

## **Accomplishment Level of Guidance Role by Primary Education Inspectors According to Primary School Principals and Inspectors Themselves**

<sup>1</sup>Sabri Çelik and <sup>2</sup>Berna Balcı

<sup>1</sup>Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Technical Education, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Yamantürk Vocational High School of Trade and Anatolian Vocational High School of Trade, Ankara, Turkey

---

**Abstract:** The purpose of this article is to identify the accomplishment level of guidance role of primary school inspectors according to the views of primary school principals and inspectors themselves. A 30-item questionnaire developed by researchers with this purpose was administered to 257 primary school principals in primary education and 125 primary school inspectors working in the central districts of the province of Ankara. The findings of the stated that primary school inspectors have accomplished their guidance role at a middle or high level according to their own views, but at a low or middle level according to principals. The research findings are consistent with the findings of the research dealing with similar subjects.

**Key words:** Primary School Inspector · Primary School Principal · Guidance

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Inspection is the process of controlling one's behavior on behalf of the public. Inspection in the education system is a process synthesizing the results predicted through various theories. These theories are grouped into three. In the first group, there are learning, personality and behavior theories. In the second group, there are legal and political theories and the theories related to knowledge and group dynamics. In the third group, there are organization, administration and communication and role theories [1].

Inspectors have a lot of roles, including inspection, except for the guidance role in the inspection of educational institutions. However, the most important one of all is the guidance role [2]. Along with this, the inspection concept involves not only supervision and investigation procedures but also vocational guidance and assistance necessary for the objectives of the institution [3,4,5].

Guidance is the assistance to an individual in decision making, adaptation and problem solving [6]. Guidance is an assistance process provided to the individual by professionals in meeting the requirements by developing the individual's within the reality of nature and society. The importance of guidance role stems from the increased success and productivity of the institution thanks to inspectors since they explain to teachers and administrators what to do and how to do it to achieve the best and the route to be followed rather than detecting errors and shortcomings in an institution. To be able to achieve this, the guidance role of inspectors should dominate their inspection role. In this way, teachers and administrators see inspectors as leaders guiding them in the information exchange, helping them develop their schools and therefore increase the success and quality of the education system and conveying educational changes and developments to teachers and administrators [2,7].

---

**Corresponding Author:** Dr. Sabri Çelik, Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Technical Education,  
Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey

The implication of inspection as a concept depends on understanding what components form it. The first component of inspection is the identification of the existing condition. The second component is assessment. Assessment is can be defined as comparing measurement results in a scale and making a value judgment. Assessment involves the provision of information for decisions and focusing on decision options. The third component is correction and development activities related to implementation of alternatives which are transformed into decisions as a result of assessment [8].

As well as being one of the processes of administration, inspection assists in the rearrangement of other processes. Therefore, different activities and techniques are applied in inspection. These activities are accepted to be successful if they are organized according to the following basic principles [9].

**Intentionality:** It is impossible for inspection activities which are not guided by pre-determined objectives to contribute to educational activities. People involved in the process of inspection should be aware of the objective of inspection.

**Planning:** This principle means thinking about the work, identifying intermediate and basic objectives, programming and identifying the steps to be taken in place and time in detail.

**Continuity:** Inspection should be continuous to be able to accomplish its objectives. The developments in the field of science and technology require continuity in inspection.

**Objectivity:** Dealing with and examining a subject or matter on the basis of phenomena without considering personal opinions and tendencies in inspection is objectivity.

**Clarity:** This principle clearly states what is expected from staff in the processes and objectives.

**Being Democratic:** Providing an atmosphere facilitating participation and cooperation of the related people and creating democratic attitudes are requirements of this principle. Being democratic in inspection removes the drawbacks of autocracy.

**Being Incentive:** The pride and excitement provided by being a member of an organization are directly proportional to the productivity of the service. In the inspection process, triggering the interest, desire and excitement of the employees is the basic principle.

The efficiency of educational system is determined through inspection because inspection provides administration with information about itself by preventing educational system from deviating planned organizational objectives and supervising the operation of organization [10] and helps administration in the detection, correction and development of the shortcomings [11]. The units responsible for inspection in Turkish Education System are The Committee of Ministry Inspection and The Presidency of Primary School Inspectors. It is stated that inspection system in Turkey shares certain similarities with the ones in the countries in European Union with this structure [12].

In addition, some of the reasons that make inspection necessary can be stated as follows [13]:

1. Educational policy is multidirectional and complicated.
2. Educational organizations include various organizations within their structure.
3. Educational organizations are always in line with the impact of interest groups
4. Educational inputs are people, tools and objectives, but products are only people and their evaluation.
5. It requires a great deal of effort and coordination in terms of time, work and financing to direct people to certain goals.
6. Educational organizations are composed of bureaucratic establishments and institutions and education system is in interaction with its environment.

