African Journal of Business Management Vol. 6(30), pp. 8964-8977, 1 August, 2012
Available online at http://www.academicjournals.org/AJBM
DOI: 10.5897/AJBM11.1983
ISSN 1993-8233 ©2012 Academic Journals

Full Length Research Paper

Case of administrative inspection in primary education institutions

Ahmet Akbaba

Faculty of Education, Yüzüncü Yıl University, VAN - TURKEY. E-mail: akabab@mynet.com.tr.

Accepted 17 October, 2011

The purpose of this research is to identify and provide solutions from perspective of teachers and administrators for problems faced by school principals in management and inspection, guiding related people to improve quality of education. The research seeks to answer the question, "what should be administrators' role in overcoming the problems in educational institutions arising from scientific progress and changes, dissemination of culture of quality, and adaptation to change and information society?" The population of the research is composed of administrators and teachers that served in Van during 2010 to 2011 academic year. Measurement tool was created with the participation of primary schools teachers and administrators, developed and implemented in consultation with experts working in various universities; Kruskal-Wallis test was used in analysis of the data collected. This analysis was done with the computer statistical package for social science (SPSS) for Windows 12:00. Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated as 0.95.

Key words: Primary education institutions, administrative inspection.

INTRODUCTION

Administrative inspection is, in terms of individual, efforts to control the behavior of individuals within the organization and review process, in terms of organization, process of controlling whether the organization is working in line with the objectives, the degree of success in running work, identifying and controlling the reasons for the failure for benefit of the organization, assessment and evolution, and managing the organization. There various models of inspection such as scientific, educational, clinical, developmental, differentiated and artistic inspection. We will focus on the administrative inspection model which we can address within organizational inspection. However, for educational, administrative inspection includes a wider meaning than organizational inspection.

At first glance, inspection means a little narrower than inspection, inspection and inspection are used as synonym for each other today. Inspection is a wide service area such as monitoring and evaluating the work done, making recommendations to ensure that relevant persons so that they become more productive, helping the staff in institutions for their work and development through guidance (Su, 1974). Institution's management philosophy is one of important factors in administrative inspection. In human resources management and development based participatory democratic governments; administrative inspection will be conducted accordance with motivating principle of clarity. Inspection, in terms of system specifications, is getting information of input, processing, and output elements of system and arrangement of these elements to be used in enterprise of institutions.

"Assessment" is basis of the inspection process. The situation includes comparing criteria with result of detection and a process to make value judgments. Although, control is for proving, this process is intended to develop (Karagözoğlu, 1977).

Administrative inspection is made by school principal that is authorized within the organization. In educational institutions, these duties and powers are given to school principals. 60th Article of Primary Education Institutions Regulation creates the legal basis of inspection mandate of staff in primary education institutions. Managerial inspection also provides understanding, implementation and comprehension the educational process in detail.

The main objective of the administrative inspection to maintain the administrative structure to ensure smooth

operation, check and improve the process of education and training. One of the objectives of administrative inspection is to move the school a place where it is appreciated by senior management and public. Besides these main objectives:

1. Research and investigation,
2. Making guidance,
3. Better management of the organization,
4- Provide confidence for inspector, the audited and institution,
5. Securing the objectives of the authority,
6. Improving the performance of those who work,
7. Performing organizational commitment, creating the effective school,
8. To provide understanding and to enforcing relevant legislation,
9. Improvement of quality, efficiency and productivity,
10. Reducing costs,
11. Providing decision-making,
12. To notify the changing and developing information technology practitioners can be considered among the objectives.

Managerial training and characteristics of the inspector: Education management is a profession, a branch of science. This science has its own rules as other branches of science. Education administrators should know very well and undergo training in these matters; education, instruction, inspection, techniques of investigation and motivation. Otherwise, the administrator will work to implement these fields to learn by trial and error. Such a management approach will cause large and difficult problems for the organization.

Another factor that underlined the need of inspection in education is that today, inspection is considered as associated with development rather than control. From this perspective, inspection and development of education has become one of the most essential elements for achieving the objectives of the education system (Aydın, 2005).

One of the most important duties of inspectors is consultancy. Inspectors are instructive person, who is constantly consulted. Administrative inspectors must give satisfactory answers to employees asking for consultation on issues that they do not know. Managing board of teacher, other meetings and working groups, information exchange and ensuring coordination, requires certain know-how. Administrative inspector without this kind of information can not be successful. This fund of information can only be gathered by educational training and education and training in the field of inspecting.

