



Examining Education Supervisors' Stress Level They Experience Due to Their Duties

Aydın Balyer ¹, Yüksel Gündüz ²

Abstract

The main purpose of this study is to determine education supervisors' stress level they experience due to their duties. The working group comprised of 208 education supervisors employed in İstanbul province in the 2009-2010 academic year. The data were gathered through Education Supervisors' Stress Level Determination Scale (ESSLDS) developed by the researchers themselves. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found as 0,90. The data were analyzed with arithmetic mean, standard deviation, t-test and one-way variant analysis method (ANOVA). The results reveal that the education supervisors experience moderate level stress due to variety of their duties; a bit higher stress due to inefficiency of supervision and difficulties of working conditions; lower than normal level stress regarding of communication problems. In general, education supervisors experience moderate level stress due to their supervisory duties they carry out. While there are significant differences in gender, age, number of rewards and number of in-service training variables, there is no significant difference concerning education and professional experience variables.

Keywords

Supervisor
Stress
Supervision
Supervision duty

Article Info

Received: 01.11.2011

Accepted: 03.17.2014

Online Published: 08.06.2014

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2014.1797

Introduction

As an important part of our daily lives, stress is a term that is often mentioned by many people from every social and age group. According to Derogatis (1987) stress is a psychological pressure composed of three different sources such as personal characteristics, environmental factors and emotional reactions. According to another definition it is a state that triggers emotional, cognitive and psychological reactions which are created by unusual stimulants (Phares, 1988: 442). In its broadest sense, it is a state that disrupts one's conformity and compels their capacity regarding individual-environment interactions. It is also thought that stress results from the situation and disturbs, causes anger and irritates others (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001: 397).

Stress is perceived as a threatening, dangerous event and situation and therefore, it causes tension as well (Scheier & Carver, 1987; Sarafino, 1994). Although it is perceived as a negative concept at first, it should be known that it has positive effects as well. In this regard, while low level and short-term stress affect normal and business life positively, long-term and intensive stress may ruin one's balance and cause many stress-related disturbances (Batlaş & Baltaş, 1999: 78). As far as business life is concerned, while certain amount of stress can motivate people and increase their performance; higher

¹ Yıldız Technical University, Turkey, balyer@yildiz.edu.tr

² Artvin Coruh University, Turkey, gunduz0735@hotmail.com

level stress level may have a negative influence. It is remarked that people who suffer from high level of stress have low-motivation in their work.

Rearcres reveal that those who work under stress are neither lazy nor clumsy. On the contrary, they are skilled, hardworking, dynamic, emphatic, idealistic and human-oriented individuals (Barrick, 1989: 35). Even though they suffer from stress and feel themselves under physical and psychological restrains, they can dream and they do not have a feeling of deadlock and hopelessness. These feelings are symptoms of burnout which is a higher phase of stress and in this phase, people have the feeling of emotional exhaustion and insufficiency (Schwab, Jackson & Schuler, 1986; Maslach et al, 2001).

According to employees, stress has inner and outer reasons some of which are colleagues, poor and autocratic management style, personal characteristics, workload, environment, ambiguity of duties and conflicting duties. In addition, there are some other important reasons like restructuring of an organization, changing job responsibilities, quality problems at workplace, lack of enthusiasm towards work, being unable to balance relationships between work and personal life. Apart from this, ignoring employees' personal qualities and qualifications regarding promotion and career opportunities, inconsistency of priorities and one's lack of control on his own work can lead to stress in an organization.

Moreover, giving new responsibilities to employees in addition to their current workload, increasing financial worries, political and administrative pressures. Having no opportunity to participate in decisions, reward and punishment styles and not being autonomous may also lead to stress (Cedoline, 1982; Schwab et al, 1986; Wisniewski & Gargiulo, 1997; Micklevitz, 2001; Lambie, 2006; Boehlko, 2009; Jones, 2009). Additionally, it can be remarked that excessive time pressure, both excessive and lower workload could lead to question their personal self-esteem as well. What is more, it decreases productivity and effectiveness of education institutions significantly, which departs them from their goals. In this regard, it is pointed that inner and outer stressors can influence supervisors as well. Here, inner stressors are considered as exertion of authority, monotony, lack of promotion, excessive responsibilities, ambiguous demands, conflicts of values, unreality of workload while outer stressors are family, friends, health, financial situation which do not stem from the person himself.

