Examining Teacher Job Satisfaction and Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours: A Comparative Study of Turkish Private and Public School Teachers

Dr. Hilmi Sungu[1], Dr. Abdurrahman Ilgan[2], Dr. Oksana Parylo, and Dr. Mustafa Erdem[3]

[1]Bozok University, [2]Duzce University, [3]Yuzuncu Yil University

In spite of a strong body of research examining teacher job satisfaction and teachers' assessment of their principals' behaviours, most studies focus on the educational systems in the first world countries. This quantitative study focuses on a lesser-examined educational context by comparing school teachers' job satisfaction levels and principals' instructional supervision behaviours in Turkish private and public schools. The results suggest that for all examined demographical characteristics of participating teachers (e.g., gender, school level, subject matter, and years of teaching), private school teachers had higher levels of job satisfaction and assessed their principals' instructional supervision behaviours higher than did public school teachers. These findings suggest there are more favourable working conditions in Turkish private schools than in public schools and support research trends on the topic of teacher job satisfaction from other countries.

L'important corpus de recherche qui porte sur la satisfaction au travail des enseignants et leurs évaluations du comportement des directeurs a surtout étudié les systèmes d'éducation dans les pays du premier monde. Cette étude quantitative se situe dans un contexte éducatif moins étudié et compare les niveaux de satisfaction au travail des enseignants et le comportement des directeurs relatif à la supervision professionnelle dans des écoles privées et publiques en Turquie. Les résultats indiquent que pour toutes les caractéristiques démographiques étudiées (par ex. sexe, niveau scolaire, matière, nombre d'années d'enseignement), les enseignants dans les écoles privées ressentent plus de satisfaction au travail et estiment davantage le comportement de leurs directeurs relatif à la supervision professionnelle que les enseignants dans les écoles publiques. Ces résultats portent à croire qu'en Turquie, les conditions de travail dans les écoles privées sont plus favorables que celles dans les écoles publiques, ce qui s'inscrit dans les tendances en recherche portant sur la satisfaction au travail des enseignants dans d'autres pays.

Introduction

Differences between public and private schools have been in the centre of researchers' attention for decades. Overall, the general agreement among researchers and practitioners is the belief in

the superiority of private schools. This belief is strengthened by the fact that private and charter school students, academically, outperform public school students (Jeynes, 2012). However, classroom processes in public and private schools do not differ significantly (O'Brien & Pianta, 2010). Potential reasons for these differences may be the higher (on average) socio-economic status of private school students and the fact that some private schools offer higher salaries for their teachers and leaders, thus attracting and retaining better educators. Research suggests that it is more difficult to retain teachers in schools that serve predominantly low achieving and minority students as well as those from lower socio-economic backgrounds (Scheopner, 2010) and concludes that private schools succeed in retaining their high-performing teachers (Ballou & Podgursky, 1998). Yet, despite the differences, public and private schools have a lot to learn from each other to strengthen and rejuvenate the educational system (Jeynes & Beuttler, 2012). There are numerous studies examining teacher job satisfaction in public and private schools, but less is known about how principals' instructional supervision behaviours impact job satisfaction of public and private school teachers. In this study, we compared the survey responses of Turkish public and private school teachers to further our understanding of how teachers in Turkey assess their principals' instructional supervision behaviours and their own job satisfaction levels.

Study Context

In Turkey, formal education includes preprimary (3-5 years), primary (5-9 years), lower secondary (9-13 years), upper secondary (13-17 years), and tertiary educational institutions (18-23 years). Compulsory minimal education of five years was increased to eight in 1997 (Dulger, 2004) and to 12 years in 2012. Preschool education is not compulsory in Turkey. The public and private educational institutions are under the control and supervision of Turkish Ministry of National Education (TMNE). Founding private educational institutions requires formal permission from the TMNE (General Directory for Private Schools, 2013). No financial support is provided for the students attending private schools. Table 1 indicates that the vast majority of schools are public, employing many more teachers than do private schools (TMNE, 2013).

Literature Review

Teacher Job Satisfaction

Teacher job satisfaction, a popular research topic in organization and management studies, is related to job characteristics, salary, working conditions, management, and relations with co-workers (Luthans, 2005). Clearly, job satisfaction is important to overall school success because teacher dissatisfaction decreases student achievement and increases disciplinary problems and teacher turnover (Hanushek et al., 2004). The literature connects teacher job satisfaction to a number of school variables. On the school level, teacher job satisfaction is related to school context, leadership behaviours, and workload stress. At the student level, teacher job satisfaction is connected to the racial make-up of student population and student behaviour (e.g., Collie, Shapka, & Perry 2012; Frankenberg, 2006). An examination of teacher job satisfaction and turnover motivation as antecedents of teacher attrition (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011) revealed that school context variables like value consonance, supervisory support, relations with colleagues and parents, time pressure, and disciplinary problems affected

Table 1

Comparing Turkish Public and Private Schools

School Level	School Type	Number of Teachers	Number of Students	Student Percentage (%)	Schooling Rate (%)
Preprimary	Public	13,134	953,209	88.42	64
	Private	12,895	124,724	11.57	
Primary	Public	261,497	5,426,529	97.00	99
	Private	20,546	167,381	2.99	
Lower secondary	Public	250,833	5,035,415	96.84	93
	Private	18,926	164,294	2.95	
Upper Secondary	Public	232,517	3,824,549	96.06	70
	Private	22,378	156,665	3.93	
General High School	Public	99,196	2,587,161	94.90	35
	Private	20,197	138,811	5.09	
Vocational High School	Public	133,321	2,251,797	99.21	35
	Private	2,181	1,7854	0.78	

teachers' choices regarding whether to stay with or leave jobs. Job satisfaction was also mediated through emotional exhaustion and feelings of belonging. In addition to school variables, teacher job satisfaction was related to school leadership and management (Lee, 2006), principals' decision-making styles (Hariri et al., 2012) and to the frequency of the principal's use of humour (Hurren, 2006).

