

GENERAL PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN GENERAL INSPECTIONS OF PRIMARY SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO THE VIEWS OF INSPECTORS AND PRINCIPALS*

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Salih Paşa MEMİŞOĞLU
Abant İzzet Baysal University
Bolu, TURKEY

Zeki EKİNCİ
Mardin Provincial Directorate of National Education
Mardin, TURKEY

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the problems encountered in the general inspection of primary schools according to the views of inspectors and principals and develop suggestions. The survey model was used in the study. The study population consisted of the principals and assistant principals who worked at primary schools in Mardin's central districts in the school year of 2010-2011 and Education Inspectors of the Province of Mardin. In this study, "One Way Variance Analysis" was used in order to discover whether there was a significant difference between the views of principals and education inspectors according to the variables of duty state, seniority and education level or not. While the principals had "high" levels of views concerning the general problems encountered in general inspection of primary schools, the education inspectors and assistant principals had "medium" levels of views. In conclusion, it was discovered that there was not a significant difference between the views of principals, assistant principals and education inspectors in terms of the variables of duty state, seniority and education.

Key Words: General inspection, inspector, principal.

INTRODUCTION

Inspection had an administrative quality before the 1900s. Teachers are perceived as wage earners who should be inspected by the administration. In the 1900s, on the other hand, it was emphasized that the specialised knowledge was required in educational inspection. Inspection remained a branch of administration during this period, as well. It is observed that inspection acquired a scientific qualification in the 1920s and human relations were emphasized in inspection applications in the 1930s and 1940s. In recent years, on the other hand, a notion of inspection, which gives importance to the development of human capital in educational inspection where organizations aim to develop the human capital and use it in an effective way, has been emphasized (Aydın, 2011:12).

Inspection is an element of administration processes and the school administration. Inspection is used in finding the realization degree of predetermined educational objectives (Bursalioglu, 2002). In this context, the objective of inspection is to determine the realization degree regarding the objectives of the organization. General inspection that is conducted at primary schools aims to determine the realization degree regarding the objectives of the organization. The counseling and inspection that are conducted by education inspectors at public and private primary schools in our country aim to make these institutions more efficient and productive (Memişoğlu and Ekinçi, 2013). Inspection is universal. It is not possible for organizations to function without inspection no matter what their types, objectives and establishments are. (Başaran, 1988:369). Inspection is the process of following, regenerating and developing the functioning of the organization in order to prevent possible deviations from the planned organizational objectives.

* This study was prepared by using the postgraduate thesis.

According to the views of classical administration led by Taylor, inspection is required by the human nature. Even though there is a perception that human beings could inspect and direct themselves without needing any outer inspections in the notion of modern administration, inspection is still an important process of administration (Kaya 1991:126). Inspection is an organizational and administrative obligation.

The necessity of inspection for organizations and the importance of its benefits require its careful implementation. Inspection is among key provisions of using the organizational resources in an efficient and useful way, as well as sustaining and developing the organizations (Başar, 1998: 5). All of the authors emphasize the necessity and importance of inspection in the educational system. Especially the inspection of intraclass education is considered inevitable. Inspection involves working with individuals and groups. If the system gets devoid of inspection, it is condemned to loneliness, disorder and stability, and a power loss occurs (Kimbrough and Burkett,1990: 170; cited by: Aydın, 2005:3).

Inspection is an activity that enables the school to achieve its goals. Functions of inspection could be collected under six groups (Sağlam, 1975:11):

- 1.Generation of objectives,
- 2.Procurement and control of coordination,
- 3.Motivation,
- 4.Problem solving,
- 5.Development,
- 6.Evaluation

In the educational system, inspection is separated into two parts as lesson inspection and general inspection. Lesson inspection includes the observation, investigation and evaluation of studies of teachers rendering service at an educational institution in educational activities. General inspection, on the other hand, includes the procurement and control of human and material resources in the realization of the objectives of an educational organization, as well as the observation of utilization state and evaluation according to certain criteria (Taymaz,1997: 24).