Last process of management is control and evaluation. Measurement of success is determining the degree of achieving goals objectively (Bursalıoğlu, 1998).Teachers should not transmit or transfer the information but guide to source of information. Bounded structures of our schools should be changed accordingly; people should be raised who does what is right (Schlechty, 1998). The goal of the inspection is to find the most appropriate value and process for education and instruction. According to this objective, the inspection will be made for purposes such as evaluation process (Bursalıoğlu, 1982).

According to Ishıkawa, providing happiness of all work-related people is the most important task of the institution. When the institution fails to fulfill this task, its existence becomes meaningless. Having sufficient income to ensure their happiness and taking pleasure from work is essential for employees (Ishıkowa, 1995). Administrative inspector should combine the staff around a common vision during inspections. Quality of school is due to vision of their executives. Vision is a harbinger of the desired world. Vision does not have to emerge suddenly. Vision occurs as scattered creations and it is a result of outstanding talent of dreaming (Brengelman, 1995). Vision is basic principles of the school decided by school administration. Administrative inspections should be done in directions of these principals. The correct principles are like compass, they never slip up. Those who know how to assess laws of nature never lose their directions, get lost or falter toward values and invitations. Wherever we are, the compass always shows the north. Principle-centeredness is essential for elf-confidence, safety, strength, guidance, and long-sightedness (Coveg, 1996).

Good administration is essential for growing and developing students for schools. Inspection is indispensable part of administration, because it is one of the processes of management control. If you neglect inspection, works will be done according to initiative of employees. If servant knows that you always neglect the inspection, he may not do his job (Başar, 2004). Education administrators people with leadership tasks. Leaders are obliged to solve problems of the people around them as their own problems. Administrative inspectors are the top executives of the schools. Being an executive with leadership qualities is a chance to convert vision into mission. According to Drucker, basis of effective leadership is caring for mission of the institution, identifying and laying them barely (Drucker, 1995). Administrative inspectors should announce time of the inspection in advance. Required documents, book and other studies should be informed. Administrative inspection should have a pre-interview with related person to prepare her/him psychologically.

Staff development activities in a systematic and regular basis build positive relationships among employees in the organization. In organizations with qualified employees, problem-solving process is shortened, and time wasting is prevented (Baron, 1989). Organizations giving importance for staff development becomes a center of attraction (Cole, 1993).

“What are opinions of teachers of school principals in

charge of administrative inspections about achieving the goals of organization and enhancing quality by inspections?" As inspection is a process of assessment and evaluation for common good, perceptions of teachers about role of administrative inspections on achieving the goals of organization and enhancing quality by inspections were taken as the basic problem.

Purpose

In the context of the main problem mentioned previously, the overall objective of this research is to answer the following questions about role of administrative inspections on achieving the goals of organization and enhancing quality and status of being an effective factor in teachers' perceptions.

1. What are opinions of executives and teachers on fulfilling administrative inspections by school executives?
2. Is there differentiation about fulfilling administrative inspections by school executives depending on their length of service, administrative experience and education level?

RESEARCH MODEL

Model of this research is single screening model which depends on general screening model. General screening models aim to describe a situation as it stands (Karasar, 1991). This study has aimed to determine the relationship between variables (gender, professional seniority, experience and education level)

Population and sample

Population of the research is composed of a total of 157 teachers from 17 primary education institutions from 2010 to 2011 academic year. Due to the unavailability of all teachers working in the province of Van, the research conducted was in the sample group. In determining the sample, cluster sampling technique was used. For this purpose, taking into consideration the geographical proximity, two of the three state schools and three private schools from five schools in the region generated by the Van National Education Directorate were included in the research through random sampling.

Data collection tools

Assessment was conducted for the validity of tool created in consultation with teachers and school principals from four primary schools including one private school. Based on feedback obtained from the joint, the tool was set. Objectives identified in the tool, teacher's work, questions written in our departments and responses were recorded and evaluated accordance with our problems. After seeking the views of expert faculty members, the tool was applied to three schools and 50 teachers out the actual sample group and reliability of the survey was measured as 0.95.