A considerable body of international research points to connections between teacher job satisfaction and workload and the sense of teaching efficacy. Thus, teachers' greater classroom management self-efficacy and greater instructional strategies self-efficacy increase their job satisfaction (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Similarly, Collie et al. (2012) reported that teacher job satisfaction was directly related to perceived workload stress and the sense of teaching efficacy. A study of novice teachers (with less than six years on the job) also concluded that teacher job satisfaction was positively related to teacher efficacy and work engagement (Hoigaard et al., 2012).

Most of the studies carried out in Turkey about teacher job satisfaction focused on the correlation between job satisfaction and salary (e.g., Cebeci, 2006; Cevik, 2010; Erdem, 2010; İnandi et al., 2010; Karatas & Güles, 2010; Kocak, 2006; Koç et al., 2009; Tasdan & Tiryaki, 2008). In addition to the salary, principals' leadership behaviours impacted teacher job satisfaction (Yilmaz & Ceylan, 2011). Finally, other factors impacting Turkish teacher job satisfaction include school type and the subject taught. Overall, regardless of the subject matter, teachers in private schools report higher levels of job satisfaction than teachers working in public schools (e.g., Aydin, 2006; Genc, 2006; Gencturk & Memis, 2010; Sinan, 2008; Tasdan & Tiryaki, 2008).

International research also shows that private school teachers have higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment compared to public school teachers (e.g., Buka & Bilgic, 2010; Green et al., 2008; Reyes & Pounder, 1993). These differences are partly due to the organizational structure of private and charter schools that offer teachers greater autonomy (Lee et al., 1991; Renzulli et al., 2011). Research suggests that teacher job satisfaction and organizational commitment are related (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005) and concludes that decreases in job satisfaction and goal commitment are linked to higher turnover (Lynch, 2012). In addition, teacher dissatisfaction is greater in schools with higher minority populations (Frankenberg, 2006). Moreover, teachers' organizational commitment is impacted by their principals' actions and decisions (Van Maele & Van Houtte, 2012). One of the key responsibilities of a school principal is the instructional supervision of teachers.

Instructional Supervision of Teachers

In its current form, instructional supervision was introduced in the United States in the middle of the 20th century. Generally, effective teacher supervision is a cyclical process that includes a pre-observation conference, classroom observation, and a post-observation conference (Zepeda, 2012). Supervision is conducted either by principals or by specially assigned supervisors. In the era of educational cuts and increased accountability requirements, teacher supervision has become one of the main responsibilities of a principal. Traditionally, teacher supervision aims to develop and support teachers by providing objective feedback on their classroom practices to help solve instructional issues, develop and refine instructional skills, and assess teachers' performance (Gall & Acheson, 2010). Although supervision varies in different schools, districts, and educational systems, the general agreement among researchers and practitioners is that effective supervision is meaningful and based on trust (Zepeda, 2012).

Following its introduction in the 1960s, the concept of teacher supervision has been modified and different models have been introduced. Among the most popular ones have been instructional supervision (Zepeda, 2012), differentiated supervision (Glatthorn, 1997), and developmental supervision (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2013). As the name suggests, instructional supervision focuses on improving instruction and student achievement by providing professional assistance to teachers. Differentiated and developmental supervisory approaches are more teacher-driven and conducted based on teacher needs and career stages. Although these models differ in foci, they are all directed at professional development for teachers to increase their instructional efficacy and to improve student learning.

International research points to the positive effects of instructional supervision on teachers. A study from New Brunswick (Bouchamma & Michaud, 2011) reported that supervisors (i.e., principals, assistant principals, and department chairs) have gained knowledge and developed skills from supervising teachers. A quantitative study of one Wyoming school district reported that teachers found the post-observation conference more important, valued principal's constructive feedback, and believed that supervisory experiences helped them reflect on their pedagogical practice (Range et al., 2013). However, an overview of empirical research on teacher supervision points to the numerous obstacles to successful implementation of this process. Among the common factors inhibiting the success of instructional supervision is a school's hostile climate (Moswela, 2010), inadequate supervisory and interpersonal skills of principals (Pansiri, 2008; Titanji & Yuoh, 2010), and the lack of feedback and follow-up (Wanzare, 2012).

The literature review revealed that in private schools, teacher supervision has been less

analysed—only several studies were found that specifically examined this area. The qualitative study of school-based supervisory practices in one secondary private school (Collins, 2002) concluded that teacher supervision was closely intertwined with summative evaluation—supervision represented the formative assessment phase and evaluation corresponded to summative evaluation. Based on the results of the summative conference, school leaders either dismissed teachers or renewed their contracts. A follow-up study (Collins, 2004) found that centralized (from the Ministry of Education) and school-based supervision can coexist in a private school district; however, to be effective, these two processes should complement each other.

A more recent international study (Tyagi, 2010) concluded that public and private schools in India should provide more effective teacher instructional supervision and teacher professional development. Researchers of the Turkish educational system reported similar concerns over the quality and effectiveness of teacher supervision. In particular, an alarming number of Turkish teachers report not being observed during the academic year (Zepeda et al. 2012). Furthermore, supervisors have inadequate knowledge and communication skills to conduct effective teacher supervision (Unal & Erol, 2011; Yavuz, 2010). In summary, research suggests that teacher supervision is often inadequate and needs further development and improvement.

The present study aims to contribute to this area of educational research by comparing the perceptions of Turkish public and private school teachers about job satisfaction and principals' instructional supervision. The following section details the method, sample, data collection, and analysis instruments and procedures.

Methodology

Research Questions

This study aimed to compare the private and public Turkish school teachers' job satisfaction levels and principals' instructional supervision behaviours. The study was guided by two research questions:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction of teachers working at public and private schools? Does this level differ under different boundary conditions?

2. What are the teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional supervision behaviours? Do these perceptions differ under different boundary conditions?

For this study, the boundary conditions included gender, school type, subject matter, and years of teaching.

Method

An individual survey was selected as a "means for gathering information about the characteristics, actions, or opinions of a large group of people" (Pinsonneault & Kraemer, 1993, 77). Surveys allowed data collection about the participants' beliefs, which would be difficult to measure using observational techniques (McIntyre, 1999). For the purposes of this study, a cross-sectional survey was used to collect data at one selected time and to make inferences about the population under study (Hall, 2008).