Increase in the number of schools and the rules necessitated by laws, as well as duties such as regulations in education, checking whether schools obey these rules or not, coordination, education on-the-job, guiding the teachers, following the functioning and process operation have necessitated not only the educational administration, but also inspection in education (Başaran, 1998). Inspection is required in order to understand to what extent the school administrations realize the objectives of the educational system and realize these objectives at higher levels.

The objectives of inspection at a school include: (1) Providing cooperation in teacher-student relations, (2) Providing the cooperation and communication of inspector-teacher, (3) Providing the planning and sustainability in inspection, (4) Providing the evaluation function of inspection, (5) Conducting researches, investigations and making corrections accordingly (Su, 1974: 13).

In the Turkish educational system, the primary schools are inspected by education inspectors. This study aimed to reveal the general problems encountered in the inspection of primary schools. We sought answers for the following questions within the scope of the designated objective.

Regarding the general inspection:

- a. What are the general problems encountered by principals, assistant principals and education inspectors?
- b. Is there a significant difference between the views of principals, assistant principals and education inspectors regarding the general problems they encounter?
- c. Is there a significant difference between the general problems encountered by principals, assistant principals and education inspectors according to the variables of seniority and education?

METHOD

Study Model

This is a survey model study. Survey model is a study approach that aims to describe a past or present condition as it is. (Karasar, 2002: 77). According to another description, survey model aims to collect data in order to determine certain characteristics of a group (Büyükoztürk, 2010: 16).

Population and Sample

The study population consisted of 44 principals, 61 assistant principals who worked at primary schools in Mardin's central districts in the school year of 2010-2011 and 50 Education Inspectors in the Province of Mardin. No attempt was made for sampling in the study, since it was possible to reach the entire population.

Collection of the Data

The assessment instrument that was developed by Gök (2009) was used as the data collection tool in the study. In order to implement the assessment instrument, official correspondences were conducted between Abant İzzet Baysal University Institute of Social Sciences and Mardin Provincial Directorate of National Education, and a permission was obtained from the Mardin Provincial Directorate of National Education for the study. The assessment instrument was distributed to school administrators and education inspectors in the central district of Mardin and collected by the researcher. The assessment instrument was distributed to 44 principals, 61 assistant principals and 50 education inspectors, which makes 155 people in total. 43 out of 44 principals, 59 out of 61 assistant principals and 50 out of 50 education inspectors, who were sent the assessment instruments, returned these instruments. All of the returned assessment instruments were involved in the evaluation.

Data Collection Tool

Data collection tool of the study consists of two parts. In the first part, a personal information form was prepared to obtain the personal information of administrators and inspectors. In this part, the administrators and inspectors were asked about their gender, occupational seniority, educational status and duties. In the second part, on the other hand, the assessment instrument that was developed by Gök (2009) was used in order to determine the views of administrators and inspectors rendering service at primary schools, concerning the problems encountered in the general inspection of primary schools. The researcher checked the internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha) of each dimension of the assessment instrument and the Cronbach Alpha value (reliability coefficient) of the assessment instrument was found as .93,8.

Data Analysis

The data that were obtained from the study were analysed with the SPSS packaged software. Frequencies, percentages, arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated in the analysis of the data that were obtained from the study. "One Way Variance Analysis" was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between the views of principals, assistant principals and education inspectors.

FINDINGS

The task distributions of study participants are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Task Distributions of Groups in the Study Population

Task	f	%
Principal	43	28,3
Assistant Principal	59	38,8
Education Inspector	50	32,9
Total	152	100,0

According to Table 1, 28,3% of study participants are consisted of principals, 38,8% are consisted of assistant principals and 32,9% are consisted of education inspectors.