The techniques used in analyze of the data

Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values were calculated in analysis of data collected in the study, Kruskal-Wallis test was used for paired comparisons. This analysis was done with the computer statistical package SPSS for Windows 12:00. Five point likert scale was used and values were ordered from negative to positive and made available for the analysis. As average is basis for comparisons, results are graded as 4.21 to 5.00 very much, 3.41 to 4.20 much, 2.61 to 3.40 some, 1.81 to 2.60 little, 1.00 to 1.80 any. Calculation of the limits of the range is given below. Calculation of the limits of the range: Number of ranges= 5–1 = 4. Range coefficient= 4: 5=0.80 1.00 + 0.80= 1.80, 1.80 + 0.80= 2.60,_2.60 + 0.80= 3.40,_3.40 + 0.80= 4.20

FINDINGS

Arithmetic means and standards deviation of findings on opinions of teachers of school principals in charge of administrative inspections about achieving the goals of organization and enhancing quality by inspections are given in Table 1. Distributions were examined for all the answers in Table 1. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for "To what extent do you think it is important that school principals announce inspections in advance?" question is in Table 1 is 3.31 and this value corresponds to "some" range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think it is slightly important that school principals announce inspections in advance. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for "To what extent do school principals inform you about upcoming studies?" question is 2.54 and this value corresponds to "any" range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals share little information with the teachers. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for "How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?" question is 2.41 and this value corresponds to "any" range.

As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals rarely attend classes with the teachers. In Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for "To what extent do school principals reprehend students during inspections?" question is 1.91 and this value corresponds to "never" range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals rarely reprehend students during inspections. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for "To what extent do school principals ask clear and comprehensive questions?" question is 2.93 and this value corresponds to "some" range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes ask clear and comprehensive questions.

The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for "To what extent do school principals have sufficient educational qualifications to receive appropriate answers from students?" question is 3.27 and this value corresponds to "some" range in Table 1. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals have average educational qualifications to receive appropriate answers from students. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for "To what extent do school principals build good relationship with students?"

Table 1. Arithmetic means and standards deviation of opinions of teachers of school principals in charge of administrative inspections about achieving the goals of organization and enhancing quality by inspections.

Question	X	S.S.
To what extent do you think it is important that school principals announce inspections in advance?	3.31	1.56
To what extent do school principals inform you about upcoming studies?	2.54	1.38
How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?	2.41	1.35
To what extent do school principals reprehend students during inspection?	1.91	1.17
To what extent do school principals ask clear and comprehensive questions?	2.93	1.23
To what extent do school principals have sufficient educational qualifications to receive appropriate answers from students?	3.27	1.21
To what extent do school principals build good relationship with students?	3.54	1.10
To what extent does length of service enhance knowledge of school principals?	3.29	1.19
To what extent do school principals make unnecessary criticism about researching reports and studies of teachers?	2.61	1.19
To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers?	2.48	1.27
To what extent do school principals pay attention to behaviors and social activities of students?	3.54	1.16
To what extent do school principals make observations about teachers on motivating the class and student centered learning?	3.12	1.31
To what extent do school principals adopt kindly and democratic attitude during inspections?	3.31	1.22
To what extent do school principals care about address form of teachers towards students?	3.34	1.16
To what extent do school principals make negative comments about teacher in front of students?	2.57	1.39
To what extent do school principals make legal, democratic and participatory decisions?	3.15	1.18
To what extent do school principals discuss results of assessment and evaluation with teachers?	2.78	1.25
To what extent do you think school principals consult assistant principals about relations between teachers and administration?	3.22	1.16
To what extent do you approve assessments and evaluations within class made by school principals?	2.99	1.24
To what extent do you approve grading of school principal at the end of inspections?	3.15	1.18
To what extent do school principals counsel about identified deficiencies at the end of inspections?	3.05	1.13
To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?	2.91	1.33
To what extent do you think inspections made by school principals are important in enhancing quality and effectiveness?	3.61	1.19
To what extent do school principals inform you about changing and developing information technology?	3.06	1.23
To what extent do school principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections?	2.99	1.37
To what extent do find sufficient craft knowledge and technical competence of school principals?	3.04	1.22
To what extent do school principals struggle for development of learner teachers?	2.99	1.19
To what extent do school principals help on physical incompetence and financial problems during inspection?	3.10	1.26
To what extent do you find sufficient field knowledge of school principals?	3.06	1.15
To what extent do you find sufficient pedagogic formation of school principals?	3.09	1.19
To what extent do you think school principals reflect their politic view on their inspection?	2.11	1.23
To what extent do you think school principals use their fund of knowledge?	3.03	1.14
To what extent do you think school principals use their authority?	3.19	1.19
To what extent do you think school principals use their power of rewarding?	2.72	1.23
To what extent do you think school principals use their power of punishing?	2.61	1.23
To what extent do you think school principals are impartial?	3.22	1.33
To what extent do you think school principals are waspish?	2.71	1.33

