

Changes in the Role and Inspection Practices of Primary School Inspectors over a Ten Year-Time Period^a

Dr. Saduman Kapusuzoglu

Abant Izzet Baysal University, Faculty of Education

Department of Educational Sciences

14280, Bolu, TURKEY

E-mail: sadumankapusuzoglu@gmail.com

Tel: +90 374 254 10 00, ext:1651, Fax: +90 374 253 46 41

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to present, in a comparative way, the information regarding the change of inspection between the years 1976 and 1986 and reflections of submitted recommendations on practices by giving the findings of two studies carried out regarding inspection practices in primary schools (Karagozoglu, 1977) and the role of primary school inspectors (Oz, 1977), and the findings of the same studies repeated ten years afterwards.

In the present study, the population and sampling model are the same as those that were used in aforementioned studies. In total, 8709 people were requested to fill-in a questionnaire. Findings obtained at the end of the study were evaluated in a comparative way and certain recommendations were submitted. At the end of the study, it was determined that there hasn't been any change in the role of inspectors according to the opinions of closely related people and officials, that the activities that are stipulated by the legislation and modern inspection approaches haven't been applied in inspection practices and that the recommendations of the study haven't been implemented to a satisfactory level.

Keywords: *Inspection, modern inspection, role of primary school inspectors, inspection practices*

INTRODUCTION

Arrangement, planning, division of labour and coordination of works in an organized way are obligatory for implementation of functions of the education process which is planned and extensive. For that matter it is mandatory to control and evaluate, in other words "inspect" the realization level of education objectives that are formulated as certain roles and duties in a planned and scheduled way.

As a subsystem among all systems and as an element of management processes, the mandatory nature of inspection for the organization is a natural result of the fact that the organization is decided to continue its existence (Adams and Dickey, 1953; Aydin, 1984).

As an educational leadership, inspection should ensure that the efforts of teachers, administrators and other personnel taking place in educational activities are aimed at these objectives and it should be evaluated continuously (Marks et al., 1971).

It is an expected result that the subsystem of inspection in Turkish education system followed the developments and changes of the society over time. Based on this approach, the changes in the role of primary school inspectors and inspection practices can be summarized as follows:

Pursuant to the article 36/IV of Public Servants Law numbered 657, the institution of primary school inspection subjected to education services is founded for the purpose of guidance, inspection, examination and interrogation in primary school establishments by virtue of the article 23 of Primary Education Law numbered 222 and dated 05/01/1961 (modified with Law dated 12/10/1983 and numbered 2917).

Duties, authorizations and responsibilities of inspectors are determined as per the provisions of the "Regulation of Primary School Inspectors" published in the Official Gazette dated 10/11/1969. In this regulation which is still in force, "Duties of the Commission" are presented instead of inspector duties and "Issues to be Avoided by Primary School Inspectors" are modified.

Appointment and transfer of Primary School Inspector candidates, who succeed in the 600 hour-training course in conformity with the "Regulation of Primary School Inspector Training with On-The-Job Training Course" published in the Official Gazette dated 25/12/1982 and numbered 17909, are made according to the provisions of the "Regulation of Appointment and Transfer of Primary School Inspectors" published in the Official Gazette dated 22/08/1980.

In pursuance of the article 36/IV of Public Servants Law numbered 657, appointment, transfer and assignment of primary school inspectors included in "Education and Training Services Class" are made

^a This paper is derived from the Author's Doctoral Dissertation

according to service region indicated in the "Regulation of Appointment and Transfer of Primary School Inspectors" (4) just like the procedure for teachers.

Group inspection activities had been started as of the academic year 1973-1974 in 67 cities in compliance with the approval dated 17/03/1973 and numbered 420/13953. This practice was stopped as of the academic year 1978-1979 in compliance with the approval dated 25/09/1978 and numbered 420/53260 and small region (individual) inspection system has been put back into practice.

In pursuance of the approval dated 19/09/1980 and numbered 420/71033 of the Directorate General of Primary Education of the Ministry of National Education (now changed into Ministry of National Education, Youth and Sports), "Guide to Group Inspection" has been put into practice as of the academic year 1980-1981, and new provisions have been brought to the objectives, principals of inspection, to the definition and objectives of group inspection and to inspection techniques. The aim was to make it more similar to the inspections of the Inspection Committee of the Ministry.

