
THE SUPERVISORS' PRACTICE OF COLLABORATIVE APPROACH IN SCHOOLS

Rajeh Alshehri ⁽¹⁾

Assistant Professor at College of Education, Curriculum & Instruction Department, Umm Alqura University

ABSTRACT: *This research paper is a part of larger project that examine the current practices of developmental supervision in Saudi Arabia. The focus of this study is to examine the practice of collaborative approach to supervision as one of the favorite approach in supervision. In this explanatory sequential mixed-methods, the data were collected through survey and subsequent semi-structured interviews. The sample were teachers from elementary schools in Makkah. The findings indicated that supervisors sometimes practiced the collaborative approaches to development supervision. Gender and years of teaching experience had no impact on participants' responses regarding the practice of collaborative approach. Level of education did appear to affect responses about the collaborative approach. In qualitative phase, the themes were organized to three themes and sub themes. The qualitative findings supported the quantitative results, which indicated that the supervisors are to some extent practicing the collaborative approach.*

KEYWORDS: collaborative approach, developmental supervision, supervision,

INTRODUCTION

The supervisor bears the responsibility for improving the skills and performance of teachers. This can be accomplished through a variety of supervisory approaches as well as by improving preexisting supervision practices in a given school. Using different approaches to supervision, such as clinical supervision, developmental supervision, or collaborative development, will help teachers perform their tasks more efficiently and enhance their professional development (Kutsyuruba, 2003). One of the newer models in the field is developmental supervision. This approach calls for matching “the initial supervisory approach with the teacher’s or group’s developmental levels, expertise, and commitment” (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1998). This model of supervision founded by Glickman was “based on Goldhammer’s clinical supervision model, but Glickman’s model focuses on teachers’ cognitive development as facilitated by the supervisor. Glickman’s model features three options for supervision: directive, collaborative, and nondirective” (Minnear-Peplinski, 2009, p. 42).

According to Glickman and Gordon, in developmental supervision, the supervisor determines the teachers’ cognitive development through formal instruments or by observing and asking questions (as cited in Ozyildirim & Aksu, 2016). Afterward, the supervisor uses the most suitable supervisory approach. The supervisor should support teachers to advance higher supervisory levels and move from directive to collaborative to nondirective supervisory behaviors. Since contemporary supervisory approaches have been introduced to schools in

Saudi Arabia, it is crucial to see how they have been implemented. The developmental supervision has four approaches: directive control supervision, directive informational supervision, collaborative supervision, and nondirective supervision. The purpose of this paper is to examine the supervisors' practice of collaborative approach as perceived by teachers in Saudi Arabia. The resulting data can then be used to increase effective supervisory practice in Saudi schools.

Research Questions

The following research questions explored the supervisors' practices of developmental supervision as perceived by teachers and controlling for level of education, experience, and gender:

1. To what extent are supervisors practicing the collaborative approach to developmental supervision?
2. To what extent do gender, years of teaching experience, and levels of education impact participant responses regarding supervisors' practice of collaborative approach to supervision?

These research questions explored whether there are different views among participants regarding the practice of the styles of supervision. The questions addressed whether such differences are related to the length of experience, level of education, or gender of the respondents.

Significance of the Study

Education in Saudi Arabia currently emphasizes quality over quantity, and as a result, the perceptions and opinions of teachers and supervisors about the practices of supervision is essential (Abdulkareem, 2001). However, very few studies have examined developmental supervision practices in Saudi Arabia (Alqasim, 2010). Albabtain (2014) explored the extent educational supervisors practiced developmental supervision methods by examining supervisors' and teachers' perspectives. However, that study was limited to male participants at high schools in Riyadh. Another study of the practice of modern supervision approaches was conducted by Buraik (2011). A key limitation of that study was that the researcher's sample included only female supervisors' in the Jizan province. To address these gaps in the literature, the present study will provide the Saudi Ministry of Education with information that can be used to evaluate the status of supervision and conduct effective supervision plans.

Pajak (2000) suggested that seeking teachers' perceptions about the practice of developmental supervision is the first step in appropriate and influential supervision. Therefore, I elicited teachers' opinions about the practice of developmental supervision in Saudi Arabia. It is important to note that my study investigated the implementation of these approaches but not teachers' knowledge or understanding of them. I likewise did not seek to learn teachers' preferred supervisory approaches. Instead, from the data collected in the questionnaires and

interviews, I considered actual supervision practice and to what extent supervisors implemented that approach.

In addition to the lack of studies on the practice of developmental supervision in Saudi Arabia, no studies have investigated modern supervisory practices while controlling for gender. Most studies that explored female teachers' perceptions of supervisory practices have been conducted outside Saudi Arabia (e.g., Al-Dajani, 2013; Alloh, 2012; Almarmori, 2012; Hilo, 2009; Qetah & Ziyah, 2014). This study will thus explore male and female teachers' opinions, with gender treated as a key demographic variable.

Moreover, most previous studies used a quantitative design (e.g., Abdulkareem, 2001; Algamdi, 2010; Aljameel, 2003; Aljaradat, 2009; Alloh, 2012; Buraik, 2011; Shedefat and Alqaderi, 2005). The design of this study employed a mixed-methods approach to increase the validity and reliability of its findings. To the knowledge of the researcher, this study will be the first to use a mixed-methods approach to explore teachers' opinions about collaborative approach practice of developmental supervision in Saudi Arabia. A questionnaire and semi-structured interview were the primary data sources, which helped obtain more in-depth and accurate information.

Collaborative approach: an approach to supervision where the supervisor and teacher exchange ideas and agree upon a course of action. The supervisor in this approach encourages teachers to express their perceptions and ideas. Supervisors also honestly present their own views (Glickman et al., 2014).

Developmental supervision: The supervision of teachers in different ways – directive (control or informational), nondirective, collaborative--as they operate on varied levels of thought, ability, and effectiveness.

Saudi elementary school teacher: for the purposes of this study, a teacher who has a bachelor's or higher degree and teaches at an elementary school, from first grade to sixth.

Supervisor: "An educationally qualified person who is appointed by the Ministry of Education to inspect, supervise, and evaluate teachers and the instructional process on a regular basis" (Abdulkareem, 2001, p. 10).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Developmental Supervision

The developmental model of supervision assumes that teachers operate on varied levels of thought, ability, and effectiveness, which require them to be supervised in different ways. Therefore, the definition of supervision here is assistance given to teachers based on their developmental levels and individual differences (Daresh, 2007; Glickman et al., 1998). These

approaches to supervision fall under four categories: directive control, directive informational, collaborative, and nondirective. The teachers' conceptual levels and characteristics should be considered when choosing from these approaches in different supervision situations (Glickman et al., 1998). Therefore, "the core of developmental supervision is that two basic factors have an impact on whether supervisors provide more or less effective treatment: the supervisor's basic beliefs about supervisory practice and the teacher's characteristics" (Daresh, 2007, p. 330).