question is 3.54 and this value corresponds to “much” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals build good relationship with students. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent does length of service enhance knowledge of school principals?” question is 3.29 and this value corresponds to “some” range in Table 1. As result, we can conclude that teachers think length of service moderately enhance knowledge of school principals. In Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals make unnecessary criticism about researching reports and studies of teachers?” question is 2.61 and this value corresponds to “some” range. As result, we can conclude

that teachers think school principals sometimes make unnecessary criticism about researching reports and studies of teachers. In Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers?” question is 2.48 and this value corresponds to “any” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals rarely lecture sample lessons for teachers. In the same table The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals pay attention to behaviors and social activities of students?” question is 3.54 and this value corresponds to “much” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals usually pay attention to behaviors and social activities of students.

The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals make observations about teachers on motivating the class and student centered learning?” question in Table 1, is 3.12 and this value corresponds to “some” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes make observations about teachers on motivating the class and student centered learning. In Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals adopt kindly and democratic attitude during inspections?” question is 3.31 and this value corresponds to “some” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes adopt kindly and democratic attitude during inspections. According to Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals care about address form of teachers towards students?” question is 3.34 and this value corresponds to “some” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes care about address from of teachers towards students. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals make negative comments about teacher in front of students?” question is 2.57 and this value corresponds to “any” range in the table. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals never make negative comments about teacher in front of students.

The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals make legal, democratic and participatory decisions?” question is 3.15 and this value corresponds to “some” range in Table 1. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes make legal, democratic and participatory decisions. According to Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals discuss results of assessment and evaluation with teachers?” question is 2.78 and this value corresponds to “some” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes discuss results of assessment and evaluation with teachers. According to Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you think school principals consult assistant principals about relations between teachers and administration?” question is 3.22 and this value corresponds to “some” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes consult assistant principals about relations between teachers and administration. According to Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you approve assessments and evaluations within class made by school principals?” question is 2.99 and this value corresponds to “some” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers sometimes approve assessments and evaluations within class made by school principals.

The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you approve grading of school principal at the end of inspections?” question is 3.15 and this value corresponds to “some” range in Table 1. As result, we can conclude that teachers sometimes approve grading of school principal at the end of inspections. According to Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals counsel about identified deficiencies at the end of inspections?” question is 3.05 and this value corresponds to “some” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes counsel about identified deficiencies at the end of inspections.

The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?” question is 2.91 and this value corresponds to “some” range in the table. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you think inspections made by school principals are important in enhancing quality and effectiveness?” question is 3.61 and this value corresponds to “much” range (Table 1). As result, we can conclude that teachers think inspections made by school principals are important in enhancing quality and effectiveness.

The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals inform you about changing and developing information technology?” question is 3.06 and this value corresponds to “some” range in Table 1. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes inform you about changing and developing information technology. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections?” question is 2.99 and this value corresponds to “some” range (Table 1). As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of

inspections.

The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do find sufficient craft knowledge and technical competence of school principals?” question is 3.04 and this value corresponds to “some” range (Table 1). As result, we can conclude that teachers find average craft knowledge and technical competence of school principals. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals struggle for development of learner teachers?” question is 2.99 and this value corresponds to “some” range in the table. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes struggle for development of learner teachers.

The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals help on physical incompetence and financial problems during inspection?” question is 3.10 and this value corresponds to “some” range in the Table 1. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes help on physical incompetence and financial problems during inspection. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you find sufficient field knowledge of school principals?” question is 3.06 and this value corresponds to “some” range (Table 1). As result, we can conclude that teachers find average field knowledge of school principals. In Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you find sufficient pedagogic formation of school principals?” question is 3.09 and this value corresponds to “some” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers find average pedagogic formation of school principals. In Table 1, the arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do school principals help on physical incompetence and financial problems during inspection?” question is 2.11 and this value corresponds to “little” range. As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals rarely help on physical incompetence and financial problems during inspection.

The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you think school principals use their fund of knowledge?” question is 3.03 and this value corresponds to “some” range (Table 1). As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes use their fund of knowledge. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you think school principals use their authority?” question is 3.19 and this value corresponds to “some” range (Table 1). As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes use their authority. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you think school principals use their power of rewarding?” question is 2.72 and this value corresponds to “some” range (Table 1). As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes use their power of rewarding. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you think school principals use their power of punishing?” question is 2.61 and this value corresponds to “some” range (Table 1). As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals sometimes use their power of punishing.