Study sample

Survey data were collected in January-February of 2013 using paper-based Likert type five-point scale. The target population of the study (N=1000) included primary and secondary public and private school teachers working in different provinces, geographically separated across Turkey, during the spring semester of 2012-2013 academic year. The research was conducted in five different provinces selected as representative of Turkey and located in the East, West, North, South and middle part of the country. Participating teachers were selected using cluster sampling. The lists of schools and school districts were obtained from the provincial offices of education. Upon formal permission of provincial offices, the surveys were administered. In total, 1200 paper surveys were administered in 110 schools from 5 provinces. The number of surveys distributed was higher than the targeted sample size to ensure that a sample size suitable for this study would be achieved. The return rate was high (82%), yielding a total of 984 responses. For the participants' demographic data, see Table 2.

Instruments and procedures

Two different scales were used to measure teachers' job satisfaction levels and principals' instructional supervision behaviours. The Teacher Job Satisfaction Scale (Tasdan, 2008) included 14 statements with 5-point Likert-scale responses such as: (1) Never satisfies me; (2) Adequately satisfies me; (3) Reasonably satisfies me; (4) Quite satisfies me; and (5) Really satisfies me (see Appendix A). Higher scores indicated high level of job satisfaction while low scores showed a lower level of job satisfaction. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) revealed that the scale had three sub-dimensions (see Table 3): managerial satisfaction (explained 21.29% of total variance); adequacy of work life (21%); and economic facilities, self-development and security (20.67%). Based on the EFA results, one statement was excluded from the scale; thus, the Teacher Job Satisfaction Scale (TJSS) explained 62.8% of the total variance in teachers' job satisfaction. Factor loading ranges varied between 0.451 and 0.855. Therefore, the construct validity of the TJSS was relatively high. The reliability coefficient was also high (see Table 3), suggesting that the TJSS was found consistently reliable.

The researchers developed the Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours Scale (PISBS) for the purposes of this study. The scale's items (23 statements) were based on the literature review and experts' opinions (see Appendix B). The PISBS was a 5-point Likert scale, with the answer options: (1) Never; (2) Rarely; (3) Occasionally; (4) Frequently; and (5) Very frequently. Higher points in the scale reflected a higher level of appraisal of principals' instructional supervision behaviours. The Principal Component Analysis of EFA revealed that the scale was uni-dimensional with the internal consistency coefficient alpha of 0.975; the KMO was 0.975 and the Barlett's test (0.000) was statistically significant (see Table 4). Factor loadings ranged from 0.723 to 0.866; item-total correlations ranged from 0.703 and 0.847 (see Table 4). Since the scale explained 64.7% of total variance, it was considered uni-dimensional. The scale had an internal consistency coefficient alpha of 0.973. Therefore, the scale had high reliability and construct validity.

Table 2

Participants' Demographics

Variable	Level	Public School Teachers		Private School Teachers	
		N	%	N	%
School Type	Elementary	225	30.4	46	19.1
	Middle School	230	31.0	113	46.9
	General High School	117	15.8	79	32.8
	Vocational High School	169	22.8	3	1.2
	Total	741	100.0	241	100.0
Gender	Female	386	52.1	108	45.6
	Male	355	47.9	129	54.4
	Total	741	100.0	237	100.0
Subject	Classroom Teacher (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th grade)	207	28.0	42	18.0
	Social Sciences (History, Geography, Social Studies, Foreign Language, Religion, etc.)	225	30.4	93	39.9
	Science and Math	126	17.1	67	28.8
	Vocational Subjects	89	12.0	5	2.1
	Physical education, art, music, etc.	92	12.4	26	11.2
	Total	739	100.0	233	100.0
Service Period	1-2 years	93	12.6	45	18.5
	3-5 years	98	13.2	46	18.9
	6-10 years	189	25.5	80	32.9
	11-15 years	179	24.2	54	22.2
	16-20 years	81	10.9	11	4.5
	21 and more	100	13.5	7	2.9
	Total	740	100.0	243	100.0

Table 3

Construct Validity and Reliability Analysis of the TJJS

Dimensions	Number of items	Explained variance %	Factor loadings range	Reliability coefficient	Item-total correlations range
Managerial satisfaction	4	21.29	0.717 – 0.818	0.83	0.612 – 0.744
Adequacy of work life	5	21	0.451 – 0.811	0.788	0.471 – 0.654
Economic facilities, self-development, and security	4	20.67	0.630 – 0.855	0.803	0.563 – 0.687
Total Variance Explained for Job Satisfaction of Teacher: 62.812		KMO: 0.912		Reliability coefficient for TJJS: 0.89	

Table 4

Construct Validity and Reliability Analysis of the PISB

Scale	Number of items	Explained variance %	Factor loadings range	Reliability coefficient	Item-total correlations range
PIBS	23	64.7	0.723 – 0.866	0.975	0.703 – 0.847

Data Analysis

The data gathered by TJSS and PISB scales were analysed by SPSS (Version 20). To compare public and private schools teachers in terms of demographic variables, independent sample t-tests were used. Percentages and frequencies were used to analyse demographic variables. To describe teachers' job satisfaction and school principals' instructional supervision behaviours, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation were used. The skewness index of composite TJSS was -0.63 and kurtosis index was -0.284; skewness and curtosis indexes ranged between -1 and 1, which is considered excellent (George & Mallery, 2001). The skewness index of PISBS was -0.375 and the curtosis index was -0.811. These results indicated that parametric statistic procedures to analyse the data were suitable.

Findings

The results will be reported in the order the data were analysed. First, descriptive statistics will be provided. Second, the results of t-tests will be examined to compare the differences between the public and private school teachers in terms of gender, subject taught, school level, and years of experience. We will also report on the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principals' instructional supervision behaviours.