According to Glickman et al. (1998), most teachers operate on the middle stage of reasoning and concerns. However, teachers differ regarding their level of motivation, abstraction, development, and expertise. Thus, selecting a suitable supervisory approach is not an easy task. For example, a teacher may display a higher level of development in one area and a lower level in another. Glickman et al. (1998) suggested if the majority of a teacher's characteristics indicates a moderate capacity for decision making for instance, the supervisor should use the collaborative approach. Supervisors should be aware that the teachers' stage of development can change when their circumstances change, such as when moving to another school, and supervisors must adapt their behavior accordingly.

Glickman et al. (1998) explained how supervision is developmental: "first, the entry-level supervisory approach is matched with the teacher's current developmental levels and the immediate situation. Second, supervisory behaviors are gradually modified to promote and accommodate long-range teacher development toward higher levels of reflection and problem solving ability" (p. 142). Generally, teachers need more direction and structure when they are on the lower level of development, while teachers on higher levels need more active involvement in the decision-making process (Pajak, 2000).

Teachers have different opinions about what constitutes the most useful supervisory model. The different models of school supervision can be simplified to the four categories of developmental supervision. Glickman et al. (2014) recommended that supervisors use the approach that best matches the teacher's developmental level. A teacher with a low developmental level should thus be associated with the directive approach, while the nondirective approach should be used with teachers in the higher stages of development, and the collaborative approach should be used with teachers in the middle stage of development. The choice of supervisory approach therefore depends on teacher developmental level, problem-solving skills, and whether the supervisor seeks to control the situation or to share information (Glickman et al., 2014; Pajak, 2000). In general, Glickman et al. advised that directive control be used with teachers who are inexperienced and for emergency situations. The other supervisory approaches are used with other teachers based on their expertise and competence (Pajak, 2000).

Collaborative approach. Glickman et al. (1998) stated that "Collaborative supervision is premised on the participation by equals in making instructional decisions. Its outcome is a

mutual plan of action” (p. 175). This approach is used with the experienced teacher who functions at a moderately high developmental level and has a similar expertise and concern for the problem as the supervisor. In addition, teachers and supervisors use this approach when they are both committed to solving the problem, involved in carrying out the decision, and held accountable for the results. Furthermore, Glickman et al. stated that leaving teachers out of the decision-making process when said teachers want to be involved could lead to distrust or low morale, in which case the collaborative approach should be used. In the collaborative approach, “teachers are striving for independence and want to solve their own problems, but they usually seek out assistance from others either before or after their initial efforts to solve a problem” (Gordon, 1990, p.294). Following this approach, Glickman et al. (1998) mentioned 10 behaviors a supervisor is expected to have during a supervisory conference meeting:

- Clarifying: Identifying the problem as seen by the teacher,
- Listening: Understanding the teacher’s perception of the problem,
- Reflecting: Verifying the teacher’s perception of the problem,
- Presenting: Providing the supervisor’s perception of the problem,
- Clarifying: Seeking the teacher’s understanding of the supervisor’s perception of the problem,
- Problem solving: Exchanging possible solutions,
- Encouraging: Accepting conflict,
- Negotiating: Finding an acceptable solution,
- Standardizing: Agreeing on the details of the plan, including follow-up,
- Reflecting: Summarizing the final plan.

Previous Studies

The quality of supervisory practices influences teachers’ performance growth. Applying contemporary approaches to supervision, such as clinical supervision (Alsumairi, 2008; Hampton, 2009; Kelting, 2013; Moswela & Mphale, 2015), developmental supervision (Albaptain, 2014; Gordon, 1990; Hilo, 2009; Ozyildirim & Aksu, 2016; Phillips & Glickman, 1991; Siens & Ebmeier, 1996), or differentiated supervision (Abdulkareem, 2014; Abualkas, 2012), has a positive impact on teachers’ instructional practices and reflective thinking.

Some studies investigated the supervisory practices and perceptions of actual and preferred approaches to supervision that have been used within Saudi Arabia (e.g., Abdulkareem, 2001; Alkrdem, 2011) and outside Saudi Arabia (e.g., Aburezq, 2006; Kalule & Bouchamma, 2014; Mukaid, 2006; Shedefat & Alqaderi, 2005; Tayyem, 2009). Abdulkareem’s (2001) study was concerned with the current supervisory practices in Riyadh public schools. His goal was to “identify what supervisory practices are widely used or emphasized by supervisors, and what practices are ignored or overlooked” as well as “to point out what practices alternatively are desired to be used” (p. 4). His sample consisted of 140 male teachers and 85 male supervisors randomly selected in Riyadh public schools. Teachers were willing to accept the direct

supervision model and wanted to see more roles for supervisors in their visits to the classroom. The findings also indicated that the “clinical model of supervision, or peer coaching model, which focus on classroom performance, would be influential supervision methods for teacher development” (p. 127). Abdulkareem recommended that a collegial, teacher-oriented model of supervision should be developed by the Ministry of Education to provide direct assistance to teachers with different options for teachers and supervisors to grow professionally.

Alkrdem (2011) examined the practice of school-based instructional supervision in secondary schools in Saudi Arabia. He investigated the perceptions of head teachers, teachers, and district education officers. Data were collected through questionnaires and interviews. The questionnaires were completed by 272 teachers and in-depth interviews were conducted with 33 participants. The findings revealed that the supervisors did not have the necessary skills and were not serious about their supervisory roles.

Regarding the practice of developmental supervision, several studies investigated the practice of developmental supervision (e.g., Albabtain, 2014; Alloh, 2012; Shedefat & Alqaderi, 2005). In the Saudi context, Albabtain (2014) investigated the degree to which educational supervisors practiced developmental supervision methods, based on the perspectives of educational supervisors and high school teachers in Riyadh. His sample included 268 male participants: 70 educational supervisors and 198 school teachers. The educational supervisors practiced methods of developmental supervision—direct, collaborative, or indirect—to an average degree according to the sample perspectives. In addition, there were no statistically significant differences among the opinions of educational supervisors about the degree to which the direct educational approach was used, based on the qualification variable. However, he claimed that there was a significant variance among the opinions of educational supervisors regarding the degree to which indirect and collaborative approaches were used based on the current position and teaching experience variables due to the interest of educational supervisors having extensive teaching experience.

Alloh (2012) used quantitative research to explore the effects of developmental supervision on the teaching practices of Arabic teachers in Gaza. The sample consisted of 421 female and male teachers randomly selected from UN teachers in Gaza. Developmental educational supervision was found to improve the teaching practices of the teachers. There were no statistically significant differences in their improvement level based on gender or school grade taught, but there were statistically significant differences concerning years of experience.

Shedefat & Alqaderi's (2005) quasi-experimental study identified the effects of applying educational developmental supervision on the instructional practices of science teachers in the Al-Mafraq educational province of Jordan compared with traditional supervision. His sample consisted of 122 male and female teachers selected randomly during the scholastic year 2002–2003, and assigned randomly to one of two groups: the experimental group, which consisted

of 64 subjects, and the control group of 58 subjects. He found that developmental supervision was more effective at improving the instructional practices of science teachers compared to traditional supervision.