It is inspector's duty to help teachers achieve their goals, develop learning-teaching process in the classroom and achieve vocational change and development [14].

Sergiovanni and Starrat [15] state that the most important goal of educational inspection is to develop students and therefore society. The second goal is to provide leadership behavior in order to implement a convenient curriculum at each level and domain of the education system. The third goal is to develop an environment that promotes learning and teaching. Inspection should look for ways that enhance learning and teaching techniques in every possible way, create physical, social, psychological atmosphere and environment that support learning, combine, coordinate all educational efforts and provide their permanence. Besides, Sergiovanni and Starrat [15] indicate that inspection has the purpose of quality control, professional development and motivating teachers. In terms of quality control, inspectors are responsible for managing learning and instruction and fulfill this responsibility by visiting schools, talking to individuals in the organization. As for professional development, the second goal of inspection is to help teachers enhance their instructional skills and classroom experiences and increase their knowledge. It is stated that motivating teachers, the third goal of inspection, contributes to the level of teaching and the objectives of school, though this is often ignored.

It is observed that a great deal of research into inspection and primary school inspectors has been conducted in our country [5,8,16,17,18,19]. The findings of this research have consistently suggested that primary school teachers do not have necessary pre-service and in-service training facilities; the number of inspectors is not sufficient; teachers and school administrators do not pay enough attention to reports written by inspectors; inspection aims at detecting shortcomings and errors and teachers cannot receive the necessary amount of assistance from inspectors. These results show that primary school inspectors cannot accomplish their guidance role at an adequate level. Therefore, we aim at examining guidance role of primary school inspectors in detail in this study.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The participants of the study consisted of primary school inspectors and principals working in the province of Ankara and in the central districts of the province of Ankara. The number of primary school inspectors working in the province of Ankara is 166. The number of principals working in primary school in the central districts of the province of Ankara is 543. 125 primary school inspectors participated in the study and this number constitutes 75% of the population.

A representative sample was chosen from primary school principals through simple random sampling. To this end, 260 schools (50%) were randomly chosen from this list of the schools and their principals were included in the sample.

A questionnaire (Identification of Accomplishment Level of Guidance Role in Inspection Scale) was developed by the researcher in order to collect the necessary data. In the Likert-type questionnaire, there were 25 items related to guidance role of primary school inspectors.

Experts were asked about the content validity of the instrument and the number of items was decreased according to their views. Factor analysis was conducted for the structure validity of the instrument and the four dimensional structure of questionnaire was identified at the end of principal components analysis. After examining these items, the first dimension was called "Guidance Behavior for Getting to Know and Guiding Students" (Items 1, 2, 3, 4), the second dimension "Guidance Behavior for Classroom Management and Motivating Students" (Items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10), the third dimension "Guidance Behavior for Teaching-Learning Process, Method and Materials" (Items 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21) and the fourth dimension "Guidance Behavior for School Administration" (Items 22, 23, 24, 25).

## **FINDINGS**

125 of the all 382 participants were Primary School Inspectors and 257 were Primary School Principals. 79.2% of the Primary School Inspectors in the study were male and 20.8% were female. Of the Primary School Principals, 84% were male and 16% were female. The majority of both the Primary School Principals and Primary School Inspectors were composed of males.

When the educational background of the participants is investigated, it is seen that 72% of the Primary School Inspectors has an undergraduate and 27.2% has a graduate degree. 72.4% of the Primary School Principals has an undergraduate degree, 23.7% has a college degree and 3.9% has a graduate degree. It is obvious that the number of the percentage of the Primary School Inspectors who have a graduate degree is higher. 24.8% of all the Primary School Inspectors has the seniority of 10-12 years; 75.2% has the seniority of more than 13 years. 12.5% of the Primary School Principals has the seniority of 7-9 years; 24.9% has the seniority of 10-12 years and 62.6% has the seniority of more than 13 years.

Primary school principals think that primary school inspectors fulfill their responsibility concerning the dimension of “Guidance Behavior for Getting to Know and Guiding Students” at middle level (sometimes). In other words, the educational guidance the primary school inspectors show the teachers in issues such as evaluating the students objectively, combining the guidance work at schools with the curriculum, helping students with learning difficulty and using effective teaching methods is regarded to be insufficient.

The level of accomplishing the behaviors of primary school inspectors concerning the “Guidance Behavior for Classroom Management and Motivating Students” has been found to be at the middle level (sometimes). In this dimension, the only behavior seen efficient is guiding the teachers in classroom management by observing them in class. The behavior accomplished at the lowest level is helping the teachers find better teaching methods themselves in new situations they face in educational settings.