Descriptive statistics for teacher job satisfaction and principals' instructional supervision behaviours (see Table 5) revealed that public school teachers believed that their principals displayed an average level of instructional supervision behaviours (X= 3.15); whereas, private school teachers asserted that their principals displayed a high level of instructional supervision

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours

Scales	Dimensions	Public School Teachers			Private School Teachers		
		N	X	SD	N	X	SD
PISB	Uni-dimensional	741	3.154	0.971	243	3.848	0.863
	Managerial satisfaction	741	3.261	0.953	243	3.845	0.9317
Teachers' Job Satisfaction	Adequacy of work life	741	3.357	0.710	243	3.876	0.7006
	Economic facilities, self-development and security	741	2.678	0.794	243	3.519	0.9200
Composite Job Satisfaction		741	3.118	0.672	243	3.757	0.724

behaviours (X= 3.85). Participating public school teachers believed that most frequent instructional behaviours of their principals (represented by the items of the PISB scale) were "monitoring students' academic performance" (X=3.63), "informing teachers about the new developments in academic meetings" (X=3.60), and "listening to the teachers' teaching problems" (X=3.59); whereas, private school teachers believed that their principals' most frequent instructional behaviours were "monitoring students' academic performance" (X=4.31), "providing required support for the adaptation of the teachers who have just started the profession or who are new at school" (X=4.14), and "encouraging teachers to discuss teaching problems, sharing experience and knowledge during academic meetings" (X=4.13). The least frequent behaviours for public school principals included "encouraging teachers to engage in peer observation (X=2.37), "encouraging mutual analysis of the observations after teachers' observed each other's teaching practices" (X= 2.46), and "rewarding successful teachers based on concrete actions" (X=2.64), whereas, for private school principals, the least frequent instructional supervision behaviours were "rewarding successful teachers based on concrete actions" (X= 3.29), "meeting with teachers regarding objectives of the course and expected student acquisitions before classroom visit" (X= 3.38), and "encouraging mutual analysis of the observations after teachers' observed each other's teaching practices" (X= 3.45).

While job satisfaction level of public teachers was at a reasonable level (X= 3.12), private school teachers' satisfaction level was found to be higher (X= 3.76). The statements that yielded the highest responses from public and private school teachers were the same: "my communication with the colleagues and people I interact with" (X= 3.76 for public school teachers; X= 4.15 for private school teachers); and "having the opportunity to get to know my colleagues that I work with" (X= 3.63 for public school teachers; X= 4.07 for private school teachers). The statements that public school teachers least agreed with were "the fairness of the payment in response to the work I do" (X= 2.44) and "the amount of my salary and extra pay I earn" (X= 2.49). For the private school teachers, the least agreed upon statements were "the amount of my salary and extra pay I earn" (X= 3.26) and "the opportunity of competition at school" (X= 3.43).

Comparison of Public and Private School Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours According to the Teachers' Demographic Characteristics

T-test results comparing public and private school teachers' perceptions of school principals' instructional supervision behaviours (see Table 6) revealed that female [$t_{(222,4)}$ = 8.79; $p < 0.05$] and male teachers [$t_{(482)}$ = 6.15; $p < 0.05$] working at private schools perceived their school principals displayed instructional supervision behaviours more often compared to the public school teachers. Similarly, teachers working at private elementary schools [$t_{(77,95)}$ = 4.8; $p < 0.05$], private middle schools [$t_{(283,7)}$= 8.88; $p < 0.05$] and private high schools [$t_{(366)}$ = 3.81; $p < 0.05$] perceived their principals exhibited instructional supervision behaviours more often compared to the responses of public school teachers working at the same respective school levels (see Table 7). T-test results comparing public and private school teachers' perceptions of school principals' instructional supervision behaviours based on the subject matter (see Table 8) revealed that in all subjects, teachers working at private schools perceived that school principals displayed instructional supervision behaviours more often compared to the public school teachers. This was true for participants who identified themselves as a classroom teacher [$t_{(247)}$ = 3.921; $p < 0.05$]; social sciences teacher [$t_{(202,025)}$ = 5.96; $p < 0.05$]; science and math teacher

Table 6

T-test Results Comparing Teachers' Perceptions of School Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours Based on Gender

Gender	Groups	n	X (M)	SD	df	t	p
Female	Public	386	3.0991	1.00217	222,4	8.79	0.000
	Private	108	3.8816	0.75819			
Male	Public	355	3.2138	0.93551	482	6.15	0.000
	Private	129	3.8084	0.95534			

Table 7

T-test Results Comparing Teachers' Perceptions of School Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours Based on the School Level

School Type	Groups	n	X (M)	SD	df	t	p
Elementary	Public	225	3.2863	1.04827	77,95	4.8	0.000
	Private	46	4.0736	0.82447			
Middle School	Public	230	3.0621	0.93961	283,07	8.88	0.000
	Private	113	3.9523	0.71487			
High School	Public	286	3.1239	0.92613	366	3.813	0.000
	Private	82	3.5747	1.00386			

Table 8

T-test Results Comparing Teachers' Perceptions of School Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours Based on the Subject Matter

Subject	Groups	n	X (M)	SD	df	t	p
Classroom Teacher (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th grade)	Public	207	3.28	1.038	247	3.921	0.000
	Private	42	3.95	0.8501			
Social Sciences (History, Geography, Social Studies, Foreign Language, Religious etc.)	Public	225	3.170	0.9401	202, 025	5.960	0.000
	Private	93	3.831	0.7926			
Science and Math	Public	126	3.217	0.9186	191	4.186	0.000
	Private	67	3.793	0.8956			
Physical education, art, music etc.	Public	92	2.968	1.003	58, 7	6.543	0.000
	Private	26	4.081	0.6841			

[t $_{(191)}$ = 4.186; p ‹ 0.05]; and physical education, art, music teacher [t $_{(58,7)}$ = 6.543; p ‹ 0.05]. Finally, in all groups based on the service period or seniority in the profession (1-2 years [t $_{(136)}$ = 6; p ‹ 0.05]; 3-5 years [t $_{(142)}$ = 4.75; p ‹ 0.05]; 6-10 years [t $_{(267)}$ = 5.33; p ‹ 0.05]; 11-20 years [t $_{(120,2)}$ = 5.2; p ‹ 0.05]) private school teachers perceived that school principals performed instructional supervision behaviours more often compared to the public school teachers (see Table 9).