Table 2: Findings regarding the General Problems Encountered by Principals, Assistant Principals and Education Inspectros in General Inspections

Questions	Groups					
	Principal		Assistant Principal		Inspector	
	\bar{x}	SS	\bar{x}	SS	\bar{x}	SS
1-Objective and policy of inspection in institutions are not determined	3.37	1.23	3.15	1.25	3.22	1.28
2-There is a dual inspection structuring in the national education system	3.18	1.25	3.32	1.07	3.60	1.30
3-Inspection is limited with past and not prudential	3.48	1.22	3.57	.05	3.22	1.21
4-Number of inspectors in institutions is less compared to the work load	3.76	1.10	3.06	1.24	3.26	1.19
5-Inspectors who are responsible for the general inspection also inspect teachers	3.11	1.33	3.08	1.41	2.68	1.26
6-General inspection reports that are presented to the presidency are not evaluated in a short time as is required	3.67	1.12	3.35	1.26	3.68	1.25
7-Regulations and notices regarding the inspection are changed frequently	3.88	1.23	3.71	1.27	3.20	1.19
8-Forms and reports being used in inspection are not standardized	3.65	1.36	3.49	1.30	3.10	1.37
TOTAL	3.51	0.84	3.34	0.89	3.24	0.87

The arithmetic means of the views of principals regarding the dimension of general problems encountered in the general inspection was found as $\bar{x} = 3,51$ with a standard deviation of 0.84. Based on this means, it could be asserted that problems experienced by principals in the general inspection are at a "High" level.

It could be asserted that the finding regarding the fact that principals consider the problems "forms and reports being used in inspection are not standardized" and "Inspection is limited with past and is not prudential" as very important is supported by the finding of Karagözoğlu (1977), which was obtained from his study titled "Inspection Applications in Primary Education" and is as follows "... teachers think that they can not receive sufficient support from inspectors regarding the planning and implementation of educational activities, inspection reports are considered a threat risk and the view of inspectors regarding success is affected by appearance, neatness and interest in the inspector rather than education".

It is observed that the finding regarding the fact that principals consider the problems “Objective and policy of inspection in institutions are not determined”, “There is a dual inspection structuring in the national education system” and “Inspectors who are responsible for the general inspection also inspect teachers” as moderately important is supported by the conclusion of Öztürk (1999) in his study titled “Views of Inspectors and Principals regarding the Problems Encountered in General Inspections of Primary Schools”.

The arithmetic means of the views of assistant principals regarding the dimension of general problems encountered in the general inspection was found as $\bar{x} = 3,34$ with a standard deviation of 0.89. Based on this means, it could be asserted that general problems experienced by assistant principals in the general inspection are at a “Medium” level.

Examining Table 2, assistant principals consider the problem “regulations and notices regarding the inspection are changed frequently” as very important with an arithmetic means of $\bar{x} = 3,71$, consider the problem “Inspection is limited with past and is not prudential” as very important with an arithmetic means of $\bar{x} = 3,57$, and consider the problem “forms and reports being used in inspection are not standardized” as very important with an arithmetic means of $\bar{x} = 3,49$.

It is observed that the finding regarding the fact that assistant principals consider the problems “General inspection reports that are presented to the presidency are not evaluated in a short time as is required”, “There is a dual inspection structuring in the national education system”, “Objective and policy of inspection in institutions are not determined”, “Inspectors who are responsible for the general inspection also inspect teachers” and “Number of inspectors in institutions is less compared to the work load” as moderately important is supported by the determination of Öztürk (1999) in his study titled “Views of Inspectors and Principals regarding the Problems Encountered in General Inspections of Primary Schools”.

The arithmetic means of the views of inspectors regarding the dimension of general problems encountered in the general inspection was found as $\bar{x} = 3,24$ with a standard deviation of 0.87. Based on this means, it could be asserted that general problems experienced by inspectors in the general inspection are at a “Medium” level.

Examining Table 4-5.3, inspectors consider the problem “General inspection reports that are presented to the presidency are not evaluated in a short time as is required” as very important with an arithmetic means of $\bar{x} = 3,68$ and consider the problem “There is a dual inspection structuring in the national education system” as very important with an arithmetic means of $\bar{x} = 3,60$.

