2,774	,006
	Tea-cher	148	46,0	8,37	148	36,0	9,71						
Supervision Approach for the Teachers at Medium Development Levels	Super-visor	22	43,3	3,77	22	37,0	5,49	1,554	,124	,603	,547	1,824	,070
	Tea-cher	148	42,3	7,64	148	33,4	9,04						
Supervision Approach for the Teachers at High Development Levels	Super-visor	22	53,5	5,75	22	47,0	6,74	2,742	,007	1,302	,195	3,036	,003
	Teacher	148	50,9	9,12	148	39,6	11,21						
The Overall Develop-mental Supervision Model (Total)	Super-visor	22	196,3	15,89	22	169,4	23,16	2,205	,029	,768	,444	2,588	,010
	Teacher	148	191,3	30,26	148	147,7	38,20						

4. Conclusion. The statements regarding the developmental supervision model are adopted by both educational supervisors and elementary teachers "entirely", whereas the supervisors find the model as "high" and the class and branch teachers find the model as "medium" as for its of applicability. Furthermore, the supervision approach for the teachers at low development levels is adopted by educational supervisors and teachers "entirely", whereas the class and branch teachers adopt the model at "high"

level together with all the participants. Nevertheless, the supervision approach for the teachers at the medium development levels is adopted by educational supervisors, class and branch teachers "entirely", whereas the educational supervisors and class teachers find the model as "highly" applicable and the branch teachers find the model as "medium" in respect to applicability. On the other hand, the supervision approach for the teachers at high development levels is adopted by educational supervisors and branch teachers "entirely", whereas the class teachers adopt the model at "high" level. In addition, the educational supervisors find the model as "highly" applicable whereas the class and branch teachers find the model as "medium" in respect to applicability.

The developmental supervision model and its subdimensions are adopted more by educational supervisors and teachers in accordance with the relevant opinions regardless of finding the applicability low. The overall developmental model and its subdimensions are adopted by educational supervisors and teachers at similar levels. On the other hand, the opinions of educational supervisors and teachers fail to differ in the statements regarding developmental supervision and the supervision approach for the teachers at the medium development level whereas it appears that the opinions of supervisors and teachers differ regarding the overall developmental supervision model and the supervision approaches for the teachers at low and high development levels.

According to the results of this study, it shall be mentioned that educational supervisors and elementary teachers adopt the developmental supervision model entirely. In scope of the studies conducted abroad and domestically, finding the applicability of the model low in comparison to the adoption level can be related to the low satisfaction level in traditional supervision applications and the indicator of intention to perform the supervision in compliance with the developmental level of teachers. Determining the actual needs of teachers as well as providing the most applicable assessment for self-development shall be possible only through structural and administrative changes enabling assessment and development in accordance with educational, structural and administrative changes.

References:

Bayram, N. (2004). Sosyal bilimlerde SPSS ile veri analizi. Bursa: Ezgi Kitabevi.

Buyukozturk, S. (2002). Sosyal bilimler icin veri analizi el kitabi. Ankara: Pegem A Yayincilik.

Doe, J. (1995). Developmental supervision and reflective thinking of teacher: An imperical study. Dissertation Proposal: Weston, Nebraska.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P. (1987). Clarifiying developmental supervision. Educational Leadership, 44(8), 64-68.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). Supervision and instruction. A developmental approach. USA: Allyn and Bacon.

Gordon, S. P. (1990). Developmental supervision: An exploratory study of a promising model. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5(4), 293-307.

Ilgan, A. (2008). Transition from clinical supervision to developmental and reflective supervision. Ahmet Kelesoglu Journal of Faculty of Education, 25, 263-282.

Murphy, P. D., Brown, M. M. (1970). Conceptual systems and teaching styles. American Educational Research Journal, 4, 529-560.

Pajak, E. (2000). Approaches to clinical supervision. Massachusetts: Christopher-Gordon Publisher, Inc. Second Edition.

Parkay, F. W. (1979). Inner-city high school teachers: the relationship of personality traits and teaching style to environmental stress. Paper presented to the Southwest Educational Research Association, Houston.