Comparison of Job Satisfaction Levels of Public and Private School Teachers According to Various Demographical Characteristics

T-test results comparing public and private school teachers' job satisfaction levels based on the gender (see Table 10) showed that levels of job satisfaction of female [t $_{(492)}$ = 8.34; p ‹ 0.05] and male teachers [t $_{(199,2)}$ = 8.746; p ‹ 0.05] working at private schools were higher than those of female and male teachers working at public schools. Similarly, the comparison of public and private school teachers' levels of job satisfaction based on the school level (see Table 11) showed that private elementary school [t $_{(269)}$ = 7.029; p ‹ 0.05], middle school [t $_{(341)}$ = 10.232; p ‹ 0.05] and high school [t $_{(366)}$ = 5.071; p ‹ 0.05] teachers' job satisfaction levels were higher than those of teachers working at public schools. This finding was true for all school levels. The comparison of public and private school teachers' levels of job satisfaction based on the subject matter (see Table 12) showed that for all subjects (e.g., classroom teacher [t $_{(247)}$ = 5.968; p ‹ 0.05]; social sciences [t $_{(316)}$ = 7.509; p ‹ 0.05]; science and math [t $_{(191)}$ = 5.247; p ‹ 0.05]; physical education, art, music, etc. [t $_{(116)}$ = 5.752; p ‹ 0.05]) private school teachers displayed higher job satisfaction levels than public school teachers. T-test results comparing public and private school teachers' levels of job satisfaction based on the years of teaching (see Table 13) showed that in all groups based on the service period or seniority in the profession (e.g., 1-2 years [t $_{(136)}$ = 5.741; p ‹ 0.05]; 3-5 years [t $_{(142)}$ = 6.172; p ‹ 0.05]; 6-10 years [t $_{(267)}$ = 7.367; p ‹ 0.05]; 11-20 years [t $_{(323)}$ = 6.38; p ‹ 0.05]) private school teachers had higher job satisfaction levels than public school teachers.

Finally, as is shown in Table 14, positive and relatively high meaningful relationship was found between principals' instructional supervision behaviour and teachers' job satisfaction (r = 0.611; p<0.01). Thus, as principals perform instructional supervision behaviours more frequently, the teachers' job satisfaction levels increase. Similarly, when we analysed the

Table 9

T-test Results Comparing Teachers' Perceptions of School Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours Based on the Years of Teaching

Service Period	Groups	n	X (M)	SD	df	t	p
1-2 years	Public	93	3	0.9546	136	6	0.000
	Private	45	4.027	0.9158			
3-5 years	Public	98	3.040	0.9524	142	4.757	0.000
	Private	46	3.815	0.8153			
6-10 years	Public	189	3.064	0.9388	267	5.33	0.000
	Private	80	3.727	0.9181			
11-20 years	Public	260	3.2	1.002	120, 2	5.2	0.000
	Private	65	3.896	0.7958			

Table 10

T-test Results Comparing Teachers' Job Satisfaction Levels Based on the Gender

Gender	Groups	n	X (M)	SD	df	t	p
Female	Public	386	3.1339	0.68314	492	8.344	0.000
	Private	108	3.7504	0.66274			
Male	Public	355	3.1015	0.65975	199, 2	8.746	0.000
	Private	129	3.7728	0.77573			

Table 11

T-test Results Comparing Teachers' Job Satisfaction Levels Based on the School Level

School Type	Groups	n	X (M)	SD	df	t	p
Elementary	Public	225	3.2351	0.71989	269	7.029	0.000
	Private	46	4.0464	0.67910			
Middle School	Public	230	3.1060	0.60646	341	10.232	0.000
	Private	113	3.8289	0.63213			
High School	Public	286	3.0365	0.67179	366	5.071	0.000
	Private	82	3.4801	0.78410			

Table 12

T-test Results Comparing Teachers' Job Satisfaction Levels Based on the Subject Matter

Subject	Groups	n	X (M)	SD	df	t	p
Classroom Teacher (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th grade)	Public	207	3.197	0.7070	247	5.968	0.000
	Private	42	3.923	0.7713			
Social Sciences (History, Geography, Social Studies, Foreign Language, Religious etc.)	Public	225	3.079	0.6638	316	7.509	0.000
	Private	93	3.692	0.6587			
Science and Math	Public	126	3.153	0.6353	191	5.247	0.000
	Private	67	3.693	0.7512			
Physical education, art, music etc.	Public	92	3.070	0.6857	116	5.752	0.000
	Private	26	3.934	0.6415			

relationship between the principals' instructional supervision behaviours and the subscales of job satisfaction scale, a positive, meaningful, and high relationship was found between PISB and managerial satisfaction (r= .658; p<0.01), and a positive, meaningful and moderate relationship was found between PISB and the adequacy of work life (r = .464; p<0.01) and between PISB and economic facilities, self-development, and security (r = .433; p<0.01).

Table 13

T-test Results Comparing Teachers' Job Satisfaction Levels Based on the Years of Teaching

Service Period	Groups	n	X (M)	SD	df	t	p
1-2 years	Public	93	3.184	0.6482	136	5.741	0.000
	Private	45	3.897	0.7539			
3-5 years	Public	98	3.158	0.6923	142	6.172	0.000
	Private	46	3.895	0.6117			
6-10 years	Public	189	2.994	0.6262	267	7.367	0.000
	Private	80	3.646	0.7456			
11-20 years	Public	260	3.102	0.6649	323	6.380	0.000
	Private	65	3.707	0.7522			

Table 14

Relationship between Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours and Teachers' Job Satisfaction

	Composite Teachers Job Satisfaction Scale (TJSS) and Dimensions of TJSS			
	Composite TJSS	Managerial Satisfaction	Adequacy of work life	Economic facilities, self-development and security
Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours (PISB) Scale	0.611**	0.658**	0.464**	0.433**

Discussion

In summary, the findings of this analysis indicate that teachers' working conditions (i.e., better management, economic facilities, quality of work life) are more favourable in Turkish private schools than in public schools. Specifically, participating private school teachers had higher levels of job satisfaction than did public school teachers. Similarly, private school teachers assessed their principals' instructional supervision behaviours at a higher level than did public school teachers. Furthermore, these findings were true for all examined teacher demographic characteristics (e.g., gender, school type, subject matter, and years of teaching), indicating that the school status (i.e., public versus private) was behind the differences in participating teachers' responses.