When these two guides are compared, an important difference can be seen in that duties regarding professional aid and guidance are the first article of duties indicated in 1971 Guide to Group Inspection while these duties are the second article in the guide prepared in 1980.

While the guide dated 1971 includes more flexible and more democratic provisions, there are more strict articles granting less authorizations to inspectors within the guide dated 1980.

When the primary school inspection practices are evaluated in a general way, it can be seen that there have always been a search for development in inspection system.

The practice of group inspection, which has started in parallel with the change observed in the administration on 12.09.1980, is still in effect.

As per the article 5 of the Primary Education Law numbered 222, modified with the Law dated 12/10/1983, "primary school inspectors are appointed in order to carry out guidance, inspection and interrogation services of Primary education establishments. Qualifications, training types, duties and authorizations of primary school inspectors as well as their appointment procedures and principals are determined by regulations."

In recent years, the need for more primary school inspectors has increased because of the fact that the number of teachers, administrators and students in primary education establishments has increased, that second registry chief duty of primary school teachers has been given to primary school inspectors pursuant to the Regulation ("Ministry of National Education, Youth and Sports Officers Registry Chiefs Regulation" approved by the General Director of Personnel of the Ministry of National Education, Youth and Sports on 01/04/1986 with the number 60317) and that no new inspector has been appointed since three years.

Research findings on these developments that are indicated within the inspection system literature show us the state of their application. For example, findings of the research carried out by Karagozoglu (1977) on the problematique "to what extent primary school inspectors can be helpful and guiding to teachers in education-training activities during inspection practices" show that there is a significant age gap between the inspector and the inspected, that there is scarcely any women inspectors, that the number of teachers per inspector is quite high, that the on-the-job training isn't sufficient (1-2 week-seminar and course per 5 years) and that vocational guidance and on the job help to the teacher is ineffective.

It is put forth according to the findings in relation with inspection practices that the objective of inspection is an auditing activity where teachers find the weak points of the teacher, that there is no cooperation and that the points influencing the opinion of the inspector are the cleanness of the class, appearance of students and the attention paid to the inspector instead of training and education activities.

As for Oz (1977), in his study of which the objective was to detect the sufficiency of professional activities carried out by primary school inspectors as per their duty in comparison with the activities stipulated by the legislation and modern inspection approach, he reached the conclusion that there is a difference between the practices and the activities that should be carried out according to the legislation and modern inspection approach.

And Basar (1981) showed that the field the least cared within the school administration is the field of education, that administrators don't have the authority to take decision on their own and that personal and professional qualities of administrators don't create any difference among inspection activities.

Another study on inspection of education is carried out by Seckin (1982). This study has the objective to classify the qualifications that need to be shown and that are shown by the inspectors of the Ministry of National Education as well as the priorities of duties formed of these qualifications by professions. At the end of the study, it was revealed that "inspection and auditing" are the duties which take the most time, that the second place is taken by interrogation, that vocational aid is in the third place and that almost no time is spared for examination. Inspectors don't see themselves sufficient for "interrogation" duty.

The difference of the present study from aforementioned others is that the objective of this study is to analyze the changes occurred in the role of inspectors and inspection practices over a ten year-period

and to enable related and authorized persons to follow the inspection process which is an important part of educational issues, to contribute to the evaluation of practices, to make it possible to integrate and evaluate other studies carried out within the field in question, and finally to facilitate the perception of the inspection problem in education given the fact that it gives the possibility to make a comparison with a determined point in time.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is a summary of a monitoring research. In this research, the findings of a research carried out on inspection practices (Karagozoglu, 1977) and the role of inspectors (Oz, 1977) ten years ago are compared with the findings of a similar research carried out ten years afterwards.

The difference between findings obtained with a ten year-gap is defined as a change. Thus, it is tried to detect the direction of change in the problem over time by keeping the population and the sampling the same.

The population and the sampling model are the same as those that were used in aforementioned studies. However, the changes in the number of teachers and inspectors are reflected to the sampling number. For this reason, questionnaires were sent to 5401 people ten years afterwards while to 4713 people ten years earlier regarding inspection practices, and to 3308 people ten years afterwards while to 2645 people ten years earlier regarding the role of inspectors, which make 8709 people in total who were sent questionnaires.