Moreover, the studies in the literature have explored the supervisor training which is a very important topic in supervision field. Training supervisors to practice these supervisory behaviors of developmental supervision will help them to enhance the quality of their supervisory practices (Albaptian, 1994; Buraik, 2011; Gordon, 1990). Gordon (1990) discovered that most of the time, supervisors' ineffectiveness with the nondirective approach was due to a lack of training not a lack of potential to use it. Albaptian (1994) conducted an experimental study to assess the impact of training educational supervisors to use the developmental approaches to supervision on their supervisory practices. His sample consisted of 29 educational supervisors who enrolled in a training workshop in the College of Education at King Saud University in 1992–1993. He used an instrument developed by Glickman and Tamashiro in 1980 titled "Determining One's Beliefs Regarding Teacher Supervision". The participants rated themselves before and after the training course. Using that questionnaire, the researcher measured how much the supervisors practiced the developmental approaches before and after the training course. The researcher compared the results and analyzed them quantitatively. He found that after the training course, supervisors tended to use the cooperative and nondirective approaches more than the directive approach. In addition, after the course, the supervisors thought that the cooperative approach was the most common approach. None of the participants had any knowledge of developmental supervisory approaches. His recommendations were that the Ministry of Education establish a core course titled "developmental supervision theory" in the supervisors' preparation program and provide supervisors with training courses or workshops on developmental supervision to boost their performance.

Buraik (2011) asserted that there is a need for training courses for supervisors and teachers. She found that supervisors had a lack of knowledge about contemporary approaches to supervision and did not keep up-to-date about new developments in their field. In her study, she investigated 46 female educational supervisors' use of contemporary approaches to supervision in Jizan province. These approaches were clinical, developmental, electronic, differentiated, and reflective supervision. The supervisors either did not practice these five contemporary approaches or practiced them very rarely.

Additionally, literature discussed the factors that affect supervisory practice. The implementation or perceptions of supervision approaches can be affected by level of education (Alkrdem, 2011; Ozyildirim & Aksu, 2016), length of experience (Aburezq, 2006; Albaptian, 2014; Ozyildirim & Aksu, 2016), gender (Kelly, 1988), and attitudes (Aburezq, 2006). Ozyildirim and Aksu (2016) studied supervisors' and school administrators' opinions and teachers' expectations about supervision according to Glickman's developmental supervision

model. The sample contained 70 supervisors, 66 school administrators, and 529 teachers. From their responses to the questionnaires, supervisors with a graduate degree selected nondirective and collaborative behavior equally. Meanwhile, supervisors who had graduated from a training institute or had a two-year degree preferred collaborative behavior. In addition, a significantly larger number of administrators with a graduate degree preferred nondirective behavior compared to those who had graduated from a training institute or had a two-year degree. However, most school administrators, supervisors, and teachers preferred collaborative over directive control behavior.

Aburezeq (2006) believed that a supervisor or teacher's level of education affected how supervision was implemented. His study examined the perceptions of Arabic teachers in Jordan regarding the supervision they received. Some teachers did not like having a supervisor with a lesser degree than theirs. Aburezeq mentioned that different factors can impact the relationship between supervisor and teacher, such as gender, academic level, and years of experience as teachers or supervisors. These factors interacted and negatively affected teacher-supervisor relationships, which reduced the quality of supervisory practice.

METHODOLOGY

This study investigated the extent to which collaborative approach to developmental supervision is practiced in Saudi Arabia. The accessible population consisted of over 12,000 male and female elementary school teachers from schools under the administration of the Educational Department of Makkah. The explanatory sequential mixed-methods approach was determined to be the appropriate research method to investigate this problem. The instruments consisted of a questionnaire adapted from Albabtain (2014) and a follow-up semi-structured interview with eight teachers who were selected purposefully from the survey's participants who indicated they were willing to participate in the interview.

Research Questions

To explore this issue, the following research questions were asked:

1. To what extent are supervisors practicing the collaborative approach to developmental supervision?
2. To what extent do gender, years of teaching experience, and levels of education impact participant responses regarding supervisors' practice of collaborative approach to supervision?

Limitations and Delimitations

The sample was a random sample of male and female teachers of daytime public schools in Makkah. Thus, teachers in night schools, private schools, vocational schools, or any other kind of schools were excluded from this study. Thus, the findings of this study cannot be assumed to apply to these other kinds of schools. In addition, the specialization of the teacher is not a point of interest in this study. All teachers regardless of their majors had the same

opportunity to participate. Moreover, teachers with degrees less than a bachelor's were excluded. The Ministry of Education no longer hires teachers with less than a bachelor's degree, and it encourages teachers without a bachelor's to complete one.

Design of the Study

A mixed-methods approach was used for this study. This approach is relatively new in the social and human sciences and has been gaining popularity in recent years (Cameron, 2011; Creswell, 2014). The *Journal of Mixed Methods* has defined this approach as "research in which the investigator collects, analyses, mixes, and draws inferences from both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or a program of inquiry" (Cameron, 2011, p. 96). The researcher in this methodology "combines statistical trends (quantitative data) with stories and personal experiences (qualitative data)" (Creswell, 2015, p.2).

The mixed-methods approach proposes six major strategies or methods in designing a research proposal (Creswell, 2009). One of these strategies is the explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, an approach appropriate to the current research because it minimizes the limitations of using only one approach, whether qualitative or quantitative. The results of a quantitative survey were interpreted and explained by using data from a qualitative follow-up interview. This integration between quantitative and qualitative data and how these data will be used together is an important factor in favor of choosing a mixed-methods design (Creswell, 2009). The researcher in the explanatory sequential mixed-methods approach "first conducts quantitative research, analyzes the results and then builds on the results to explain them in more detail with qualitative research" (Creswell, 2014, p. 225). In the first phase, I started by distributing questionnaires to collect teachers' responses about supervisors' practice of three approaches to developmental supervision. In the second phase, I conducted semi-structured interviews to gain further data to explain the quantitative responses while reinforcing the accuracy of the data.

Sampling

The sample of the study is in two phases, a convenience random sample and a cluster sample. There are 45 educational departments in Saudi Arabia. Since it would be difficult to include all teachers in all educational departments, I selected the teachers from the educational department of Makkah as the accessible population. This is a convenience random sample. Makkah region is large and has rural and urban areas. Additionally, this region has a similar culture to other regions in Saudi Arabia.

Moreover, since there are eight educational districts in Makkah and separate schools in Saudi Arabia for male and female students, I used cluster sampling to choose from these schools. I chose two schools –one boy's school and one girls' school from each district under the administration of the Department of Education of Makkah- to be included in my study. Teachers in these schools were the selected sample of my study.

Table 2
Sampling

A convenience random sample	A cluster sample
Selecting the educational department of Makkah out of 45 educational departments in Saudi Arabia.	One boys' school and one girls' school from eight districts in Makkah.