Overall, the findings of the present study support the general trends in international and Turkish research pertaining to teacher job satisfaction and instructional supervision. The findings of our study are consistent with the results of previously reported international studies about higher levels of teacher job satisfaction in private schools (e.g., Buka & Bilgic, 2010; Green et al., 2008; Reyes & Pounder, 1993). Given the paucity of international research about principals' instructional supervision behaviours, the results of the present study contribute to this line of research by reporting that private school teachers assessed their principals' instructional supervision behaviours at a significantly higher level than the participating public school teachers.

Examining the results of this study in comparison with previous Turkish studies on the topic, it is evident that our findings support the general tendencies in recent Turkish research in this area. First, the present study found that public school teachers believed their principals occasionally displayed instructional supervision behaviours. This finding is consistent with the results of numerous previous studies conducted in the Turkish context (e.g., Büyükdoğan, 2003; Çalhan, 1999; Çalık et al., 2012; İnandı & Özkan, 2006; Tahaoğlu & Gedik, 2009; Yüce, 2010). However, our results report that principals' instructional supervision behaviours occurred more frequently thus showing that teachers assessed their principals' practices at a higher level, similarly to some recent studies from the Turkish context (e.g., Aksoy & Işık, 2008; Çakici, 2010; Sağır & Memişoğlu, 2012; Serin & Buluç, 2012).

Second, private school teachers stated that their principals performed instructional supervision behaviours more frequently than did private school teachers. This finding mirrors the results of the previous studies on the topic that reported that private school principals frequently engaged in the instructional supervision of their teachers (e.g., Altinöz, 2009; Yuca, 2004). However, while there is a general agreement among researchers about a better state of instructional supervision in Turkish private schools (and our findings contribute to this assertion), there is a need for an in-depth qualitative analysis of instructional supervision practices, especially because the majority of these studies are quantitative.

Third, our results indicate that private school teachers have a higher level of job satisfaction than public school teachers. This result holds true for all subscales of the job satisfaction instrument: managerial satisfaction, adequacy of work life, economic facilities, self-development, and security. These results are aligned with the previous Turkish studies (e.g., Gençtürk & Memiş, 2010; Sinan, 2008) that reported meaningful differences between general job satisfaction, intrinsic job satisfaction, and extrinsic job satisfaction levels of private and public school teachers in favour of private school teachers.

Limitations and implications

The data collection time and the data collection sites limited this study. The data were collected at one point, thus preventing researchers from examining the trends pertaining to teacher job satisfaction and principals' instructional supervision behaviours. For the purposes of this study, we have used instructional supervision model mainly due to the fact that it is the closest to the one used in the Turkish schools. Thus, the findings of this study may not be transferable to other settings where other models of teacher supervision are used.

As with any data collection, there is a possibility that participants did not provide truthful responses. Although the research sites for this study were representative of geographical regions of Turkey, the sample was not truly representative at a national level. However, a high response rate allows us to suggest that the collected data accurately represented the beliefs of teachers in the participating schools.

In addition, the alternative hypothesis is that the higher job satisfaction may be related to the better working conditions in private schools. These better conditions result in higher quality supervision, which, in turn, leads to higher job satisfaction of teachers. Future research should test whether better instructional supervision leads to higher teacher job satisfaction when the variable of working conditions is controlled.

The major finding of the study is that there is a higher level of teacher job satisfaction and principals' instructional supervision in private schools than in public schools. These results

indicate the need for the policy-makers and practitioners to revisit the regulations about teacher supervision. Additional training or targeted professional development on instructional supervision may improve principals' practices, thus, increasing teacher effectiveness. Similarly, the results point to the need to increase public school teachers' job satisfaction. Given that both public and private school teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the salary, the government and policy makers should account for this result while planning future educational reforms. However, while increasing the salary may be problematic and harder to achieve (one of the aspects rated lowest on the job satisfaction scale), schools and districts have higher control over school climate and job-embedded professional learning provided for teachers and should work to improve working conditions and professional learning opportunities available to teachers.

Conclusion

The results of this study suggesting stronger levels of teacher job satisfaction and principals' instructional supervision in Turkish private schools are not surprising. Given higher salaries and more comfortable working conditions in private schools, it is expected that teachers will be more satisfied with their jobs. This study advances research on teacher job satisfaction, instructional supervision, and the differences between public and private schools. More specifically, the results contribute to the lesser-examined educational context—the context of Turkish K-12 schooling. For practitioners and policymakers, this study suggests the need to re-examine how instructional supervision occurs in a public school context and to provide necessary support and training for leaders responsible for teacher supervision. Finally, based on these results, future research may examine how specific instructional supervision behaviours affect teacher well-being and focus specifically on the organizational aspects of private schools that foster higher teacher job satisfaction.

In conclusion, though the results of this study indicate better levels of teacher job satisfaction and principals' instructional supervision in Turkish private schools than in public schools, only 3% of students attend private schools. The high cost of private schools makes it impossible for most parents to afford this schooling option. Therefore, practitioners and policy makes should focus their efforts on improving public schools that educate the vast majority of pupils. These efforts will not only improve teachers and leaders, but will also lead to the ultimate goal of schooling—providing better education to all pupils.

References

Aksoy, E., & Isik, H. (2008). Instructional leadership roles of elementary school principals (in Turkish). *Kırgızistan Türkiye Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 19*, 235-249.

Aydin, D. (2006). *Job Satisfaction of Teachers* (in Turkish). İstanbul: Marmara University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Ballou, D., & Podgursky, M. (1998). Teacher recruitment and retention in public and private schools. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 17*(3), 393-417.

Bouchamma, Y., & Michaud, C. (2011). Communities of practice with teaching supervisors: A discussion of community members' experiences. *Journal of Educational Change, 12*, 403-420.

Buka, M., & Bilgic, R. (2010). Public and private schoolteachers' differences in terms of job attitudes in Albania. *International Journal of Psychology, 45*(3), 232-239.

Buyukdogan, B. (2003). *Synthesis about high school principals' instructional leadership behaviours* (in Turkish). Konya: Selçuk University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Cakici, E. (2010). *The level of instructional leadership actualization of the primary school administrators* (in Turkish). Sakarya: Sakarya University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Calhan, G. (1999). *Principals' instructional leadership* (in Turkish). İstanbul: Yildiz Technical University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Cebeci, S. (2006). *Job satisfaction levels of school principals* (in Turkish). İstanbul: Beykent University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Cevik, N. (2010). *The relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction in primary schools* (in Turkish). Ankara: Gazi University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2012). School climate and social-emotional learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(4), 1189-1204.