According to primary school principals, the inspectors accomplish “Guidance Behavior for Teaching-Learning Process, Method and Materials” at the middle-level. In this dimension, there are some competencies such as informing teachers about using teaching methods suitable for the student level and the topic and answering their questions, informing teachers about innovations in instructional technology, helping teachers make students more efficient in classroom setting, helping teachers make lesson presentations more efficient, helping them react correctly in disciplinary problems and in taking measurements. These competencies are the topics in which teachers need help most, especially today when a new curriculum is being applied. Inspectors’ help to teachers in this topic is not regarded efficient by the school principals. It should be noted that this situation may have various causes such as reserved attitude of the teachers in front of the inspectors, the idea of the teachers that inspectors may see them inefficient if they ask questions, or the attitude of inspectors based on inspection rather than guidance can be some of the causes.

It is seen that the inspectors accomplish behaviors in “Guidance Behavior for School Administration” dimension at the middle-level. Primary school inspectors have the duty of guiding the school administrators as well as teachers. However, the findings of the study show that they accomplish this duty of theirs and some behaviors at lower levels. For instance, the behavior of sustaining the collaboration of school administration, guidance service and classroom teachers in guiding students according to their interests and abilities is the one which is guided the least. On the other hand, guidance behavior on improving the relationships between the school and the families is seen at the middle level. Based on these findings, it can be asserted that as the inspectors cannot accomplish guidance behaviors for teachers effectively, they cannot accomplish guidance behaviors for school administrators, either.

According to their own views, primary school inspectors do their duties at the high level in accomplishing the behaviors in the ‘guidance behavior of getting to know and guiding the students’ dimension. The educational guidance behaviors the primary school inspectors show teachers in evaluating students objectively, combining the guidance work at schools with the curriculum, helping students with learning difficulty and using effective teaching methods are not seen efficient. It has been found that according to principals, inspectors accomplish behaviors related to the same dimension at the middle level. It is obvious that the inspectors view their behaviors efficient. Yet, it should be noted here that even the inspectors themselves do not think that they accomplish these behaviors at quite a high level.

Table 1: t-test results related to comparison between the accomplishment level of guidance role of primary school inspectors and responsibility type

Dimensions	Responsibility type					
	Primary school inspector (N=125)		School principal (N=257)		t	p
	X	S	X	S		
1. Guidance Behavior for Getting to Know and Guiding Students	3.74	0.90	2.71	0.87	10.597	.000
2. Guidance Behavior for Classroom Management and Motivating Students	3.57	0.91	2.65	0.89	9.358	.000
3. Guidance Behavior for Teaching-Learning Process, Method and Materials	4.32	0.49	3.39	0.83	13.550	.000
4. Guidance Behavior for School Administration	13.85	0.68	2.91	0.75	11.931	.000

Primary school inspectors think that their behaviors related to “Guidance Behavior for Classroom Management and Motivating Students’ are at the middle or high level. In this dimension, the behavior regarded efficient at the high level is by observing the ability of teachers in motivating students for the lessons showing necessary guidance to teaching personnel so that they can better understand student psychology. The behavior accomplished at the lowest level, on the other hand, is guiding teachers by observing teachers’ establishing domination in classroom setting. The interesting point is that while the inspectors think that they accomplish ‘guiding by observing teachers’ establishing domination in classroom setting’ behavior at the lowest level, the same behavior is found by the school administrators as the one which is accomplished at the highest level. In fact, this finding possibly points to the real problem or one of the basic problems of our inspection system.

According to their own views, the inspectors accomplish “Guidance behavior for Teaching-Learning Process, Method and Materials’ at the highest level. Concerning this dimension, ‘guiding efficiently in teachers’ developing methods and techniques applied at school according to student level’ and ‘guiding the school personnel on the importance of students’ learning by doing, experiencing and applying’ are the behaviors accomplished at the highest level. The behaviors accomplished at the lowest level are ‘contributing to career development of educational staff and helping them apply the new knowledge and abilities at school setting’ and ‘guiding educational staff in becoming self-realized individuals who have judgment abilities in any situation they can face in school setting’. These findings can be interpreted as the fact that inspector give sufficient information to teachers about teaching processes, yet they do not support them adequately in their self-development. It is seen that principals’ and inspectors’ views vary in this dimension. Principals claim that both in instructional processes and personal development, they are given middle-level support by the inspectors.

It is observed that the accomplishment level of the behaviors in the dimension of “Guidance Behavior for Classroom Management and Motivating Students” of inspectors is at the high level according to inspectors’ own views. When the distribution in Table 1 is examined, it is observed that inspectors think that they have accomplished the guidance behavior for the cooperation and solidarity of school administration, guidance service and classroom guide teachers in the subject of directing students into courses and professions according to their interests and abilities at the high level. This behavior is reported to be accomplished at the lowest level by the school principals. As in other dimensions, in this dimension school principals see inspectors’ behaviors insufficient, but inspectors consider their own behaviors sufficient.