Bhagat, McQuaid, Lindholm and Segovis (1985), Arnold and Feldman (1986) emphasize that stress can affect employees' performance negatively. Hobfall (1989) claims that when inner and outer stress sources are concerned, it should be considered and handled together to keep the stress at a desired level. As it affects employees' work performance negatively, it is essential for an organization and individuals to know how to handle it. They can prevent stress by weakening its reasons and strengthening ties among employees (Akinboye, Akinboye & Adeyemo, 2002). They suggest that individuals should trust themselves in coping with stress. Furthermore, Micklevitz (2001) states that being aware of the symptoms can help administrators' prevent it. When stress becomes inevitable, organizing various social gatherings and being in a supportive environment can help reduce people's stress level. Otherwise, failure in health and business life is inevitable (Lambie, 2006: 35; Schwab et al, 1986: 27). Additionally, in order to reduce or eliminate stress, working places should have a cooperative atmosphere, ambiguity should be diminished, employees' participation in decisions should be increased, professional development opportunities should be offered, and unreal expectations should be eliminated. Besides, it should be vital to provide employees' interaction with each other, make a change in their units and departments or a career moves (Lambie, 2006).

When education supervisors are concerned, Lambie (2006) remarked that they have a high level stress and burnout compared to employees in other service areas. In their studies, Pines and Aronson (1983), Pines (1993) revealed that education supervisors who are under stress perform poorly. They also discovered significant relationship between stress and supervisors' professional achievements. In some other researches, it is stated that education supervisors who are dealing with many problems are under stress professionally and therefore, their work should be handled with care (Barrick, 1989; Wisniewski & Gargiulo, 1997; Pennington & Ho, 2009). In similar researches conducted both in America and N. Zealand it was discovered that supervisors' recognition, their job satisfaction, psychological tensions

and workload are among the most important sources of stress. In another study it was revealed that the stress they experience while conducting their duties influences their work directly or indirectly. It was also stated that, ambiguity in duties and having too much workload affect their work directly (O'Driscoll & Beehr, 1994: 143).

Regarding supervisors' stress sources, it can be understood that these sources are not different from general ones. However, some special job-related situations cause them to experience stress different from other professional groups. More importantly, stress causes low motivation among education supervisors and therefore, it affects education quality as well. In this case, supervisors do not make an effort for both developing themselves and improving the system itself except for meeting bureaucratic requirements, and they can even have negative attitudes toward their work (Zalaquett & Wood, 1997: 193). Such a situation renders them to be unable to do their work properly. Experiencing stress has also an important impact on teachers' teaching facilities, supervisors' supervisory duties, administrators' administrative duties and students' learning activities (Wisniewski & Gargiulo, 1997: 325).

All these aforementioned aspects show that stress that education supervisors experience due to their duties affect their performance negatively and prevent them from performing properly. In this regard, this study purposed to determine education supervisors' stress level they experience due to their duties and raise some awareness about supervision system in Turkey. For this reason, the answers of the following questions were researched:

1. How much stress do education supervisors experience due to their duties?
2. Does the level of stress they experience differ regarding variables such as gender, age, professional experience, education, number of rewards taken and number of in-service trainings attended?

Methodology

Research Design

This research employed a survey method. This method is usually used to reach a decision out of a large population. By using this method, it is possible to get a group or a sample which is considered to represent the general population (Karasar 2004: 79).

Working Group

The population consisted of 334 education supervisors working at the Directorate of National Education Ministry (MEB) in Istanbul province. In this study, as all 334 education supervisors in that population was reached, further sampling was not required. 215 education supervisors out of 334 accepted to participate in the research voluntarily. Since 7 forms were incomplete, they were excluded from the total number. Finally, the working group comprised of 208 participants.

Data Collection

The data were collected through "Education Supervisors' Stress Level Determination Scale (ESSLDS)", developed by the researchers themselves. It had two parts. The first part aimed to gather knowledge about the education supervisors' demographic features and the second part was composed of 32 items to determine the stress level education supervisors experience due to their duties. It was also intended to find out if there is significant difference between stress level and their gender, age, professional experience, education, number of rewards taken and number of in-service trainings attended. Responses were indicated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Not at all (1) to Very much (5).

While the lowest score that taken from this scale was calculated as 32, the highest score was 160 in general. When sub-dimensions are concerned, the lowest score that can be taken from the first sub-dimension is 7 whereas the highest is 35. The lowest score taken from the second sub-dimension is 10 while the highest is 50. For the third sub-dimension, the lowest score taken is 9, the highest is 45 and the lowest score taken from the fourth sub-dimension is 6, the highest is 30.

Validity and Reliability

Validity and reliability was proved by following some steps. In the first phase, principle component analysis was administered for the validity of it, and in the analysis process, Varimax Rotated Method was implemented. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value obtained from the 208 education supervisors was found as .85. Later on, Barlett's test was done to determine whether it consists of multi-parameters in population and it was discovered that for these data, Bartlett's test results were highly significant at .001 level.