I contacted the General Authority for Statistics in Saudi Arabia by email through their website to determine the exact number of elementary school teachers in Makkah. They reported that there were a total of 12,315 teachers (6,121 males and 6,194 females). The eight educational districts in Makkah are North District, East District, South District, West District, Center District, Bahrah District, Al Jumum District, and Al Kamel District. I randomly chose one boys' school and one girls' school from each district to distribute the questionnaires to the teachers. As a result, 16 randomly selected schools that have 480 male and female teachers received the questionnaire. This sample is comparable to the literature as previous studies have had participants ranging between 100 and 300 participants (Abdulkareem, 2001; Albabtain, 2014; Alloh, 2012; Shedefat & Alqaderi, 2005).

All participants were asked to indicate at the end of the questionnaire if they would be willing to participate in a follow-up interview and the best way to contact them. From those who agreed to participate, I purposefully chose eight teachers to conduct individual semi-structured interviews. The selection was based on the variables of my study: gender, the years of teaching experience, and the level of education.

Instruments

Mixed-methods designs were seldom used in the relevant literature. The majority of studies found used only one approach, either a quantitative or qualitative approach, to collect the data (e.g., Abdulkareem, 2001; Albabtain, 2014; Alloh, 2012; Algamdi, 2010; Aljameel, 2003; Aljaradat, 2009; Al-Oraimi et al.; Berson, 2012; Buraik, 2011; Qasim, 2012; Shedefat & Alqaderi, 2005). I used the explanatory sequential design. Employing both a questionnaire and an interview provided more accurate information about the supervisory practices of the collaborative approach of developmental supervision to be analyzed. The main instruments used in mixed-methods research are observations, interviews, closed-ended questionnaires, and open-ended questionnaires. This is because using different ways to collect data can boost the validity and dependability of the data (Zohrabi, 2013).

I adapted a valid instrument from the literature for use in this study. The closed-ended questionnaire from Albabtain (2014) was evaluated by 11 specialists and experts in the College of Education at King Saud University to obtain content validity. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the questionnaire was 0.96, which was very high and showed the questionnaire

to have very good reliability. I obtained a written approval from the instrument's developer to use it in my study. The questionnaire examined the degree to which supervisors practice developmental approaches to supervision in Riyadh. This instrument contains 48 statements that measure practice of the three approaches to developmental supervision of interest. Since my study investigates the differences in the responses regarding gender, I changed the language to be gender-inclusive. In this paper, I will be analyzing the collaborative part of this questionnaire. Three of my colleagues reviewed the survey after changes to make sure there was no threat to its content validity.

Since my study is a mixed-methods design, an interview was used in addition to the questionnaire. I randomly selected eight teachers for the semi-structured interviews. The protocol for the interview questions was designed and the validity and reliability of the questions obtained through peer reviews.

Data Collection Procedures

I contacted the Human Subjects Committee at SIU to obtain their approval to conduct the study and to start collecting the data. Permission was also obtained from the Department of Education in Makkah to implement this study. The Department of Education sent an email message containing a link to my questionnaire on the Survey Monkey website to all teachers in the selected schools. This means that my sample of 480 teachers from eight boys' schools and eight girls' schools received the survey. Teachers who read the information in the email message and agreed to participate followed the link to take the survey. Completion of the survey indicated the participant's voluntary consent to participate in this research study. The participant's name was not required for more protection of the participants' privacy. The email message was sent twice between April 1, and April 20, 2017. The second email was sent as a reminder message. After that, the teachers did not receive any further emails.

After collecting the completed surveys and dismissing the uncompleted questionnaires and analyzing the quantitative data, follow-up semi-structured interviews were conducted to confirm the accuracy of and to explain the survey results. The interviews were conducted through the phone for different reasons. First, it was the preferred way that the participants chose. Also, it saves the participants' time and provides them with more privacy. Moreover, from a cultural aspect, using the phone is more suitable way to conduct the interview with female teachers in Saudi Arabia. Each participant chose the time for the interview so that a time comfortable for them could be chosen in order to improve the quality of the responses. The responses to the interview questions were audiotaped after gaining permission from participants and having them sign a consent form which they returned by email. The interviews were conducted in May 2017.

The consent form promises the privacy and confidentiality of the participants' identities and responses. To link the interview transcripts and notes to the audio recordings, random names

were used instead of the participants' real names. In the consent form, participants were asked to identify any specific information they did not want to be reported or transcribed for research use. I took all reasonable steps to protect the participants' identities. Paper copies of the data were kept in a locked storage cabinet in my home. The tapes will be destroyed 90 days after completion of the study. Any other electronic data files for this study are kept on a private password-protected laptop stored in my home where only I have access.

Validity

Burns (1999) asserted that "validity is an essential criterion for evaluating the quality and acceptability of research" (p. 160). Addressing threats to validity and reliability increases the value and trustworthiness of this study.

Regarding content validity, I adopted a questionnaire that was reviewed by 11 experts in the Curriculum and Instruction Department to ensure its validity. After the changes that I made in the survey, the questionnaire was reviewed by three of my colleagues. For the second phase of my study, I did peer reviews with my colleagues to ensure the validity and reliability of the interview questions, to make sure they were clear and to minimize any ambiguity in the language.

To increase internal validity, researchers should use more than one method to make sure they are measuring what is supposed to be measured (Zohrabi, 2013). Therefore, I used three methods to ensure the internal validity of the data, including triangulation, member checks, and peer review. Triangulation consists of collecting the data through more than one technique: in this case a closed-ended questionnaire and an interview. A member check technique was used to ensure the confirmability. After each interview, I reviewed the notes with the participant to check for any errors or misunderstandings. By doing this, I ensured that the study was truly representative of the participants' perceptions. Finally, I used peer review. In analyzing the data, I enlisted a team of three researchers, including myself, to review my interpretation of the interview data. Those peer reviewers were familiar with supervisory practices in Saudi Arabia and the educational field in general. This practice enhanced the credibility of the data and decreased researcher bias by describing exactly what the participants reported.

One of the possible threats to the study's validity and trustworthiness was researcher bias as every investigator has some kind of bias. I did everything I could to prevent my own biases from influencing the findings. One way of doing this was to avoid leading questions that prompt participants to provide answers that support my opinion.

Finally, the interviews were one-on-one to prevent the influence of other participants on any interviewee. Furthermore, the participants were able to select the time of the interviews to limit the influence of the time on their responses.

Data Analysis

The explanatory sequential mixed-methods approach is “characterized by the collection and analysis of quantitative data in a first phase of research followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data in a second phase that builds on the results of the initial quantitative results” (Creswell, 2009, p. 211).

After collecting the questionnaires, I used SPSS version 24 to analyze the statistical data. To compare the responses based on gender, a *t*-test was used. Gliner, Morgan, and Leech (2009) mentioned that a *t*-test is used to examine “a single-factor, between-groups design with two levels” (p. 289). According to Gliner et al., the “one-way ANOVA is used for designs with one independent variable, between groups, and two or more levels” (p. 292). A one-way ANOVA was used to examine the differences among the responses of participants with different levels of experience.