Collins, A. B. (2002). School-based supervision at a private Turkish school: A model for improving teacher evaluation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 1*(2), 172-190.

Collins, A. B. (2004). Teacher performance evaluation: A stressful experience from a private secondary school. *Educational Research, 46*(1), 43-54.

Cooper-Hakim, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*, 241–259.

Dulger, I. (2004). Turkey rapid coverage for compulsory education-1997 Basic Education Program. Paper presented at the Scaling Up Poverty Reduction: A Global Learning Process and Conference, Shanghai.

Erdem, A. R. (2010). Economical problems of primary and secondary school teachers and effects of these problems on their performance (in Turkish). *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 7*(1), 270-87.

Frankenberg, E. (2006). *The segregation of American teachers*. Cambridge, MA: Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

Gall, M.D., & Acheson, K.A. (2003). *Clinical supervision and teacher development: Preservice and inservice applications* (6thed.). New York: Wiley.

Genc, M. (2006). *Comparison of private and public school teachers' job satisfaction levels* (in Turkish). İstanbul: Yeditepe University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Gencturk, A., & Memis, A. (2010). An investigation of primary school teachers' teacher efficacy and job satisfaction in terms of demographic factors (in Turkish). *İlköğretim Online, 9*(3), 1037-1054.

General Directorate for Private Schools (2013). *Regulations for private schools* (in Turkish). Retrieved May 13, 2013, from http://ookgm.meb.gov.tr/www/okul-acma-islemleri/icerik/100

Glatthorn, A. A. (1997). Differentiated supervision (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P., & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (2013). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Green, F., Machin, S., Murphy, R., & Zhu, Y. (2008). Competition for private and state school teachers. *Journal of Education and Work, 21*(5), 383-404.

Hall, J. (2008). Cross-sectional survey design. In P.J. Lavrakas (Ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Survey Research Methods* (2nd ed., pp. 172-173). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin. S. G. (2004). Why public schools lose teachers. *Journal of Human Resources, 39*, 326–54.

Hariri, H., Monypenny, R., & Prideaux, M. (2012). Principalship in an Indonesian school district: Can principal decision-making styles significantly predict teacher job satisfaction? *School Leadership and Management, 32*(5), 453-471.

Hurren, B. L. (2006). The effects of principals' humor on teachers' job satisfaction, *Educational Studies, 32*(4), 373-385.

Inandi, Y. Aggun, N., & Atik, Ü. (2010). Job satisfaction level of teachers working in elementary schools according to the opinions of school administrators and teachers (in Turkish). *Journal of Mersin University Faculty of Education, 6*(1), 102-126.

Jeynes, W. H. (2012). A meta-analysis on the effects and contributions of public, public charter, and religious schools on student outcomes, *Peabody Journal of Education, 87*, 305-335.

Jeynes, W. H., & F. Beuttler. (2012). What private and public schools can learn from each other. *Peabody Journal of Education, 87*, 285-304.

Karatas, S., & Gules, H. (2010). The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational loyalty (in Turkish). *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 3*(2), 74-89.

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M.M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(3), 741-756.

Koc, H. Yazicioglu, I., & Hatipoglu, H. (2009), Examining the relationship between the teachers' perceived job satisfaction and performance (in Turkish). *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 28*, 13-22.

Kocak, T. (2006). *The relationship between the school principals' transformational leadership styles and the teachers' job satisfaction* (in Turkish). Ankara: Gazi University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Lee, M. (2006). What makes a difference between two schools? Teacher job satisfaction and educational outcomes, *International Education Journal, 7*(5), 642-650.

Lee, V. E., Dedrick, R. F., & Smith. J. B. (1991). The effect of the social-organization of schools on teachers' efficacy and satisfaction. *Sociology of Education, 64*, 190–208.

Luthans, F. (2005). *Organizational behavior* (10th edn). New York: McGraw Hill.

Lynch, M. (2012). *A guide to effective school leadership theories*. New York, Routledge.

McIntyre, L. J. (1999). *The practical skeptic: Core concepts in sociology*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Moswela, B. (2010). Instructional supervision in Botswana secondary schools: An investigation. *Educational Management, Administration, & Leadership, 38*(1), 71-87.

O'Brien, R. H., & Pianta, R. C. (2010). Public and private schools: Do classroom processes vary by school type? *The Elementary School Journal, 110*(3), 409-419.

Pansiri, N. O. (2008). Instructional leadership for quality learning: An assessment of the impact of the primary school management development project in Botswana. *Educational Management, Administration, and Leadership, 36*(4), 471-494.

Pinsonneault, A., & Kraemer, K.L. (1993). Survey research methodology in management information systems: An assessment. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 10*(2), 75-105.

Range, B. G., Young, S., & Hvidston, D. (2013). Teacher perceptions about observation conferences: What do teachers think about their formative supervision in one US school district? *School Leadership and Management, 33*(1), 61-77.

Renzulli, L., Macpherson Parrot, H., & Beattie, I. (2011). Racial mismatch and school type: Teacher satisfaction and retention in charter and traditional public schools. *Sociology of Education, 84*(1), 23-48.

Reyes, P., & Pounder, D. (1993). Organizational orientation in public and private elementary schools. *Journal of Educational Research, 87*(2), 86-93.

Sagir, M., & Memisoglu, S. P. (2012). The perceptions of administrators and teachers about elementary school administrators' educational leadership roles (in Turkish). *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching, 1*(2), 1-12.

Scheopner, A. J. (2010). Irreconcilable differences: Teacher attrition in public and catholic schools. *Educational Research Review, 5*, 261-277.

Serin, M. K., & Buluc, B. (2012). The relationship between instructional leadership and organizational commitment in primary schools (in Turkish). *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 18*(3), 435-549.

Sinan, L. (2008). *Comparing the levels of job satisfactıon of lower secondary school subject teachers in publıc and private elementary schools* (in Turkish). İstanbul: Beykent University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 1029-1038.