After this analysis, the scale was composed of 4 different sub-dimensions with values over 1 which represents 56.11 % of total variances of it. In social sciences, the variance rates may vary in the range of 40 % and 60 % that are accepted as sufficient (Scherer et al., 1988; Vieira, 2011:29). The eigenvalue of the first sub-dimension was 4,07 (Variety of Duties), and explained 12,74 % of the total variance. It was 3,98 for the second sub-dimension (Inefficiency of Supervision), and explained 12,45 % of the total variance. It was 3,72 for the third sub-dimension (Difficulties of Working Conditions), and explained 11,64 % of the total variance. The eigenvalue of the fourth sub-dimension was 3,33 (Communication Problems), and explained 10,40 % of the total variance. As a result, the total variance value which the sub-dimensions explained together was 47,23, and this proved its validity statistically. In order for an item to remain in a test, factor load must be at least .30 for a sub-dimension. The magnitude of the factor loading must be at least .30 (Barnes et al, 2001:81). As such, total variance rate of the first factor was between 0,48-0,75; it was 0,38-0,71 for the second factor; it was 0,42-0,71, and finally it was 0,51-0,67 for the fourth factor. In this study, the factor loads of all the items were between 0,38-0,75, which proved the validity of all the items. According to this result, the first sub-dimension was composed of 7 items (8,10,27,28,29,30,31); second sub-dimension consisted of 10 items (12,13,14,15,16,18,19,20,21,32); third composed of 9 items (1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,11) and the fourth was composed of 6 items (17,22,23,24,25,26). Here, Cronbach Alpha reliability was found as .90 in the test total which showed a high reliability. It was discovered as .85 for the first sub-dimension; .80 for the second; .80 for the third, and it was .76 for the fourth sub-dimension. The internal total coefficient consistency of all the four sub-dimensions was .76 and it proved statistically significant results at .001 level. It showed that all the sub-dimensions proved high level of reliability as well as the 32 items.

Data Analysis

In the data analysis process, first, frequency and percentage were calculated, later on, arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated. Thirdly, hypothesis tests were done to determine the difference between the scores of the sub-dimensions and test total score concerning variables. As a result of this test, independent variables are composed of two categories. As deviation was normal, t-test was used as a hypothesis test. When category "n" was below 30 (gender), and as it was far from normal range, non-parametric Mann Whitney U test was administered. In the cases of when independent variables were separated into two categories, one-way ANOVA test was done for determining test-total and item total scores. Since a significant difference was discovered in F test, variance analysis complementary calculations (post-hoc) were done. When no significant difference was found in Levenes test results, Scheffe Test was administered. As there is significant difference, Tamhane's test was done. All the results in this study were tested in two ways and significance level was accepted as .05, and the significant results at .01 and .001 levels were presented in tables. All statistical analysis was done with SPSS 15.0 for Windows.

Findings

The findings and results obtained through this research were presented and discussed in this part. In Table 1, the education supervisors' demographics were presented as frequency and percentage.

Table 1. Education Supervisors' Demographic Features

Variable	Category	f	%	Variable	Category	f	%
Gender	Female	20	9,6	Education	Undergraduate	2	1,0
	Male	188	90,4		Graduate	159	76,4
Age	30-40 yrs. old	63	30,3		Masters	47	22,6
	41-45 yrs. old	40	19,2	Number of Rewards Taken	1-3 defa	105	50,5
	46-50 yrs. old	31	14,9		4 ve daha fazla	75	36,1
	51 yrs. old and over	74	35,6		Hiç almadım	28	13,5
Professional Experience	6-15 years	46	22,1	Number of In-service Trainings Attended	1-4 defa	46	22,1
	16-20 years	31	14,9		5 ve daha fazla	160	76,9
Professional Experience	21-25 years	50	24,0	Trainings Attended	Yanıtsız	2	1,0
	26 years and more	81	38,9				
Total: f=208 %=100,0							

As shown in Table 1, 90,4 % of the education supervisors was male while 9,6% was female. Concerning their age, 36 % of them was 51 years old and over; when professional experience is concerned, 39 % of them had 26 years and more experience. Regarding their education variable, 76,4 % of them was university graduates. When the number of rewards taken is concerned, 50,5% of them took rewards between 1-3 times. Finally, as far as the number of in-service trainings attended variable was concerned, 76,9 % of them attended in-service trainings more than 5 times. As can easily be noticed, in this research, the number of female supervisors was quite fewer than their male colleagues. In Table 2, arithmetic means and standard deviation results were presented regarding to the sub-dimensions.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Education Supervisors Regarding Stress Experience Due to Their Duties