I analyzed the interviews qualitatively using a coding method. My main aim was to identify the open and closed codes and themes that emerged from the participants’ responses in addition to the themes in the literature review. These themes explain, support, and question the findings of the quantitative data.

RESULTS

Out of the 480 questionnaires sent to teachers in 16 elementary schools in Makkah, excluding the uncompleted questionnaires, a total of 112 questionnaires (23.3%) were completed, and 15 participants agreed to participate in the interview phase, eight of whom were selected based on three criteria: gender, teaching experience, and level of education.

Questionnaire Demographics

The following tables display the demographic analysis of the participants according to gender, level of education, and years of experience. Table 3 presents the sample’s frequencies and percentages based on gender. There were 67 male teachers, comprising 59.82% of the respondents, and 45 female teachers comprising 40.18%, for a total of 112 teachers.

Table 3

Sample Distribution According to Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	67	59.82%
Female	45	40.18%
Total	112	100%

Table 4 presents the sample’s frequencies and percentages based on level of education. There were 83 teachers with a bachelor’s degree, which formed 74.11% of respondents; 27 teachers with a master’s degree (24.11%), and only two holding a PhD (1.79%).

Table 4
Sample Distribution According to Level of Education

Level of Education	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor’s	83	74.11%
Master’s	27	24.11%
PhD	2	1.79%
Total	112	100%

Table 5 presents the sample’s frequencies and percentages based on years of teaching experience. There were 45 teachers who had 1–10 years of experience teaching (40.18% of respondents), 37 with 11–20 years of expertise (33.04%), and 30 with 21 years or more of experience (26.79%).

Table 5
Sample Distribution According to Years of Teaching Experience

Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1–10 years	45	40.18%
11–20 years	37	33.04%
21 years or more	30	26.79%
Total	112	100%

Quantitative Findings

Regarding the analysis of the quantitative data, frequency, mean, percentage, and standard deviation were used to answer the first research question. Meanwhile, *t*-tests and one-way ANOVA tests were used to answer the second research question.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked, “To what extent are supervisors practicing the collaborative approach to developmental supervision?” The results in Table 5 demonstrate the participants’ responses. The grand mean was 2.64, and the level of supervisors’ practice of the collaborative approach was shown to be typically “sometimes.” This means that the collaborative approach comes next after the directive approach as most frequently used by supervisors in Makkah schools.

Table 7 shows the highest mean score of 2.88 for the statement “The Educational Supervisor discusses what was observed in class during the post-observation meeting.” This mean indicates that the supervisors’ level of practice for this statement was “sometimes.” Half

(50.0%) of participants marked “sometimes” for this statement, 22.4% selected “usually,” 20.5% reported “rarely,” and 7.1% selected “never”. The collaborative approach is best used with “the teacher who is good at observing but passive at deciding about something” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988 as cited in Ozyildirim & Aksu, 2016, p.127). In another statement in the survey, the participants pointed out that their supervisors asked them about what they would like to be observed and the goal of their visit. In this statement, teachers believe that the supervisors and teachers most of the time agreed to focus on some specific aspects to be observed during the class period and they discussed it during their post-observation meeting.

The statement with the second-highest mean was, “The Educational Supervisor proposes some effective teaching strategies that are appropriate for the class lesson plans.” The mean was 2.82, which meant that supervisors sometimes practiced this statement; 17.0% of participants selected “usually” as the level of practice for this statement, 56.2% selected “sometimes,” 18.8% selected “rarely,” and 8.0% selected “never”. This means that the supervisors proposed and encouraged teachers to use some suitable strategies for their class in planning and implementing phases. However, they are not obligated to follow them.

Table 7

Supervisors' Practice of the Collaborative Approach to Developmental Supervision

Statements	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1- TES gives teachers an equal opportunity to participate.	15 13.4%	26 23.2%	57 50.9%	14 12.5%	2.63	0.87
2- TES helps teachers alter their teaching methods to correspond to the educational goals of the school.	14 12.5%	19 17.0%	60 53.5%	19 17.0%	2.75	0.89
3- TES involves teachers in setting the goal of evaluation.	23 20.5%	23 20.5%	56 50.1%	10 8.9%	2.47	0.92
4- TES engages in supervisory deliberations with teachers to reach an agreed-upon opinion.	18 16.1%	22 19.5%	56 50.1%	16 14.3%	2.63	0.92
5- TES invites teachers that have similar problems to find solutions.	27 24.1%	23 20.5%	47 42.0%	15 13.4%	2.45	1.00
6- TES introduces and clarifies the goals of the training program before it is held.	18 16.1%	25 22.3%	55 49.1%	14 12.5%	2.58	0.91
7- TES specifies with the teacher the goals of observation and its methods.	12 10.7%	34 30.4%	55 49.1%	11 9.8%	2.58	0.81
8- TES cooperates with the teacher in pinpointing the problem and suggests appropriate solutions.	13 11.6%	31 27.7%	58 51.8%	10 8.9%	2.58	0.81
9- TES accepts the teachers' opinions and encourages them in the post-observation meeting.	21 18.8%	21 18.8%	51 45.4%	19 17.0%	2.61	0.98

10- TES discusses what was observed in class during the post-observation meeting.	8 7.1%	23 20.5%	56 50.0%	25 22.4%	2.88	0.84
11- TES proposes some effective teaching strategies that are appropriate for the class lesson plans.	9 8.0%	21 18.8%	63 56.2%	19 17.0%	2.82	0.81
12- TES believes that the relationship with the teacher is contributory.	25 22.3%	15 13.4%	53 47.3%	19 17.0%	2.59	1.02
13- TES cares for supervisory deliberations with a group of teachers.	18 16.1%	23 20.5%	58 51.8%	13 11.6%	2.59	0.90
14- TES encourages workshops in solving educational issues with teachers.	19 17.0%	24 21.4%	54 48.2%	15 13.4%	2.58	0.93
15- TES encourages all teachers to specify the behavioral objectives that have to be achieved according to the different learning styles.	12 10.7%	30 26.8%	56 50.0%	14 12.5%	2.64	0.84
16- TES encourages teachers to share their experiences.	14 12.5%	20 17.9%	54 48.2%	24 21.4%	2.79	0.92
17- TES contributes in reinforcing collaborative work among teachers.	16 14.3%	19 17.0%	58 51.7%	19 17.0%	2.71	0.92
18- TES believes that cooperation with teachers to improve their skills is a goal to be achieved.	18 16.1%	23 20.5%	52 46.4%	19 17.5%	2.64	0.95
Grand Mean					2.64	0.90

On the other hand, at 2.45, the statement with the lowest mean score was, “The Educational Supervisor invites teachers that have similar problems to find solutions.” This mean score indicates that the supervisors’ level of practice of this statement was “rarely”; 44.6% of participants thought that supervisors rarely or never practiced this statement, while 42.0% thought they sometimes practiced it, and 13.4% said the supervisors usually practiced this statement. The results show that supervisors do not intend to invite teachers with similar problems together and ask them to find solutions. Nevertheless, in another statement, the answers showed that the supervisors usually asked teachers to work together, share their experiences, and do mutual visits to improve their performance and overcome any difficulties they may face.