The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you think school principals are impartial?” question is 3.22 and this value corresponds to “some” range (Table 1). As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals are sometimes impartial. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers for “To what extent do you think school principals are waspish?” question is 2.71 and this value corresponds to “some” range (Table 1). As result, we can conclude that teachers think school principals are sometimes waspish.

Findings on the research questions

Kruskal-Wallis analysis was applied in order to understand whether there is a difference between opinions of teachers due to variables, such as professional seniority, education level, and administrative experience. Result of the analysis show that Chi-square value of answers for “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?” and “To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers at inspections?” questions were found significant at $p<0.05$ significance level. Chi-square value of other questions were found insignificant at $p>0.05$ significance level (Table 2).

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers at inspections?” question depending on professional seniority of teachers ($p<0.05$). It is observed teachers with 26 years or more than 26 years of seniority give more positive answers than the teachers with 3 to 10 years of professional seniority for “To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers at inspections?” question (Table 2).

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?” question depending on professional seniority of teachers professional ($p<0.05$). It is observed teachers with 26 years or more than 26 years of professional seniority give more positive answers than the teachers with 3-10 years of professional seniority for “To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers at inspections?” question. As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, teachers with 16 to 20 years of professional seniority and 26 years or more than 26 years of professional seniority give more positive answers than

Table 2. Findings on answers which are found significant depending on professional seniority of teachers.

	Professional seniority	N	X	S.S.	Chi-square	P
To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers at inspections?	3–10 years	104	2.26	1.21	11.437	0.022
	11–15 years	12	2.50	1.38		
	16–20 years	9	2.78	1.30		
	21–25 years	7	2.86	1.21		
	26 and more	25	3.16	1.28		
	Total	157	2.48	1.27		
To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?	3–10 years	104	2.72	1.29	9.614	0.047
	11–15 years	12	2.83	1.11		
	16–20 years	9	3.67	1.22		
	21–25 years	7	2.86	1.77		
	26 and more	25	3.48	1.36		
	Total	157	2.91	1.33		
To what extent do school principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections?	3-10 years	104	2.77	1.29	9.828	0.043
	11-15 years	12	3.17	1.34		
	16-20 years	9	3.22	1.72		
	21-25 years	7	3.86	1.35		
	26 and more	25	3.52	1.39		
	Total	157	2.99	1.37		

teachers with 3-10 years of professional seniority for “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation” question (Table 2).

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do school principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections?” question depending on professional seniority of teachers ($p<0.05$). As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with 16 to 20 years of professional seniority and 26 years or more than 26 years of professional seniority and teachers with 3 to 10 years of professional seniority (Table 2). Teachers with 21 to 25 years of professional seniority and 26 years or more than 26 years of professional seniority give more positive answers than teachers with 3 to 10 years of professional seniority for “To what extent do school principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections?” question (Table 2).

Findings on perceptions of teachers depending on their administrative experience

Kruskal-Wallis analysis was applied in order to understand whether there is a difference between opinions of teachers depending on their administrative experience. Result of the analysis show that Chi-square value of answers for “How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?”, “To what extent do school principals counsel about identified deficiencies at the end of audits?”, “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?”, “To what extent do you find sufficient pedagogic formation of school principals?” and “To what extent do you think school principals are impartial?” questions were found significant at $p<0.05$ significance level. Chi-square value of other questions were found insignificant at $p>0.05$ significance level in Table 3.

There is a significant difference between answers for “How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?” question depending on administrative experience of teachers ($p<0.05$) (Table 3). As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with 11 to 15 years of administrative experience and teachers with 21 to 25 years of administrative experience. It is observed teachers with 11 to 15 years of administrative experience give more positive answers than the teachers with 21 to 25 years of administrative experience for “How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?” question.

There is a significant difference between answers for

Table 3. Findings on answers which are found significant depending on administrative experience of teachers.