Sub-Dimensions	N	\bar{x}	ss
Variety of Duties	208	21,59	11,36
Inefficiency of Supervision	208	32,21	10,13
Difficulties of Working Conditions	208	32,88	10,17
Communication Problems	208	15,85	7,26
Total	208	102,53	17,03

As can be seen in Table 2, while absolute mean value of the first sub-dimension is 21, the mean value of the group is 21,59. This finding shows that education supervisors experience moderate level stress due to variety of duties. While absolute mean value of the second sub-dimension is 30, the mean value of the group is 32,21. This finding reveals that education supervisors experience stress nearly at moderate level regarding inefficiency of supervision. Concerning difficulties of working conditions, while absolute mean value of the third sub-dimension is 27, the mean value of the group is 32,88. It indicates that they experience stress more than average level. When communication problems is concerned, absolute mean value of the fourth sub-dimension is 18 whereas the mean value of the group is 15,85. This shows that education supervisors experience stress lower than moderate level. Total score that the group took from the scale is 105, and the absolute mean value is 102,53. According to this, absolute mean value is lower than total mean. This means that education supervisors experience stress a bit less than moderate level due to their duties. In Table 3, Mann Whitney U test results are presented.

Table 3. Mann Whitney U Test Results Regarding Gender Variable

Sub-dimensions	Gender	N	Means of Rankings	Total of Rankings	U	z	p
Variety of Duties	Female	20	116,93	2338,50	1631,50	-,97	,331
	Male	188	103,18	19397,50			
	Total	208					
Inefficiency Of Supervision	Female	20	141,68	2833,50	1136,50	-2,91	,004**
	Male	188	100,55	18902,50			
	Total	208					
Difficulties of Working Conditions	Female	20	117,65	2353,00	1617,00	-1,02	,303
	Male	188	103,10	19383,00			
	Total	208					
Communication Problems	Female	20	123,40	2468,00	1502,00	-1,48	,139
	Male	188	102,49	19268,00			
	Total	208					
Total	Female	20	131,07	2621,50	-2,078		,038*
	Male	188	101,67	19114,50			
	Total	208					

*p< 0.05 ; ** p<0.01

As seen in Table 3, there are statistically significant differences at least .05 level regarding gender variable and stress scores of inefficiency of supervision sub-dimension. Here, the stress level that female supervisors have is significantly higher than their male colleagues. This may mean that female supervisors feel themselves disturbed compared to their male colleagues. It is commented that the difference might stem from the duties that are expected from women in the society. As a result of this expectation, female supervisors could be taking their work more seriously and expecting others to do so. However, when their expectations are not met, they may have a feeling of disturbance. In Table 4, one-way ANOVA results have been presented.

Table 4. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding Age Variable

Sub-dimensions	Variance Source	KT (Sum of Squares)	df	KO (Mean of Squares)	F	P
Variety of Duties	Between Groups	31,79	3	10,60	,34	,793
	Inter-groups	6284,64	204	30,80		
	Total	6316,44	207			
Inefficiency Of Supervision	Between Groups	18,50	3	6,16	,16	,923
	Inter-groups	7862,18	204	38,54		
	Total	7880,69	207			
Difficulties of Working Conditions	Between Groups	267,50	3	89,16	2,69	,047*
	Inter-groups	6740,49	204	33,04		
	Total	7007,99	207			
Communication Problems	Between Groups	13,66	3	4,55	,24	,865
	Inter-groups	3790,71	204	18,58		
	Total	3804,38	207			
Toplam	Between Groups	644,73	3	214,91	,73	,531
	Inter-groups	59417,09	204	291,26		
	Total	60061,82	207			

* p<,05

As shown in Table 4, regarding age variable significant difference was found only in the third sub-dimension at .05 level. In order to determine the source of difference, it was moved on complementary calculations (post-hoc). As there was no significant difference in Levenes test results in this sub-dimension, Scheffe Test was administered to find out from which age group the lowest significant difference stems from. According to this, when difficulties of working conditions sub-dimension is concerned, the stress level of education supervisors who are between 41-45 years old ($\bar{x}=34,50$) is quite higher than those who are between 36-40 years old ($\bar{x}=31,33$), which is statistically significant ($p<,01$). This may stem from age difference. Relatively older education supervisors may find new situations tiring by comparing them to previous working conditions, which have been changing steadily. No significant differences were found in the other categories except for this category. Apart from the third sub-dimension, education supervisors' stress level does not differentiate from each other both in the other sub-dimensions and test total regarding age factor. This may be because of the stress rate they feel because of variety of their duties, inefficiency of supervision and communication problems. They may not be feeling the stress at the same level and scale. In Table 5, one-way ANOVA results regarding rewards variable have been presented.