The second-lowest mean score was 2.47, for the statement “The Educational Supervisor involves teachers in setting the goal of evaluation.” This mean score also reflects that the supervisors’ level of practice was “rarely” for this statement. Half of participants (50.1%) selected “sometimes” 8.9% selected “usually” and 41% selected “rarely” or “never”. Supervisors have small roles in teacher evaluation. Therefore, it is not their main task. They rarely involve teachers in setting the goals of evaluation but they usually involve them in creating the objectives of observation.

The remaining mean scores for statements in the collaborative approach ranged from 2.58 to 2.79, which indicated that supervisors' level of practice for these statements was "sometimes."

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked, "To what extent do gender, years of teaching experience, and level of education impact participant responses regarding supervisors' practice of collaborative approach to supervision?"

Both *t*-tests and ANOVA tests were performed to determine whether there was a significant impact from gender, level of education, or years of experience on participants' responses regarding the practice of the collaborative approach of supervision. The following tables display the results of these tests.

The following tables display the results of the *t*-tests and ANOVA test to examine the impact of gender, level of education, and years of experience on participants' responses regarding the practice of the collaborative approach to developmental supervision. As shown in Table 8, a *t*-test was performed to see if there were any differences in participants' responses related to gender factor. It showed that there were no significant differences between sample responses regarding the supervisors' practice of the collaborative approach to developmental supervision, $t(110) = -1.47, p > 0.05$. This meant that gender had no impact on teachers' responses about supervisors' practice of this approach.

Table 8
Impact of Gender on Participants' Responses (Collaborative Approach)

Gender	Sample Size	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> -test statistic	Degrees of Freedom	<i>p</i> value
Male	67	2.56	0.72	-1.473	110	0.14
Female	45	2.76	0.69			

As shown in Table 9, a *t*-test was performed to see if there were any differences in participants' responses related to level of education factor. It represented the significant difference between sample responses regarding the supervisors' practice of the collaborative approach to developmental supervision, $t(73.177) = -2.48, p < 0.05$. This meant that level of education had an impact on teachers' responses about supervisors' practice of this approach.

Table 9
Impact of Level of Education on Participants' Responses (Collaborative Approach)

Level of Education	Sample Size	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> -test statistic	Degrees of Freedom	<i>p</i> value
Bachelor's	83	2.56	0.75	-2.481	73.177	0.015*
Graduate	29	2.87	0.51			

As shown in Table 10, an ANOVA test was performed to see if there were any differences in participants' responses related to years of teaching experience. Table 12 illustrated that there no significant differences between sample responses regarding the supervisors' practice of the collaborative approach to developmental supervision, $F(2, 109) = 2.68, p > 0.05$. This meant that variation in years of teaching experience had no impact on teachers' responses about supervisors' practice of this approach.

Table 10

Impact of Years of Teaching Experience on Participants' Responses (Collaborative Approach)

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F statistic	p value
Between groups	2.62	2	1.310	2.682	0.073
Within groups	53.25	109	0.489		
Total	55.87	111			

Interview Demographics

In the qualitative phase of the study, 15 participants agreed to take part in an interview. I selected eight of these participants to conduct semi-structured interviews with. The participants were selected based on three criteria: gender, teaching experience, and level of education. All participants preferred doing the interview over the phone. Table 11 shows the interviewees' characteristics, including assigned name, gender, teaching experience, and education level.

Table 11

Interviewee Distribution

Name	Gender	Years of Teaching Experience	Level of Education
Fatimah	Female	18	Master's
Arwa	Female	4	Bachelor's
Razan	Female	11	Bachelor's
Norah	Female	25	Bachelor's
Nawaf	Male	8	Bachelor's
Abdullah	Male	14	Master's
Ali	Male	12	Bachelor's
Khalid	Male	21	Bachelor's

Qualitative Findings

For the qualitative phase, the questions were developed based on the quantitative results. Interviewees' responses to these questions were coded, which generated themes that explained the quantitative findings. The main questions in the semi-structured interviews were as following:

1. How likely is it that the supervisor gives you as a teacher a chance to offer suggestions and solutions? Does the supervisor give you a chance to discuss the teaching strategies and their implementation?
2. To what extent does the educational supervisor encourage collaborative work among teachers? Has the supervisor asked you to attend another teacher's class?
3. What do you think about the relationship between you and your supervisor?
4. When you have a problem in your work, do you consult with your supervisor? Does the supervisor help you in solving the problem? Give an example if possible.
5. Do you think that your feedback and suggestions are important to the supervisor during supervisory meetings? Is your supervisor striving to work with teachers to provide them with a good work environment?

Results

Table 12 shows the themes that emerged from the interviewees' responses regarding collaborative approach to developmental supervision.

Table 12

Themes from Interviewees' Responses

Collaborative Approach	Teacher involvement	- Collaboration - Pre-post conference - Importance of teacher's opinion
	Peer work	- Teacher's observation - Inviting teachers to work together
	The relationship	- Complementary relationship - Contributory relationship - Encouragement

Collaborative approach. Themes drawn from the questions about the collaborative approach were teacher involvement, peer work, and the relationship. Regarding the teacher involvement theme, participants' responses showed three related codes: collaboration, pre-post conference, and importance of teacher's opinion. The participants stated that teachers were involved in the supervisory practice. Some mentioned that their supervisors usually asked them what they would like to be observed in the observation session. In addition, supervisors during the post-conference discussed with teacher what was observed and encouraged them to express their opinions about possible solutions to problems. These codes from participants' responses pointed out the involvement of teachers in the supervisory process, such as in Ali's comments:

Through his visits, my supervisor specifies the problem and finds solutions. And as soon as he gets a chance, he brings up these problems in the supervisory deliberation with teachers to find good solutions. In the personal phase, when he notices a problem in my performance, he tries to inform me about it by asking questions and having a discussion until we isolate the problem together and find some possible solutions. Sometimes he provides me with some suggestions, and sometimes I suggest the solutions and he reflects on them and encourages me to try them.

Arwa thought that her involvement in the supervisory process was in her decision to take the supervisor's suggestion or ignore it. However, she mentioned that her supervisor sometimes gave her the chance to offer her own suggestions and predictions for what could happen:

The supervisor points out the problem and suggests some solutions, and it is up to me to take that suggestion or not. However, my supervisor sometimes asks me what I think of this solution and to provide my opinion and predictions.

Regarding the theme of peer work, two codes emerged from the interviews: teacher's observation and inviting teachers to work together. From the qualitative data, supervisors usually asked teachers to work with other teachers with similar problems to help each other. Additionally, supervisors would ask teachers to attend other teachers' classes for observation. Sometimes a common problem would arise, and one teacher would have had done a good job of solving this problem; thus, the supervisor would ask teachers to attend an observation session for that teacher's class. Razan said, "My supervisor encourages mutual visits between teachers. Moreover, when she visits our school, she takes all the math teachers along to attend the observation class with her." Arwa likewise said, "My supervisor advocates mutual expertise exchanges between teachers. She wants us to be competitive and helpful with each other at the same time."