It is observed that the finding regarding the fact that education instructors consider the problem “General inspection reports that are presented to the presidency are not evaluated in a short time as is required” as very important is supported by the finding of Söbü (2005), which was obtained from his study titled “Problems of Primary School Inspectors” and is as follows “the reports that are prepared at the end of the general inspection and presented to the Provincial Directorate of National Education are not handled sufficiently”.

The finding regarding the fact that education inspectors consider the problem “There is a dual inspection structuring in the national education system” as very important is supported by the finding of Arabacı (2010), which was obtained from his study titled “Education Inspection in the Reconstruction Process and the Chaotic Condition: Suggestion for a New Model” and is as follows “As is observed in many public organizations, there is a conflict of authority and duty between inspection units such as Ministry Inspection Committee, Presidency of Primary School Inspectors and Internal Inspection Unit within the Ministry of National Education. The assertions in 14. 15. 17. National Education Councils of the Inspection System, as well as many researches and scientific platforms support the finding, which requires assembling under the same roof.

Table 3 : One Way Variance Analysis regarding the Views of Education Inspectors, Principals and Assistant Principals concerning the Problems Encountered in General Inspections

Dimension	Resource of Variance	Total of Squares	sd	Average of Squares	F	p
Problems Encountered In Inspections	Inter-Group	1,740	2	0.870	1.132	0,325
	Intra-Group	114,465	149	0.768		
	Total	116,205				

As is seen in Table 3, according to the results of the One Way Variance Analysis that was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between the subject views of principals, assistant principals and education inspectors regarding the “General Problems Encountered in the General Inspection” in terms of the variable of duty state, it was determined as $p > 0.5$ in the lower dimension of “General Problems Encountered in the General Inspection”. This value shows that there is not a significant difference between the subject views in terms of the variable of duty state in the dimension of problems encountered in the general inspection at a level of .05.

It was observed that there was not a significant difference between the views of principals, assistant principals and education inspectors who participated in the study in terms of the variables of seniority and education level regarding the “general problems encountered in the general inspection” at a level of .05.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Regarding eight problems in the dimension of the general problems encountered in the general inspection , it is observed that two are perceived as a problem by inspectors, five are perceived as a problem by principals and three are perceived as a problem by assistant principals at a considerable rate. The fact that general problems encountered in the general inspection are felt by principals more than inspectors could be explained through the relation between the problems encountered in the dimension of general problems being encountered and roles and duties that are expected from the inspection and inspectors. According to this result; while inspectors think that the general inspection they conduct organizes and develops the system, principals believe that the general inspection is limited with the determination of the situation.

Principals consider the problems “regulations and notices regarding the inspection are changed frequently, number of inspectors in institutions is less compared to the work load, general inspection reports that are presented to the presidency are not evaluated in a short time as is required, forms and reports being used in inspection are not standardized, inspection is limited with past and is not prudential” as very important.

Asistant principals consider the problems “regulations and notices regarding the inspection are changed frequently, inspection is limited with past and is not prudential, forms and reports being used in inspection are not standardized” as very important.

Education instructors consider the problems “general inspection reports that are presented to the presidency are not evaluated in a short time as is required and there is a dual inspection structuring in the national education system” as very important.

The dual inspection system, which is involved in the central organization of the Ministry of National Education within the body of Counseling and Inspection Presidency and Provincial Directorate of National Education as the Presidency of Education Inspectors, is considered as a very important problem by education inspectors.

According to the arithmetic means of participants' views regarding the dimension of general problems encountered in the general inspection; it could be asserted that while principals experience problems at a "high" level, assistant principals and inspectors experience at a "moderate" level.

Reegarding the lower dimension of general problems encountered in the general inspection; it was observed that there was not a significant difference between the views of principals, assistant principals and education inspectors in terms of the variables of duty state, seniority and education level.