Table 5. One-way ANOVA Results Regarding Rewards Taken Variable

Sub-dimensions	Variance Source	KT (Sum of Squares)	df	KO (Mean of Squares)	F	P
Variety of Duties	Between Groups	78,19	2	39,09	1,28	,279
	Inter-groups	6238,24	205	30,43		
	Total	6316,44	207			
Inefficiency Of Supervision	Between Groups	7,49	2	3,74	,09	,907
	Inter-groups	7873,19	205	38,40		
	Total	7880,69	207			
Difficulties of Working Conditions	Between Groups	2,53	2	1,26	,037	,964
	Inter-groups	7005,46	205	34,17		
	Total	7007,99	207			
İletişim Sorunları	Between Groups	423,29	2	211,64	10,22	,000***
	Inter-groups	4243,76	205	20,70		
	Total	4667,05	207			
Communication Problems	Between Groups	414,54	2	207,27	,71	,492
	Inter-groups	59736,22	205	291,39		
	Total	60150,76	207			

*** p<,001

As seen in Table 5, regarding the number of rewards supervisors taken variable, statistically significant difference was discovered only in the fourth sub-dimension at .001 level. In order to determine the source of difference between these dual-categories, it was moved on complementary calculations (post-hoc). When statistically significant difference was discovered in Levenes test results at .01 level (Levene: 6,66), Tamhane's test was administered as a complimentary calculation. The stress level of education supervisors who have never taken any rewards throughout their professional careers ($\bar{x}=19,46$) is significantly higher than those who have taken rewards more than 4 times ($\bar{x}=14,93$) ($p<,01$). According to this result, it can be claimed that education supervisors who have not taken rewards before may be considering and perceiving that the reason of it is the communication problems they experience. Here, it can be said that communication is not provided sufficiently as it affects understanding negatively by nature and here, this appeals to the current situation. No significant difference was found in other categories except for the fourth sub-dimension. In Table 6, t-test results have been presented regarding in-service training variable.

Table 6. T-test Results Regarding In-service Training Variable

Sub-dimensions	Number of In-service Training	N	\bar{x}	ss	St. deviation	t	sd	p
Variety of Duties	1-4 defa	46	22,91	5,77	,85	1,89	204	,060
	5 ve daha fazla	160	21,16	5,42	,42			
Inefficiency of Supervision	1-4 defa	46	34,19	6,37	,94	2,51	204	,013*
	5 ve daha fazla	160	31,62	6,02	,47			
Difficulties of Working Conditions	1-4 defa	46	33,28	6,89	1,01	,50	204	,618
	5 ve daha fazla	160	32,79	5,51	,43			
Communication Problems	1-4 defa	46	17,80	5,62	,82	2,42	204	,016*
	5 ve daha fazla	160	15,90	4,39	,34			
Toplam	1-4 defa	46	107,08	17,57	2,59	2,05	204	,041*
	5 ve daha fazla	160	101,26	16,79	1,32			

* p<,05

As can be understood from Table 6, when the number of in-service trainings supervisors participated in is concerned, statistically significant difference was found in terms of inefficiency of supervision and communication problems sub-dimensions at .05 level both in scale total and item total scores. As such, total stress level of the supervisors who participated in those trainings between 1-4 times is higher compared to their colleagues who participated 5 times or more. It is thought that the supervisors who participated in in-service training between 1-4 times are relatively younger and more dynamic ones and they may have higher expectations for their future careers, which can be a source of stress for them. There was no statistically significant difference in education supervisors' stress level regarding their professional experience and education variables both in scale total scores and sub-dimensions. It can be commented that those whose professional experience and education levels were equal experience stress at the same degree.

Discussion

This research was conducted to determine education supervisors' stress level due to their duties they conduct and some results were obtained. The results reveal that education supervisors experience stress at moderate level, a bit higher than moderate level and a bit lower than moderate level regarding variety of duties, inefficiency of supervision, difficulties of working conditions and communication problems sub-dimensions.

As far as their variety of duties sub-dimension is concerned, it was found that they experience stress at moderate level (\bar{x} =21,59). In addition to their current duties, assigning new responsibilities to education supervisors, abundance of duties and ambiguity of their duties are considered as sources of stress (Lambie, 2006: 34). According to a study conducted by Gündüz (2008) 85% of education supervisors claim that they carry out a lot of duties in different fields of education and their duties need innovating. By expanding their variety of duties, their workload increases, and with this increasing workload they cannot help others properly, which is another source of stress (Açıkgöz, 2001). Research findings indicate that long lasting stress can lead to physical, psychological and emotional discomfort (Billingsley & Cross, 1993).