Ali mentioned that his supervisor encouraged peer work by conducting a special workshop for teachers with the same major and helped implement the exemplary lesson given every month by teachers:

The supervisor in our major encourages teachers to share their expertise. He asks us as Arabic language teachers to perform an exemplary lesson every month. He works with the teacher who will do the exemplary lesson in everything from planning and preparing to implement the lesson. Teachers and the supervisor have a meeting prior to the lesson and after the lesson to discuss and get the most out of the lesson.

With regard to the relationship theme, three codes emerged: complementary relationship, contributory relationship, and encouragement. Abdullah, who has a master's degree, claimed that the relationship between supervisor and teachers was usually a complementary relationship:

Some supervisors and teachers are friends or colleagues, which influences the supervisor's assessment of the teacher's ability or performance. The supervisor should be able to assess the teacher's level of performance and then choose the best way to help him improve his teaching practice and overcome any difficulties that he may face.

Abdullah's response was different from other interviewees, such as Khalid and Norah, who thought of their relationship with their supervisors as a contributory relationship in which the supervisor valued their opinions and suggestions. Khalid said the following:

I think the relationship between me and my supervisor is good. I used to have some tension with supervisors but not anymore. Now they work as helpful assistants not evaluators trying to catch your mistakes and impose their ideas on your teaching performance.

Norah made a similar statement:

My supervisor always asks me what I want him to observe and provides me with some suggestions he thinks will help me. I am fortunate because I have a supervisor who values my long experience in the teaching field, which is more extensive than his.

In summary, interviewee responses indicated that supervisors practiced the collaborative approach to developmental supervision. The qualitative data explained how supervisors practiced this approach. The survey results showed that supervisors' level of practice of this approach could be classified as "sometimes." The qualitative results explained what "sometimes" meant. Interviewees mentioned that even though the supervisors' style was generally directive, they always valued teachers' opinions and contributions to specifying problems and finding solutions.

The majority of interviewees saw the supervisor as a helpful assistant. Moreover, most interviewees favored the collaborative approach. They thought that since the Saudi Ministry of Education took the authority out of the hands of supervisors, the relationship between supervisor and teacher had improved as they now collaborate to improve teachers' work. However, because supervisors do not visit frequently, interviewees said that the supervisor usually solved problems individually with teachers. It was clear to me that the teachers' responses to the survey and interview questions were strongly influenced by the relationship between them and their supervisors. In the past, this relationship was under pressure due to

the evaluation process that supervisors had to perform. This was in keeping with Nolan, Hawkes, and Francis, who reviewed six case studies of clinical supervision (as cited in Goldsberry, 1998). They concluded that the collegial relationship between supervisor and teacher was a characteristic of all successful cases.

CONCLUSIONS

Supervision is not merely monitoring the work of teachers or employees; rather, it is collaborative group work that aims to produce a positive environment where teachers can work effectively and students can learn more efficiency (Barott & Galvin, 1998). Developmental supervision is one form of supervision where supervisor and teacher can work together to improve teachers' work in the classroom. In this approach, the supervisor should determine the teachers' cognitive development level and then use the most suitable supervisory approach with them. In this study, teachers from Saudi Arabia evaluated their supervisors' application of collaborative approach of developmental supervision. It appeared that supervisors tended to use collaborative approach more often to supervise teachers. However, since the supervisors had a large number of teachers to supervise, they usually used traditional supervisory methods, such as having observation and post-observation conferences with teachers. The paucity of visits from supervisors was one of the main obstacles that prevented supervisors from implementing the other approach such as nondirective approach to developmental supervision. In my opinion, it is important to use the different approaches of developmental supervision with teachers. Teachers develop and their performance is influenced by their cognitive ability, their experience, and the environment around them. If the teacher's performance is improving as he acquires more experience in teaching, the supervisor must adjust their supervisory approach to fit with the teacher's level. They cannot use the same supervisory method with all teachers.

Recommendations for Policymakers

For a long time, teachers in Saudi Arabia have seen supervision as an evaluation process. Educators in the field of supervision have been trying to differentiate between developmental supervision and evaluation. However, "no amount of linguistic maneuvering will reconcile the two for teachers as long as the reality on the ground does not change" (Abdul Rehman & Al-Barqi, 2014, p. 1559).

Based on the results of the present study, a change could be seen in teachers' perspectives on supervision. I believe that policymakers have made progress by shifting the work of supervisors to be assistants to teachers rather than evaluators. Supervisors are responsible for only 10% of teachers' evaluation grade, which has influenced the relationship between teachers and supervisors. Goldsberry (1998) mentioned that scholars have different opinions about whether teacher evaluation can be done in a way that promotes a collaborative environment and improves teaching practices. Based on the results of the present study, I agree with those

scholars who see teacher evaluation as undermining the effort to build a collaborative culture and mutually rewarding relationships between supervisors and teachers.

Policymakers should establish an appropriate climate for supervisors to implement developmental supervision or other contemporary approaches to supervision. The main factor hindering supervisors from fully implementing the developmental approach as it should be is the large number of teachers they have to supervise. Another obstacle is a general lack of understanding about developmental supervision among teachers and some supervisors. Finally, more training courses and workshops should be offered to teachers and supervisors to learn and practice the collaborative approach of developmental approaches more effectively.

Suggestions for Future Research

Some suggestions for future research in the field of supervision are listed below.

1. Conduct a study to investigate principals' and supervisors' perceptions of the practice of developmental supervision. Principals in Saudi schools are responsible for the majority of teachers' evaluations. In addition to their responsibilities at the school, principals supervise teachers and do the same job that supervisors do but without professional preparation for it (Starratt, 2008). It would thus be illuminating to investigate this matter in future research.
2. Conduct a similar study with a larger sample from every region in Saudi Arabia.
3. Conduct an empirical study to implement developmental supervision approaches in schools and investigate their effectiveness on teachers' performance as well as on the relationship between teachers and supervisors.
4. Conduct an empirical study to investigate the impact of implementing developmental supervision approaches on students' achievement. Improving student achievement is one of the main goals of supervision but has not been examined enough in the literature (Goldsberry, 1998).
5. Conduct a study to investigate the impact of level of education on supervisors' practice of contemporary approaches to supervision.