The distribution of answers given to questionnaires filled-in by groups included within the sampling is given in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1: Distribution of Answers Given to the Questionnaire Regarding Inspection in Primary Education

	<i>Provincial Director</i>	<i>Inspector</i>	<i>District Director</i>	<i>Teacher</i>
Total Number of Officials	67	1282	580	209.731
Number of Questionnaires included within the Sampling	67	1282	580	3.472
Number of Valid Questionnaires Sent Back	54	600	538	2.553
Rate of Answer	80%	62%	92%	73%

Table 2: Distribution of Answers Given to the Questionnaire Regarding the Role of Primary School Inspectors

	<i>Inspector</i>	<i>Teacher</i>
Total Number of Officials	1282	209.731
Number of Questionnaires included within the Sampling	1282	2.026
Number of Valid Questionnaires Sent Back	1019	1.543
Rate of Answer	79%	76%

As a data collection tool for the research, the same questionnaires used in the study carried out ten years earlier were applied on Primary School Inspectors, Primary School Teachers, Provincial Directors of National Education, Youth and Sports and Primary School Teachers. Questionnaires are formed of 115 articles including those regarding work load and available resources, those regarding the activities of primary school inspectors and those regarding inspection approach. Data collected via questionnaires were evaluated in computer environment by using statistical methods and techniques. In the research, following questions are tried to be responded:

1. Regarding primary education level of Turkish education system for the last ten years (1976-1986),
 - a. What are the number and natural (age), professional (position, expected roles) characteristics of inspectors?
 - b. What are the number and natural (age), professional (position, expected roles) characteristics of teachers?
 - c. How is the inspector-teacher distribution?
 - d. What are the changes occurred in relation with primary school inspector training?
2. Regarding the two studies carried out on inspection practices (Karagozoglu, 1977) and the role of inspectors (Oz, 1977) with the purpose of comparison between two periods ten years apart from each other,
 - a. Are there differences between the opinions of closely related people and officials concerning the problematique "To what extent can primary school inspectors guide and help teachers in relation with education and training activities during inspection practices"?
 - b. Are there differences between the practiced professional activities of primary school inspectors and the activities stipulated by the legislation and modern inspection approach?

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Findings obtained at the end of research are analyzed in two groups: The first group contains the findings obtained in relation with inspection practices while the second group includes the findings regarding the role of inspectors in primary education. According to the first group of findings, the biggest change observed ten years afterwards is the fact that the average age of inspectors is younger in the actual inspection system (Table 3).

Table 3: Age Distribution of Subgroups

Age Groups	Primary School Inspector		Provincial Director		District Director		Primary School Teacher	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
20 and less	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	0.31
21-30	7	1.17	-	-	15	2.79	779	30.51
31-40	384	64	18	33.33	366	68.03	1405	55.03
41-50	137	22.83	32	59.26	149	27.70	322	12.61
51 and more	68	11.33	3	5.56	7	1.30	24	0.94
Blank	4	0.67	1	0.185	1	0.185	15	0.58
Total	600	100	54	100	538	100	2553	100

The reason of this situation is that appointments of successful inspector candidates trained in compliance with the "Regulation of Primary School Inspector Training with On-The-Job Training Course" are made during the academic year 1984-1985.

Another important change observed in comparison with ten years earlier is that being knowledgeable and active is more preferable than having experience and professional history in appointments of administrative duties (Table 4). Moreover, there is an increase in the number of inspectors within the inspection group (Table 5).

Table 4: Professional Position of Subgroups

Year	Primary School Inspector		Provincial Director		District Director		Primary School Teacher	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
5 and less	-	-	-	-	-	-	123	4.82
6-10	9	1.50	-	-	30	3.58	709	27.77
11-15	140	23.33	6	11.11	256	47.58	600	23.50
16-20	270	45	25	46.30	171	31.78	747	29.26
21-25	73	12.17	19	35.19	68	12.64	294	11.52
25 and more	106	17.67	3	5.56	12	2.23	71	2.78
Other	2	0.33	1	0.81	1	0.18	9	0.35
Total	600	100	54	100	538	100	2553	100

Table 5: Number of Inspectors in Inspection Groups

Number of Inspectors within the Group	Number of Answering Inspectors	
	f	%
1	2	0.33
2	65	10.83
3	261	43.50
4	165	27.50
5	47	7.83
6 and more	54	9.00
Blank	6	1.01
Total	600	100

Regarding the timing of inspection, there isn't any change in comparison with ten years earlier. Inspectors concentrate their inspections during March, April and May and continue their classic inspection practices. Yet it is expected from inspectors to visit teachers with fewer gaps between visits both at the start and in the middle of academic year since the main objective of modern inspection approach is the development of educational environment, guidance and leadership.