Another result reveals that education supervisors experience a bit higher stress than moderate level regarding inefficiency of supervision (\bar{x} =32,21). Researches revealed that not being recognized by authorities was considered one of the biggest stress sources (O'Driscoll & Beehr, 1994: 143). When education supervisors feel themselves inefficient in their duties, this can weaken their attitudes towards their work and reduce their efficiency. It was remarked that education supervisors cannot participate in decisions properly and they are not informed about the decisions regularly. Besides, their suggestions are not taken seriously and implemented, either (Onat, Civelek, Cengiz, Budak, Erçakmak, Demir,

Seçkin & Öz, 2003: 201). It should be remembered that supervisors are the officials who provide alternatives based on their proficiency in their fields (Özdemir, 2001: 63).

A further result remarks that education supervisors experience quite higher stress than moderate level regarding difficulties of working conditions ($\bar{x}=32,88$). In supervision organizations, service buildings and equipment were scarce, which affects speed of supervision, its continuity and productivity negatively (Tekişik, 2003: 65). In a study conducted by Gündüz (2008) approximately 80% of supervisors stated that their heavy workload should be reduced. Inadequacy of intutional conditions can cause stress while performing their duties (Lambie, 2006: 34). Education supervisors can sometimes face duties that surpass their individual capabilities. In these situations, being in a supportive environment can reduce their stress. Moreover, in order to provide social respect and increase their authority in the society, their incomes should be increased as well (Sabuncuoğlu & Tüz, 1998: 111-113). Researches reveal that due to the fact that education supervisors carry some of their work home and do not spend time on their families (Yıldırım, 2011), it affects their family lives negatively (Altındağ, 2007).

Another result indicates that education supervisors experience a bit lower stress than moderate level in respect of communication problems they have ($\bar{x}=15,85$). In some researches conducted by Başaran (1986), Harman (1998), Yıldırım (2001), Kavas (2005) and Doğanay (2006) it was found out that administrators, teachers and education supervisors experience communication problems among them. In this research, it was found that in general education supervisors experience "moderate level" stress due to their duties they carry out. This result is supported by some researches conducted by Barrick (1989), Wisniewski and Gargiulo (1997), Pennington and Ho (2009). Similarly, they discovered that education supervisors are under stress because of communication problems and it is suggested that their problems should be handled with care.

Yet, it is essential to keep stress at a tolerable level in order to help education supervisors perform efficiently and productively at work, because high level stress influences the employees' work negatively. In other words, employees who are exposed high level stress can lose their motivation (Barrick, 1989: 35). Moreover, Bhagat, McQuaid, Lindholm and Segovis (1985) emphasize that stress can disrupt employees' performance negatively, which influences work quality directly. It is known that education supervisors who work under stress perform with low motivation and demotivated supervisors do not attempt to do other things in supervision process except for bureaucratic requirements. In such an atmosphere supervisors cannot concentrate on their work and can even have a negative attitude towards their work (Zalaquett & Wood, 1997: 193). Furthermore, in some researches negative relationship was found between supervisors' success and their stress level. These studies reveal that supervisors who are under stress perform poorly at work (Pines & Aronson, 1983; Pines, 1993).

No studies were found both in national and international literature examining stress that education supervisors they experience in regards to their gender, age, number of rewards taken, education, professional experience and number of in-service training participated variables. For this reason, the results that were obtained through this study were not discussed with other studies.

Regarding gender variable, there are statistically significant differences between inefficiency of supervision sub-dimension and scale total scores. Here, the stress level of female supervisors was found significantly higher than their male colleagues. As far as age variable is concerned, statistically significant difference was found only in difficulties of working conditions sub-dimension. As such, the stress level is significantly higher in education supervisors who are between 41-45 years old compared to those who are between 36-40 years old. It can be commented that older supervisors are angry about frequent changes in their working condition. Except for this sub-dimension, the stress level of education supervisors did not differ from each other.

Regarding number of rewards taken variable, statistically significant difference was found in communication problems sub-dimension. The stress level of education supervisors who have never taken any rewards throughout their professional careers before is higher than those who have taken

them more than 4 times. This result indicates that those who have taken rewards may have a satisfaction of recognition by being rewarded while the others worry about their own recognition, which can be a source of stress for them.

Concerning number of in-service variable, statistically significant difference was found in inefficiency of supervision and communication problems sub-dimensions and total test scores. As such, the stress level of education supervisors who have participated in in-service trainings between 1-4 times is significantly higher than their colleagues who participated in them 5 times and more. This result shows that those who have participated in these trainings may have learned a lot of things, developed some skills and therefore, become unable to overcome some feelings that create pressure on them. As far as education and professional experience variables are concerned, no significant difference was found in supervisors' stress levels both in test total and sub-dimensions.

Conclusion

This study was conducted to determine education supervisors' stress levels they experience due to their duties while performing their work and some results were obtained. According to the results, education supervisors experience moderate level stress due to duties regarding varieties of their duties, inefficiency of the supervision, difficulties of working conditions and communication problems sub-dimensions.