	Administrative experience	N	X	S.S.	Chi-square	P
How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?	3–10 years	126	2.30	1.32	9.961	0.041
	11–15 years	19	2.95	1.39		
	16–20 years	2	3.00	1.41		
	21–25 years	4	1.25	0.50		
	26 and more	6	3.33	1.51		
	Total	157	2.41	1.35		
To what extent do school principals counsel about identified deficiencies at the end of audits?	3–10 years	126	3.02	1.11	9.679	0.046
	11–15 years	19	3.21	1.08		
	16–20 years	2	2.00	1.41		
	21–25 years	4	2.25	1.50		
	26 and more	6	4.17	.75		
	Total	157	3.05	1.13		
To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?	3–10 years	126	2.84	1.31	11.383	0.023
	11–15 years	19	3.37	1.34		
	16–20 years	2	2.50	2.12		
	21–25 years	4	1.50	1.00		
	26 and more	6	4.00	0.63		
	Total	157	2.91	1.33		
To what extent do you find sufficient pedagogic formation of school principals?	3–10 years	126	3.06	1.15	12.726	0.013
	11–15 years	19	2.95	1.27		
	16–20 years	2	2.00	1.41		
	21–25 years	4	3.00	1.41		
	26 and more	6	4.67	0.52		
	Total	157	3.09	1.19		
To what extent do you think school principals are impartial?	3–10 years	126	3.17	1.27	11.254	0.024
	11–15 years	19	3.47	1.58		
	16–20 years	2	1.50	0.71		
	21–25 years	4	2.50	1.73		
	26 and more	6	4.50	0.55		
	Total	157	3.22	1.33		

“To what extent do school principals counsel about identified deficiencies at the end of inspections?” question depending on administrative experience of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 3. As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with 26 years or more than 26 years of administrative experience and teachers with 3 to 10 years of administrative experience. It is observed teachers with 26 years or more than 26 years of administrative experience give more positive answers than the teachers with 3 to 10 years of administrative experience for “How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?” question.

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?” question depending on administrative experience of teachers ($p<0.05$) (Table 3). As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with 3 to 10 years of administrative experience, 11 to 15 years of administrative experience, 21 to 25 years of administrative

experience and 26 years or more than 26 years of administrative experience. It is observed teachers with 3 to 10 years of administrative experience and11 to 15 years of administrative experience give more positive answers than the teachers with 21 to 25 years of administrative experience and 26 years or more than 26 years of administrative experience for “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?” question.

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do you find sufficient pedagogic formation of school principals?” question depending on administrative experience of teachers ($p<0.05$). As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with 26 years or more than 26 years of administrative experience and teachers with 3 to 10 years of administrative experience, 11 to 15 years of administrative experience, 21 to 25 years of administrative experience. It is observed teachers with 26 years or more than 26 years of administrative experience give more positive answers than the teachers with 3 to 10 years of administrative experience, 11 to 15 years of administrative experience, 21 to 25 years of administrative experience for “To what extent do you find sufficient pedagogic formation of school principals?” question.

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do you think school principals are impartial?” question depending on administrative experience of teachers ($p<0.05$) (Table 3). As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with 26 years or more than 26 years of administrative experience and teachers with 3 to 10 years of administrative experience. It is observed teachers with 26 years or more than 26 years of administrative experience give more positive answers than the teachers with 3 to 10 years of administrative experience for “To what extent do you think school principals are impartial?” question.

Findings on perceptions of teachers depending on their level of education

Kruskal-Wallis analysis was applied in order to understand whether there is a difference between opinions of teachers depending on their education level. Result of the analysis show that Chi-square value of answers for “To what extent do school principals inform you about upcoming studies?”, “How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?”, “To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers?”, “To what extent do school principals discuss results of assessment and evaluation with teachers?”, “To what extent do you approve assessments and evaluations within class made by school principals?” “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?”, “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?”, “To what extent do school principals inform you about changing and developing information technology?”, “To what extent do school principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections?”, “To what extent do school principals struggle for development of learner teachers?”, “To what extent do you find sufficient field knowledge of school principals?”, “To what extent do you think school principals use their fund of knowledge?” questions were found significant at $p<0.05$ significance level. Chi-square value of other questions were found insignificant at $p>0.05$ significance level (Table 4).

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do school principals inform you about upcoming studies?” question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) (Table 4). As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level, teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree for “To what extent do school principals inform you about upcoming studies?” question.

There is a significant difference between answers for “How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?” question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) (Table 4). As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level, teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree for “How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?” question.

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers?” question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) (Table 4). As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level, teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree for “To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers?”

Table 4. Findings on answers which are found significant depending on level of education of teachers.