When the findings obtained in relation with the On-The-Job Training of Inspectors, it can be seen that seminars and courses organized for inspectors are still inefficient like it was ten years ago (Table 6).

Table 6: Number of Courses and Seminars Which Inspectors Attend to

<i>Number of Seminars and Courses</i>	<i>Number of Attending Inspectors</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Never Attended	165	27.50
1-2	266	44.33
3-4	126	21.00
5-6	27	4.50
7-8	5	0.83
9-10	7	1.17
11 and more	2	0.33
Blank	2	0.34
Total	600	100

In comparison with ten years earlier, the increase observed in the rate of school principals guiding teachers can be interpreted as a development improving the quality of education (Table 7).

Table 7: Those Who Guide Teachers, Other Than Inspectors

<i>Those Who Guide</i>	<i>Number of Answering Teachers</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
District Director	-	-
Primary School Principal	1270	49.75
Both District Director and Primary School Principal	1	0.39
Other	2	0.78
Nobody	1	0.39
Blank	1279	50.00
Total	2553	100

No change has occurred in training methods of inspectors and in their work load, and the number of teachers to be inspected by one inspector has increased. It can be seen that inspectors are obliged to spend most of their time not for guidance but for examinations and interrogations, standing watch in the department, classroom and course inspection, exam board membership etc. like it was so ten years ago. Another change observed in inspection practices in comparison with ten years earlier is the fact that the disagreement between primary school inspectors and national education directors is eliminated. Within the last ten years, there have been positive changes in the opinions of district and provincial national education, youth and sports directors regarding the general qualities of inspection. On the other hand, teachers have negative opinions like it was so ten years ago regarding such subjects as measurement unity in evaluations, the degree of help provided by inspectors to related people, creating the most suitable environment for carrying out training and educational activities, playing an integrating and conciliatory role between senior officials and teachers, organizing vocational conferences, giving example courses, being education consultant, evaluation of the success of teachers as a whole without paying attention to details, etc.

All groups "fully" agree upon the opinions that inspectors should be obliged to have a 4 year-university education, that the number of teachers to be inspected by inspectors should decrease and that the inspection system in primary education should be reformed according to the principals of modern inspection and evaluation.

Findings obtained in relation with the roles of primary school inspectors affirm that no change has taken place within the last ten years. Such that, like it was so ten years earlier, there are big differences between the activities that should be done by primary school inspectors as per the legislation and practiced activities, between the activities that should be done as per the legislation and the activities stipulated by modern inspection approach and between practiced activities and the activities stipulated by modern inspection approach (Table 8 and Table 9)

Table 8: Comparison Between The Activities That Should Be Done By Inspectors As Per The Legislation and Practiced Activities According to The Answers of Inspectors and Teachers

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Application Point</i>		<i>Maximum Points as per Legislation</i>	<i>Average Standard Error of Application</i>	<i>Degree of Independence</i>	<i>Calculated "t" Value</i>
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Average</i>				
Inspectors	1019	110.451	146	0.595	1018	46.10*
Teachers	1543	68.445	144	0.476	1542	111.11*

*It indicates a statistical significance level of 1%

Table 9: Comparison Between The Activities That Should Be Done By Inspectors As Per Modern Inspection Approach and Practiced Activities According to The Answers of Inspectors and Teachers

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Application Point</i>		<i>Maximum Points as per Modern Inspection Approach</i>	<i>Maximum Points as per Legislation</i>	<i>Average Standard Error of Application</i>	<i>Calculated "t" Value</i>
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Average</i>				
Inspectors	1019	110.349	160	0.125	1018	140.65*
Teachers	1543	68.446	160	0.125	1541	132.60*

*It indicates a statistical significance level of 1%

When the groups, whose opinions in relation with inspection practices of inspectors are taken (Teachers, Inspectors, Provincial and District National Education Directors and Sports Directors), are compared with ten years earlier, inspectors are seen in a more positive way regarding their professional formation and the unity of application and measurement among inspectors. It can be understood that for administrators, the exactitude of evaluation of teachers' success is perceived as high while for teachers not very much so. In the same way, teachers and administrators also indicated that inspectors don't help them in their educational activities at all and that they don't show the necessary behavioural characteristics that should be seen during inspections.