Tahaoğlu, F., & Gedikoğlu, T. (2009). Leadership roles of primary school principals. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 15*(58), 274-298.

Tasdan, M. (2008). *The congruence level between personal values of teachers and organizational values of schools in public and private schools in Turkey, its relation with job satisfaction and perceived social support* (in Turkish). Ankara: Ankara University. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Tasdan, M., & Tiryaki, E. (2008). Comparing the level of job satisfaction of private and public primary school teachers (in Turkish). *Eğitim ve Bilim, 33*(147), 54-70.

Titanji, P. F., & Yuoh, N. M-Y. (2010). Supervision of instruction in Cameroon: Are pedagogic inspectors doing their work? *International Studies in Educational Administration, 38*(2), 21-40.

Turkish Ministry of National Education. (2013). *Statistics for national education system 2012-2013* (in Turkish). Retrieved May 15, 2013, from http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/istatistik/meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2012_2013.pdf

Tyagi, R. S. (2010). School-based instructional supervision and the effective professional development of teachers. *Compare, 40*(1), 111-125.

Unal, A., & Erol, S. Y. (2011). The expectations of elementary school principals from education supervisors. *E-Journal of New World Science Academy, 6*(4), 2630-2645.

Van Maele, D., & Van Houtte, M. (2012). The role of teacher and faculty trust in forming teachers' job satisfaction: Do years of experience make a difference? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(6), 879-889.

Wanzare, Z. (2012). Instructional supervision in public secondary schools in Kenya. *Educational Management, Administration, and Leadership, 40*(2), 188-216.

Yavuz, M. (2010). Effectiveness of supervisions conducted by primary education supervisors according to school principals' evaluations. *The Journal of Educational Research, 103*(6), 371-378.

Yilmaz, A., & Ceylan, C. B. (2011). The relationship between primary school administrators' leadership behaviours and job satisfaction of teachers (in Turkish). *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 17*(2), 277-294.

Yuca, U. (2004). *Private school administration analysis according to the learning organization model* (in Turkish). Kütahya: Dumlupınar University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Yuce, S. (2010). The relationship between instructional leadership behaviours of elementary school principals and teachers' organizational commitment (in Turkish). Ankara: Gazi University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Zepeda, S. J. (2012). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (3rd ed.). Larchmont, New York: Eye on Education.

Zepeda, S.J., Parylo, O., & Ilgan, A. (2013). Peer coaching: Comparing the American and Turkish educators' willingness to adopt and implement peer coaching as a form of teacher professional development. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 2*(1), 64-82.

Hilmi Sungu, PhD, is an Assistant Professor at Bozok University College of Education, Turkey. His research interests include educational administration, educational supervision and higher education policies. Dr. Sungu authored some chapters in edited books. Besides, he has international and national refereed articles. He can be reached via hilmisungu@hotmail.com

Abdurrahman Ilgan, PhD, is an Associate Professor in Duzce University College of Education, Turkey. His research interests include educational administration, instructional supervision, teacher professional development, instructional leadership, research methods in education, and educational statistics. Dr. Ilgan published a book about professional development of teachers and authored some chapters in edited books. He has international and national refereed articles. He can be reached via abdurrahmanilgan@gmail.com

Oksana Parylo received her PhD in Educational Administration and Policy from the University of Georgia, USA. In 2013-2014, Dr. Parylo was a Research Associate in the Methodology of Educational Sciences Research Group at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium. Dr. Parylo's current research interests include preparation, professional development, and evaluation of teachers and leaders and qualitative and mixed methodologies. She can be contacted via oksana.parylo@gmail.com

Mustafa Erdem, EdD, is an Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Education at Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi in Van, Turkey. His research focuses on the quality of work life, school development, educational management and school management. He received his EdD in Administration and Policy from the Ankara Üniversitesi, Turkey. His research publication can be accessed at http://www.yyu.edu.tr. He can be contacted via merdem50@gmail.com

Appendix A: Teachers' Job Satisfaction Scale

	1. Never satisfies me	2. Adequately satisfies me	3. Reasonably satisfies me	4. Quite satisfies me	5. Really satisfies me
1. The level of social security that my profession provides					
2. The amount of my salary and extra pay I earn					
3. The opportunities that my profession provides like promotion and self-improvement					
4. My communication with the colleagues and the people I interact with					
5. The fair behaviours and respect that the managers show					
6. The feeling of being appreciated while performing my duties					
7. Having the chance to know my colleagues					
8. The support and mentorship that I get from the manager					
9. The fairness of the payment in response to the work I do					
10. Having the chance to perform my personal decisions and to act independently					
11. The degree to which my school is meeting my expectations					
12. Having the chance to help my colleagues					
13. The opportunity of competition at school					
14. The attitude of the managers to us (teachers)					

Appendix B: Principals' Instructional Supervision Behaviours Scale

School Principal Behaviors	Frequency of Behaviors				
	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very frequently

1. Pays attention to the teachers' instructional problems.

2. Encourages creativity in teaching.

3. Visits classes in order to support/ improve teaching.

4. Informs teachers about the procedures and aims regarding classroom visits.

5. Meets with teachers regarding objectives of the course and expected student acquisitions before classroom visit.

6. Meets with teacher and provides feedback upon classroom visits.

7. Rewards successful teachers based on concrete actions.

8. Encourages teachers to attend professional development activities.

9. Encourages teachers to implement and share experiences gained from professional development activities.

10. Makes lifelong learning a part of school system.

11. Creates school atmosphere based on transparency and mutual trust.

12. Provides feedback regarding teachers' performance.

13. Encourages teachers to engage in peer observation.

14. Encourages mutual analysis of the observations after teachers' observed each other's teaching practices.

15. Encourages cooperation between teachers.

16. Takes the teachers' proposals into consideration while making decisions on education.

17. Strives to solve the problems when a student has deficiency/ incompetency about learning.

18. Evaluates teacher's academic activities together with the teacher himself/herself.

19. Assigns professional responsibilities to teachers based on his/her professional qualifications.

20. Monitors students' academic performance.

21. Informs teachers about the new developments in academic meetings.

22. Encourages teachers to discuss about educational problems, share and exchange information and experiences during school meetings.

23. Provides required support for the adaptation of the teachers who have just started the profession or who are new at school.