When gender variable is concerned, the stress level of female supervisors is higher than male colleagues regarding inefficiency of supervision sub-dimension. Regarding age variable, the stress level of education supervisors who are between 41-45 years old is higher than those who are between 36-40 years old in difficulties of working conditions sub-dimension. As far as the number of rewards taken variable is concerned, the stress level of education supervisors who have never taken any rewards throughout their professional careers is higher than those who have taken more than 4 times in terms of communication problems.

Concerning in-service variable, the stress level of education supervisors who have participated in in-service training programs between 1-4 times is higher than those who have participated 5 times and more regarding inefficiency of supervision and communication problems sub-dimensions. No significant difference was found in education supervisors' stress levels regarding education and professional experience variables.

Taking everything into consideration, it can be concluded from this research that education supervisors experience moderate level of stress and this stress may lead their failure both in professional and personal lives. It is evaluated that this stress stems from their working conditions and duties they carry on. Therefore, their working conditions and duties, more importantly, the supervisory system need revising. The recommendations reached through the results obtained in this study and implications for further research and practitioners are below:

1. Education supervisors experience stress due to inefficiency of supervision. Some precautions should be taken to make it more efficient.
2. Education supervisors have a variety of duties on daily basis. They should be narrowed and directed in more specific areas.
3. Education supervisors are not satisfied with their working conditions. Their working conditions should be improved and their workload should be reduced.
4. They experience stress due to communication problems. In order to solve these problems, some communicative ways should be put in to practice by senior management.
5. They state that they cannot participate in decisions efficiently, which leads to questioning the meaning of the work. It could be improved by letting them participate in decisions more.
6. With another study, the views of all education supervisors both work in the ministry and in other provinces can be researched.
7. With another comparative study, working conditions of education supervisors who are from different countries could be compared.

References

- Açıkgoz, S. (2001) Türk ulusal eğitiminde Teftiş Sisteminin Yapısı, İşleyişi, Sorunları ve Öneriler. *2000 Yılında Türk Milli Eğitim Örgütü ve Yönetimi Ulusal Sempozyumu, 11-13 Ocak 2001* (s.107-118) Ankara: Ankara: Öğretmen Hüseyin Hüsnü Tekişik Eğitim Araştırma Geliştirme Vakfı Yayınları, 4.
- Akinboye, J.O., Akinboye, D. & Adeyemo D. A. (2002). *Coping with Stress in Life and Workplace*. Nigeria: Stirling Horden Publishers.
- Altındağ, M. (2007). *İlköğretim Müfettişlerinin Rehberlik, Değerlendirme ve Soruşturma Rollerini Hakkında Ankara İli Öğretmen Ve Müfettişlerinin Görüşleri*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Arnold, H.J. & Feldman, D.C. (1986). *Organizational Behavior*. McGraw-Hill.
- Baltaş, A.ve Baltaş Z. (1999). *Stres ve Başa Çıkma Yolları*. (19.baskı) İstanbul: Remzi Yayınevi
- Barnes, J., Cote, J., Cudeck, R., Malthouse, E., (2001) Factor analysis—checking assumptions of normality before conducting factor analysis. *J. Consum. Psychol.* 10(1, 2), 79–81.
- Barrick, K.R. (1989). Burnout and Job Satisfaction of Vocational Supervisors. *Ohio University, Winter*, 35-41.
- Başaran, A. (1986). *İlköğretim Kurumlarında Grupla Teftiş Uygulamaları*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Başaran, A. ve Bozkurt, E. (Ed.) (2003) *Türk Millî Eğitim Teftiş Sisteminde Yapılanma Sorunu* (s.62-66). Ankara: Tem-Sen Yayınları.
- Başaran, A. ve Özdemir, T. (2001). *Çağdaş ve Demokratik Eğitimde Teftiş*, Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Bhagat, R.S., McQuaid, S. J., Lindholm, H. & Segovis, J. (1985). Total life stress: A Multimethod Validation of the Construct and Its Effects on Organizationally Valued Outcomes and Withdrawal Behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 70(1), 202-214.
- Billingsley, B.S. & Cross, L. H. (1992). Predictors of Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Intend to Stay In Teaching: A comparison of General and Special Educators, *The Journal of Special Education*, 25(4), 453-471.
- Boehlko, J. (2009). What Are Causes Of Stres? *Journal of Physiology*, 45(2), 1-12.
- Bozkurt, E. (Ed.) (2003), *Türk Millî Eğitim Teftiş Sisteminde Yapılanma Sorunu* (s.192-219), Ankara: Tem-Sen Yayınları
- Cedoline, A.J. (1982). Job Burnout in Public Education: Symptoms, Causes and Survival Skills. *Teachers Collage, Columbia University*, 1(3), 1-34.
- Derogatis, L. R. (1987). The Derogatis Stress Profile (DSP): Quantification of Psychological Stress. *Adv. Psychosom. Med.*, 17, 30-54.
- Doğanay, E. (2006). *Taşra Birimlerindeki İlk ve Orta Öğretim Kurumlarında Yürütülen Teftiş Hizmetlerinin Karşılaştırılması (Van İli Örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Van.
- Gündüz, Y. (2008). *Avrupa Birliğine Uyum Sürecinde Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Teftiş Sisteminin Yenilenme İhtiyacı*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Harman, M. (1998). *Sınıf Öğretmenlerine Uygulanacak Teftiş Form Önerisi*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Balıkesir.
- Hobfall, S. (1989). Conservation of Resources: A New Attempt at Conceptualizing Stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513-524.
- Jones, L. (2009). Causes of Stress at Work and Implications for Interventions. *School of Psychology*, 32(5), 1-23.
- Karasar, N. (2004). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