On the contrary of other groups, teachers indicate that they still aren't informed of the expectations and success criteria of inspectors like it was so ten years ago. All groups indicated that most of the time, inspectors control if educational activities are carried out in conformance with laws. Ten years afterwards, other groups also indicated that inspectors are always independent and neutral when evaluating the success of the teacher. In the same way, all groups have the opinion that ten years after, inspectors still make trustable and neutral evaluations.

In addition, in the study, it is recommended that the objective should be training inspectors through seminars and courses in relation with modern inspection approach, making necessary changes in structural foundations of the inspection system in order to enable inspectors to guide teachers during the academic year, orienting inspectors to continue postgraduate programmes, developing criteria in order to make it possible to carry out the teacher evaluation system based on impartial principals, examining and evaluating the reports prepared by different inspectors in relation with guidance and interrogation duties, and having sufficient information and attitude in order to enable teachers to benefit from inspection practices during teacher training programme.

Another finding of the research is the fact that research and application recommendations presented ten years ago by Karagozoglu (1977) and Oz (1977) haven't been applied to a satisfactory level.

In the research carried out by Oz (1977), it is recommended that inspectors should continuously be given information and publications regarding inspection practices. In the research carried out ten years later, it can be understood from the answers given by inspectors regarding this issue that inspectors follow the legislation with their own efforts and that vocational publications aren't provided to them in a sufficient and regular way.

Another recommendation of the research regarding practices is informing teachers along with inspectors. The practice today is training inspectors and teachers separately through courses and seminars.

For that matter, domestic and foreign training programmes recommended with the purpose of improving the knowledge and experience of inspectors still haven't been implemented. Even though researches carried out on inspection are presented in general to the Ministry, it is up to the Ministry to benefit from these researches and enable inspectors to examine these researches.

When the recommendations of Karagozoglu (1977) in his research regarding inspection practices in primary education level are examined, it can be seen that these recommendations aren't implemented to a satisfactory level and that old practices continue to be applied. Such that, it is recommended that an organization should be formed in order to enable inspectors to guide and help teachers in their education activities during the whole academic year. This has never been possible because neither a legal regulation has been implemented in order to make inspectors do only guidance instead of interrogation and examination duties, nor a satisfactory decrease has been achieved in the number of teachers to be inspected by one inspector.

Another recommendation is that group inspection activities should be stopped and that each inspector should be appointed a smaller region and lesser teachers so that efficiency will increase. On the other hand, inspection activities in group have been restarted at the beginning of the academic year 1980-1981 and a second guide has been prepared by making certain changes in the previous "Guide to Group Inspection".

There is no ongoing activity having the objective to implement a system which will make it possible to make more trustable and impartial evaluations in relation with the principals and methods that are recommended within the research in relation with the evaluation of teacher's success. With the "Officers

Registry Chiefs Regulation" approved on 01/04/1986, inspectors are trusted with the duty of second registry chief of teachers.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, H. & Dickey, P. F. G. (1953). Basic principles of supervision. New York: American Book Company.
2. Aydin, M. (1984). Eğitimde denetimsel davranış. Ankara.
3. Basar, H. (1981). Okul yöneticisinin denetim görevleri. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Ankara: Ankara University.
4. Karagozoglu, G. (1977). İlköğretimde teftiş uygulamaları. Unpublished Assoc.Prof. Thesis, Ankara: Hacettepe University.
5. Marks, J. R., Stoops. E. & King, J. (1971). Handbook of educational supervision. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
6. Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education, (1961). 222 sayılı ilköğretim ve eğitim kanunu.
7. Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education (1969). İlköğretim müfettişleri yönetmeliği.
8. Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education (1973). Cumhuriyet döneminde eğitim. Ankara: M.E.B. Basımevi.
9. Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education (1980). İlköğretim müfettişleri tayin ve nakil yönetmeliği.
10. Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education (1980). Grup teftişi rehberi, Ankara.
11. Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education (1982). Hizmet içi eğitim yoluyla ilköğretim müfettişi yetiştirilmesi hakkında yönetmelik, 25 Aralık 1982, 17909 Sayılı Resmi Gazete.
12. Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education (1986). Sicil amirleri yönetmeliği.
13. Oz, F. (1977). Türk eğitim sisteminde ilköğretim müfettişlerinin rolü. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Ankara: Hacettepe University.
14. Seckin, N. (1978). Milli eğitim bakanlığı müfettişlerinin yeterlilikleri. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Ankara: Ankara University.
15. 657 Sayılı Devlet Memurları Kanunu (1965).