SUGGESTIONS

1. In the dimension of general problems encountered in the general inspection; it was concluded that while principals experience problems at a "high" level, assistant principals and inspectors experience at a "moderate" level. Thus, it is required to standardize the inspection reports and forms that are used in inspection.
2. It is suggested to develop the occupational competences of administrators and generate a system where they can follow the legal regulations regarding the inspection.
3. It is suggested to involve inspectors that are required by the system immediately.
4. It is suggested to remove the double-headed inspection system which is thought to decrease the strength of the inspection system and gather the inspection under the same roof.
5. It is suggested to determine the objectives and policies of the general inspection and inform the education inspectors, principals and assistant principals about these objectives and policies.
6. It is suggested to conduct this study in cities that are located in different service areas and compare the results.

IJONTE's Note: This article was presented at 4th International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications - ICONTE, 25-27 April, 2013, Antalya-Turkey and was selected for publication for Volume 4 Number 3 of IJONTE 2013 by IJONTE Scientific Committee.

BIODATA AND CONTACT ADRESSES OF AUTHOR



Salih Paşa MEMİŞOĞLU, currently employed as an Associate Professor at Abant İzzet Baysal University Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences. He Phd degree in Institute of Social Sciences at Abant İzzet Baysal University. He is specifically interested in educational administration, educational supervision, leadership, school management.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Salih Paşa MEMİŞOĞLU
Abant İzzet Baysal University, Faculty of Education
Department of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration and Supervision
Bolu- TURKEY
Tel: +90374 2541000
E. Mail: memisoglus@hotmail.com



Zeki EKINCI, 1998, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Department of Special Education. He graduated from the Faculty of Education. 2012, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Educational Sciences, did his masters degree in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Education inspector Zeki EKİNCİ
Mardin, Directorate of Education
Education inspectors presidency
Mardin- TURKEY
Tel : +90544 548 00 38
E. Mail : ekincizeki@hotmail.com

REFERENCES

- Aydın, M. (2011). *Modern Educational Inspection*. 6th Edition. Ankara: Hatiboğlu Publishing House.
- Aydın, İ. (2005). *Inspection in Education*. Ankara: Pegem Publishing.
- Arabacı, İ. (1995). *Competences of Primary School Inspectors concerning the Inspection Principles*. Unpublished PHD Thesis, Ankara: A.U. Institute of Social Sciences.
- Başar, H. (1998). *Education Inspector*. 4th Edition. Ankara: Pegem Publishing.
- Başaran, İ.E.(1988). *Educational Administration*. Ankara: Sevinç Printing House.
- Başaran, İ.E. (1992). *Introduction to Education*. Ankara: Kadioğlu Printing House.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2002). *New Structures and Behaviours in School Administration*. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Scientific Research Methods*. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Gök, T. (2009). *Views of Inspectors and Principals concerning the Problems Encountered in General Inspections of Primary Schools*. Unpublished PHD Thesis, Muğla University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Karagözoğlu, G.(1977). *Inspection Applications in Primary Education*. Unpublished Readership Thesis, Ankara: G.U. Institute of Social Sciences.
- MEB. (1993). *Fourteenth Council of National Education*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Printing House.
- MEB. (1996). *Fifteenth Council of National Education*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Printing House.
- MEB. (2006). *Seventeenth Council of National Education*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Printing House.
- Memişoğlu, S.P.; Ekinci, Z. (2013). Views of Inspectors and Principals concerning the Problems Encountered in General Inspections of Primary Schools. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*. Volume 2, Number 1.
- Öztürk, Ş. (2009). *Views of Inspectors and Principals concerning the Problems Encountered in General Inspections of Primary Schools*. Unpublished PHD Thesis, Muğla: Muğla University Institute of Social Sciences.

Sağlam, E. (1975). *Inspection and Inspection Techniques in Education..* Ankara: Milli Eğitim Printing House.

Söbü, A. (2005). *Problems of Primary School Inspectors*. Unpublished PHD Thesis, Sivas: Cumhuriyet University. Institute of Social Sciences.

Su, K. (1974). *Importance of Inspections in the Turkish Education*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Printing House.

Taymaz, H. (1997). *Inspections in the Educational System*. Ankara: PegemA Publishing.