A t-test has been conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference in the accomplishment level of guidance role of inspectors between the views of primary school principals and those of inspectors. It has been found that there is a statistically significant difference between the views of inspectors and school principals in all the dimensions. (For the dimension of teaching guidance  $t_{(380)}= 10.597$ , for the dimension of educational guidance  $t_{(380)}= 9.358$ , for the dimension of guidance in in-service training  $t_{(380)}= 13.350$ ,  $p<.05$ , for the dimension of guidance for school administration  $t_{(380)}= 11.931$ ,  $p<.05$ ). While primary school inspectors see their behaviors sufficient at high level in all the dimensions, school principals see the behaviors of inspectors in all the dimensions sufficient at middle level. In a similar study conducted according to the views of teachers, the findings have suggested that inspectors do not accomplish their guidance role satisfactorily [16,18,19]. In this context, our findings are in line with the findings of previous studies. Both teachers and school principals are in the opinion that the guidance role of inspectors are not at a sufficient level. The striking point here is that inspectors see themselves accomplishing this role at the highest level. However, they think that they achieve some behaviors at middle level.

## **CONCLUSION**

As a result of this study, it is concluded that primary school inspectors have accomplished their role of guidance at a middle level according to principals, but at a high level according to inspectors. Inspectors are of the opinion that they have achieved some points like assisting in the development of teachers at a middle level but most of other behaviors at a high level. However, school principals think that inspectors accomplish their guidance role at a middle level. It is observed that the difference between the views of school principals and inspectors is statistically significant.

Another notable point is that according to school principals, inspectors' behavior of guiding teachers in classroom management is the behavior accomplished at the highest level, but inspectors say that they have accomplished this behavior at a low level. Moreover, while inspectors say that their behavior of informing teachers about the developments in teaching-learning process is at a high level, school principals state that this behavior is fulfilled at a low level. The results of this study are consistent with the results of the studies on similar subjects [16,18,19].

According to the results of this study, it can be stated that it is necessary for primary school inspectors to develop an open communication with teachers and to cooperate with school principals. In addition, they should inform teachers about new curriculum and how to implement it.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Bursalıođlu, Z., 1999. Okul Yönetiminde Yeni Yapı ve Davranış. Pegem Yayıncılık, Ankara.
2. Taymaz, H., 2000. Eğitim Sisteminde Teftiş, Kavramlar, İlkeler, Yöntemler. 4. Baskı. Takav Matbaası. Ankara: 2000.
3. Rudkin, D.A. and F.D. Veal, 1973. Principles of Supervision. Auerbach Publishers, Inc. Philadelphia.
4. Kepeođlu, M., 1996. Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik. Ankara: Gül Yayınevi.
5. Karaođođlu, G.T., 1997. MEB. Ankara.
6. Marks, J.R., 1971. Stoops, Emery, and Stoops Joyce King. Hadbook of Educational Supervision. Ally and Bason, Inc., Boston.
7. Sullivan, S. and J. Glanz, 2000. Supervision That Improves Teaching-Startegies and Techniques. Corwin Pres Inc. California.
8. Başar, H., 2000. Eğitim Denetçisi. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
9. Cengiz, C., 1992. Bakanlık Müfettişlerinin Yetiştirilmesi, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, İstanbul.
10. Başaran, I.E., 1996. Türkiye Eğitim Sistemi. Yargıcı Matbaası. Ankara.
11. Yalçınkaya, M., 1993. Etkili Teftiş. Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi, 189: 40-42.

12. Gülcan, M.G.A.B. and E. Süreçci, 2005. Anı Yayıncılık, Ankara.
13. Koçak, K., 1992. Yatılı İlköğretim Okullarında Denetim I- II- III”, Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi, 183: 24-30.
14. Seçkin, N., 1991. Eğitim Niteliğinin Geliştirilmesinde Müfettişin Rolü ve Teftişte Yeni Arayışlar. Eğitimde Arayışlar 1. Sempozyumu, Eğitimde Nitelik Geliştirme.
15. Sergiovanni, T.J. and R.J. Starratt, 1988. Supervision -Human Perspectives Fourth Edition. Mc Graw-Hill Publishing Company. New York: 1988.
16. Atay, K., 1995. *İlköğretim Müfettişlerinin Yeterlikleri*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi.
17. Balcı, Ali, O.E. Etkili and Bilim, 1988. 12, 70: 21-30.
18. Büyüksık, M., 1989. İlköğretim Denetçilerinin Rehberlik Etkinliklerinin Gerçekleşme Düzeyleri -Ankara İli Örneği-, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
19. Özdemir, S. and C. Necati, 1999. İlköğretim Müfettişlerinin Örgütsel yenileşmeye ilişkin Görüşleri. VIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi (KTÜ) 1-2-3 Eylül.