- Kavas, E. (2005). *İlköğretim Müfettişlerinin Denetim Davranışlarına İlişkin Öğretmen Algı ve Beklentileri*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli.
- Lambie, W.G. (2006). Burnout Prevention: A Humanistic Perspective and Structured Group Supervision Activity. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, 45, 32-44.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B. & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job Burnout, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- Micklevitz, S.A. (2001). Professional Burnout, Illioanlis Parksı and Recreation, *Special Focus*, 27, 27-44.
- O'Driscoll, M.P., & Beehr, A. T. (1994). Supervisor Behaviors, Role Stressors and Uncertainty as Predictors of Personal Outcomes for Subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(2), 141-155.
- Onat, M., Civelek, H., Cengiz, C., Budak, M., Erçakmak, Y., Demir, S., Seçkin, N. ve Öz, M. (2003). *T.C.MEB.Teftiş Sistemi Çalışma Grubu (1979)*, Ankara: Tem-Sen Yayınları
- Pennington, C. M., & Ho, B. (2009). Acomparison of Work related Attitudes of TESOL Members with Other Educators and Employee Groups: An International Survey Using the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, 32(2), 29-38.
- Phares, J. E. (1988). *Anxiety and Stress Introduction to Personality*. (2nd Edition). USA: Scottt and Foresman Company.
- Pines, A.M. (1993). Burnout. In Existential Perspective. In W.B Schaufeli, C. Maslach & T. Marek (Ed.), *Professional Burnout: Recent Developments in Theory and Research*. Taylor & Francis, 33-51.
- Pines, A.M. & Aronson, E. (1983). *Combatting Burnout: Causes and Cures* (2nd edition), New York: Free Press.
- Sabuncuoğlu, Z. ve Tüz, M. (1998). *Örgütsel Psikoloji*. Bursa: Alfa Yayınları.
- Sarafino, E.P. (1994). *Health Psychology: Biopsychosocial Interactions. Second Edition*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Scheier, M. F. & Charles S. C. (1987). Dispositional Optimism and Physical Well-being: The Influence of Generalized Outcome Expectancies on Health. *Journal of Personality*, 51(2), 169-210.
- Scherer, R. F., Wiebe F. A., Luther, D. C., & Adams J. S. (1988). Dimensionality of coping: Factor stability using the ways of coping questionnaire. *Psychological Reports*, 62, 763-770.
- Schwab, L. R., Jackson, E. S. & Schuler, S. R. (1986). Educator Burnout: Sorces and Consequences. *Educational Quarterly*, 10(3), 14-30.
- Tekışık, H. H. (2003). *Millî Eğitimde Teftiş ve Müfettiş Sorunu*. Ankara: Tem-Sen Yayınları.
- Vieira, A. L. (2011). *Interactive LISREL in Practice, Getting Started with a SIMPLIS Approach*, Springer Heidelberg Dordrecht, London New York.
- Wisniewski, L., & Gargiulo, R.M. (1997). Occupational Stres and Burnout among Special Educators:A Review of the Literature. *The Journal of Special Education*, 31(3), 325- 346.
- Yıldırım, B. (2001). İlköğretim Etkinliği İçin Yeni Bir İletişim Modeli Önerisi. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 11(1), 213-224.
- Yıldırım, N. (2011). Müfettişlik Mesleğinin Eğitim Müfettişleri Üzerindeki Etkileri. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 2(3), 35-51.
- Zalaquett, P.C., & Wood, R. J. (1998). (Eds.), *Evaluating stress: A book of resources*, Lanhan, MD: The Scarecrow Press.