References

- Abdulkareem, R. (2001). *Supervisory practices as perceived by teachers and supervisors in Riyadh schools, Saudi Arabia*. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University).
- Aburezeq, I. M. (2006). *Effects of supervision on classroom instruction: Perspectives of Arabic teachers in Jordan*. University of Washington.
- Abualkas, F. (2012). *The role of differentiated supervision in developing teachers performance in elementary basic stage from the view points of supervisors and teachers in Gaza Governorates school*. Master thesis. Al-Azhar University – Gaza.
- Albaptain, A. (1994). *The impact of training educational supervisors to use the developmental approaches to supervision*. Educational journal, Kuwait, 31 (8) 27-81

- Albaptain, A. (2012). *Difficulties On the Supervisory Work in Riyadh City as Perceived By The Educational Supervisors*. International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education. 10 (1) 645-674
- Albaptain, A. (2014). The Extent Educational Supervisors' Practice of Developmental Supervision's Approaches in Riyadh City. Journal of Educational Science, King Saud University. 26 (1) 135-159
- Al-Dajani, L. (2013). The Degree of Practicing the Behavior of Participative Supervision by Educational Supervisors in the Capital Amman and its Relation to Effectiveness Level of School Teachers from their point of View. Master's thesis, Middle East University.
- Algamdi, A. (2010). Difficulties facing the educational supervisors in implementing supervisory techniques in the secondary "Credit-Hour System" education at the Makkah region. Master's thesis. Umm Alqura University.
- Alloh, (2012). The level of improving the Developmental Educational supervision of the teaching practices of Arabic language teachers in Gaza Governorates. IUG Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, Islamic University, Gaza. 20 (1), 483-519
- Al-Oraimi, et al, (2014). The Degree of Supervisory Practices of Supervisors from the Perspectives of the Supervisory and Teaching Faculty in the Sultanate of Oman. Mutah Journal of Research And Studies, Jordan, 29(2), 205-242
- Alkrdem, M. (2011). School-based instructional supervision in Saudi Arabian public secondary schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of York).
- Aljameel, A. (2003) The extent to which educational supervisors fulfill their supervisory duties in the light of the mechanism of educational supervision from the point of view of teachers and educational supervisors in the Hael Educational Department. Master's thesis. Umm Alqura University.
- Aljaradat, M. (2009). The educational supervisors' level of practice for their supervisory responsibilities from the point of view of schools' principles and teachers in Hail district. *Culture and Development Journal*, 29 (9), 29-60.
- Almarmori, H. (2012). The associational style of educational supervision. *Teacher's Message Journal*, 50 (2), 61-67
- Alqasim, M. (2010). The role of school principals in promoting the use of developmental supervision in public schools in Jeddah city. Unpublished master thesis. Education college. Umm Alqura university.
- Alsumairi, A. (2008). Extent of supervisors of English language to practise clinical supervision from the viewpoint of the teachers of English language in governmental schools at Gaza Governorates, and methods of it's development. Master thesis. Islamic University, Gaza.
- Barott, J. E., & Galvin, P. F. (1998). The politics of supervision. *Handbook of research on school supervision*, 310-336.
- Berson, E. J. (2012). Teachers' Perspectives of Teacher Supervision Policies & Practices in Charter Schools in Pennsylvania. ProQuest LLC.

- Buraik, F. (2011). The current practice of female educational supervisors of contemporary approaches of supervision in Jezan district. *Journal of Qualitative Educational Research*, 23(2), 981-1016
- Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cameron, R. (2011). Mixed methods research: The five Ps framework. *The electronic journal of business research methods*, 9(2), 96-108.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods Approaches* (3th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. SEGA Publications, Inc.
- Daresh, J. C. (2007). *Supervision as proactive leadership*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Gliner, J, Morgan, G., & Leech, N. (2009). *Research methods in applied settings: An integrated approach to design and analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor& Francis Group.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (1998). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2014). *SuperVision and instructional leadership* (9th ed.). Pearson.
- Glickman, C. D., & Tamashiro, R. (1980). Determining One's Beliefs Regarding Teacher Supervision. *NASSP BULLETIN*, 64(440), 74-81.
- Goldsberry, L. F. (1998). Teacher involvement in supervision. *Handbook of research on school supervision*, 428-462.
- Gordon, S. P. (1990). Developmental supervision: An exploratory study of a promising model. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 5(4), 293-307.
- Hampton, W. L. (2009). *Clinical supervision: A case study of Clinical Supervision as it relates to the improvement of novice teachers*. Master's thesis, University of Houston.
- Hilo, G. (2009). *Supervisory Modes Degree that Practiced by Supervisors in Secondary School from Teachers' Points in Palestine*. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Sciences*, 10(3), 167-196
- Kalule, L., & Bouchamma, Y. (2014). Teacher supervision practices and characteristics of in-school supervisors in Uganda. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 26(1), 51-72.
- Kelting, T. H. (2013). *Clinical Supervision: Enhancing the Pre-service Teachers' Development in Early Field Experiences*. University of Wyoming.
- Kelly, M. P. (1988). *The instructional supervision styles of school principals*. University of La Verne.

- Kutsyuruba, B. (2003). *Instructional supervision: Perceptions of Canadian and Ukrainian beginning high-school teachers* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Saskatchewan Saskatoon).
- Ministry of Education in SA, 2016. Retrieved from <http://departments.moe.gov.sa/EducationAgency/RelatedDepartments/ESUPERVISION/boys/Pages/aboutus.aspx>
- Moswela, B., & Mphale, L. M. (2015). Barriers to clinical supervision practices in Botswana schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 3(6), 61-70.
- Mukaid, A (2006). The reality of the supervisory practices of the UNRWA educational supervisors in Gaza in the light of total quality principles and its developed methods. Master's thesis, Islamic University, Gaza.
- Ozyildirim, G., & Aksu, M. B. (2016). An Investigation on Developmental Supervision Model: Supervisors' and Administrators' Opinions and Teachers' Expectations. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 6(3), 125-146.
- Pajak, E. (2000). *Approaches to clinical supervision* (2nd ed.). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Phillips, M. D., & Glickman, C. D. (1991). Peer Coaching: Developmental Approach to Enhancing Teacher Thinking. *Journal of Staff Development*, 12(2), 20-25.
- Qasim, Abdulkareem. (2012). The degree of practicing the supervision methods as perceived by the educational supervisors in the educational directorates of the Palestinian Ministry of Education and Higher Education in the northern districts of Palestine. 26(2), 57-104
- Qetah, N & Ziyah, D. (2014). Extent of practice for the supervisory techniques for the supervisors in Gaza as perceived by teachers. 6(2), 327-364.
- Shedefat, Y., & Alqaderi, S. (2005). The Effect of Applying Developmental Educational Supervision In Improving the Instructional practices of Science Teachers in Al-Mafraq Educational Province. 17 (1), 126-170.
- Siens, C. M., & Ebmeier, H. (1996). Developmental supervision and the reflective thinking of teachers. *Journal Of Curriculum & Supervision*, 11(4), 299-319.
- Starratt, R. J. (2008). Supervision of instruction—the history of supervision, roles and responsibilities of supervisors, issues trends and controversies. Retrieved on 27-06-2013 from < <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2472/Supervision-Instruction.html>.
- Tayyem, H. (2009). Educational Supervisors's practices in Government Schools in Palestinian Northern Governorates as Perceived by (male and female) Teachers. *An-Najah University Journal for Research*, 23(3), 783-804.
- Zohrabi, M. (2013). Mixed method research: Instruments, validity, reliability and reporting findings. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(2), 254.