	Education	N	X	S.S.	Chi-square	P
To what extent do school principals inform you about upcoming studies?	Two-year	24	3.29	1.55	8.364	0.039
	Three-year	4	2.75	0.96		
	Four -year	112	2.41	1.31		
	Master degree	17	2.24	1.35		
	Total	157	2.54	1.38		
How often school principal attend classes with the teacher?	Two-year	24	3.42	1.44	14.619	0.002
	Three -year	4	2.50	1.00		
	Four -year	112	2.18	1.24		
	Master degree	17	2.47	1.42		
	Total	157	2.41	1.35		
To what extent do school principals lecture sample lessons for teachers?	Two-year	24	3.29	1.19	13.810	0.003
	Three -year	4	3.25	0.96		
	Four -year	112	2.32	1.21		
	Master degree	17	2.18	1.38		
	Total	157	2.48	1.27		
To what extent do school principals discuss results of assessment and evaluation with teachers?	Two-year	24	3.54	1.10	13.492	0.004
	Three -year	4	2.75	1.50		
	Four -year	112	2.58	1.21		
	Master degree	17	3.06	1.29		
	Total	157	2.78	1.25		
To what extent do you approve assessments and evaluations within class made by school principals?	Two-year	24	3.58	1.18	8.084	0.044
	Three -year	4	3.00	1.41		
	Four -year	112	2.84	1.22		
	Master degree	17	3.12	1.27		
	Total	157	2.99	1.24		
To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?	Two-year	24	3.79	1.18	12.455	0.006
	Three -year	4	2.75	1.71		
	Four -year	112	2.75	1.28		
	Master degree	17	2.76	1.44		
	Total	157	2.91	1.33		
To what extent do school principals inform you about changing and developing information technology?	Two-year	24	3.71	1.16	9.429	0.024
	Three -year	4	3.00	0.82		
	Four -year	112	2.96	1.21		
	Master degree	17	2.76	1.30		
	Total	157	3.06	1.23		
To what extent do school principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections?	Two-year	24	3.83	1.27	10.794	0.013
	Three -year	4	3.00	1.63		
	Four -year	112	2.82	1.32		
	Master degree	17	2.94	1.39		
	Total	157	2.99	1.37		
To what extent do school principals struggle for development of learner teachers?	Two-year	24	3.79	1.18	13.829	0.003
	Three -year	4	3.00	1.63		

Table 4. Contd.

	Four -year	112	2.84	1.14		
	Master degree	17	2.88	1.17		
	Total	157	2.99	1.19		
To what extent do you find sufficient field knowledge of school principals?	Two-year	24	3.67	1.13	15.472	0.001
	Three -year	4	2.75	1.50		
	Four -year	112	2.88	1.09		
	Master degree	17	3.53	1.07		
	Total	157	3.06	1.15		
To what extent do you think school principals use their fund of knowledge?	Two-year	24	3.67	1.20	11.208	0.011
	Three -year	4	3.25	1.50		
	Four -year	112	2.87	1.08		
	Master degree	17	3.12	1.12		
	Total	157	3.03	1.14		

question (Table 4).

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do school principals discuss results of assessment and evaluation with teachers?” question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) (Table 4). As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level, and teachers with four-year of education level. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level for “To what extent do school principals discuss results of assessment and evaluation with teachers?” question.

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do you approve assessments and evaluations within class made by school principals?” question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4. As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level and teachers with four-year of education level. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level for “To what extent do you approve assessments and evaluations within class made by school principals?” question.

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?” question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4. As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level, four-year of education level and teachers with master degree. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree for “To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?” question.

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do school principals inform you about changing and developing information technology?” question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4. As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level, teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree for “To what extent do school principals inform you about changing and developing information technology?” question.

There is a significant difference between answers for “To what extent do school principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections?” question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4. As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level, teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree for “To what extent do school

principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections?" question.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do school principals struggle for development of learner teachers?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4. As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level, teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level and master degree for "To what extent do school principals struggle for development of learner teachers?" question.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do you find sufficient field knowledge of school principals?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4. As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level, teachers with four-year of education level and teachers with master degree. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level and master degree give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level for "To what extent do you find sufficient field knowledge of school principals?" question.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do you think school principals use their fund of knowledge?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4. As result of paired comparisons made by Mann-Whitney U test in order to understand the difference, there is a significant difference between answers of teachers with two-year of education level and teachers with four-year of education level. It is observed teachers with two-year of education level give more positive answers than the teachers with four-year of education level for "To what extent do you think school principals use their fund of knowledge?" question.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do school principals discuss results of assessment and evaluation with teachers?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with two-year of education level is 3.29, teachers with three-year of education is 3.25 and these values correspond to "some" range. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with four-year of education level is 2.32 teachers with master degree is 2.18 and these values correspond to "little" range in the table. As a result, we can conclude that teachers with four-year of education and teachers with master degree look pessimistic than teachers with two-year of education and teachers with three-year of education.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do you approve assessments and evaluations within class made by school principals?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with two-year of education level is 3.58 and this value corresponds to "much" range. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with three-year of education is 3.00, teachers with four-year of education level is 2.32, teachers with master degree is 2.18 and these values correspond to "some" range in the table. As a result, we can conclude that teachers with two-year of education look positively.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do school principals enlighten and guide you on use of communication, efficiency and motivation?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with two-year of education level is 3.79 and this value corresponds to "much" range. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with three-year of education is 2.75, teachers with four-year of education level is 2.75, teachers with master degree is 2.76 and these values correspond to "some" range in the table. As a result, we can conclude that teachers with two-year of education look positively.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do school principals inform you about changing and developing information technology?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$) in Table 4 The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with two-year of education level is 3.71 and this value corresponds to "much" range. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with three-year of education is 3.00, teachers with four-year of education level is 2.96, teachers with master degree is 2.76 and these values correspond to "some" range in the table. As a result, we can conclude that teachers with two-year of education look positively.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do school principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$). The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with two-year of education level is 3.83 and this value corresponds to "much" range in Table 4. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with three-year of education is 3.00, teachers with four-year of education level is 2.82, teachers with master degree is 2.94 and these values correspond to "some" range in Table 4. As a result, we can conclude that teachers with two-year of education look positively.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do school principals struggle for development of learner teachers?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$). The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with two-year of education level is 3.79 and this value corresponds to

"much" range. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with three-year of education is 3.00, teachers with four-year of education level is 2.84, teachers with master degree is 2.88 and these values correspond to "some" range in Table 4. As a result, we can conclude that teachers with two-year of education look positively.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do you find sufficient field knowledge of school principals?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$). The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with two-year of education level is 3.67 and teachers with master degree is 3.53 and these values correspond to "much" range. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with three-year of education is 2.75, teachers with four-year of education level is 2.88 and these values correspond to "some" range. As a result, we can conclude that teachers with two-year of education and teachers with master degree look positively.

There is a significant difference between answers for "To what extent do you think school principals use their fund of knowledge?" question depending on education level of teachers ($p<0.05$). The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with two-year of education level is 3.67 and this value corresponds to "much" range. The arithmetic average of the answers given by teachers with three-year of education is 3.25, teachers with four-year of education level is 2.87, teachers with master degree is 3.12 and these values correspond to "some" range in Table 4. As a result, we can conclude that teachers with two-year of education look positively.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research is to make the relevant guidance for problems faced by the management and inspection of school principals and identify and provide solutions through the eyes of a teacher and administrator to improve the quality of the education system. As a result of evaluation of the implementation of the survey, it is observed that school principals rarely attend classes with the teachers, share little information with the teachers about upcoming studies and have difficulty against ask clear and comprehensive questions. School administrators in Turkey, supervising the performance of teachers and classroom instruction, as noted above, visit each teacher once in a semester intended for teacher training and increase the effectiveness of education (Gürsel, 1997). School principal are also register chiefs of teachers at the same time, and they enter into the register with a grade after inspections (MEB, 1991).

In line with expectation of teachers, case of being democratic, informed, compliant to ethic principle of administrative inspection comes to the front font. When research conducted in the region are examined, it was observed that school executives do not stick to schedule but work according to workload of teachers (Kurt, 2009). This result shows parallelism with that school executives do not announce the inspections in advance. Teachers express that school principals rarely lecture sample lessons for teachers, they rarely attend classes with the teachers, share little information with the teachers and have difficulty to ask clear and comprehensive questions. These results show that people to be appointed for the position of school principle should have post graduate education on educational administration. E-mail: ozbas68@gmail.com

In inspection of education, necessity of a new perspective is mentioned in the literature (Aydın, 1986; Başar, 1988; Bursalıoğlu, 1991; Taymaz, 1997; Başar, 2000; Öz, 2003). It is observed that school teachers do not guide and help teachers on matters such as making use of the time well, efficiency, quality, and communication and motivation. Teachers express that school principals hardly counsel about identified deficiencies at the end of inspections. The purposes of the contemporary inspection systems are identifying the shortcomings of the system and improving system by remedial and developmental activities. For this reason, inspector should counsel executives to develop themselves (tanergok35@mynet.com). It is observed that administrative inspectors coming to the school do not fully have professional knowledge and technical competence.

Teachers express that think school principals do not really development of learner teachers, and they find think school principals partial. Teachers express that school principals do not behave pedagogically in lessons during the inspection, they sometimes inform teachers about changing and developing information technology and they rarely lecture sample lessons for teachers (www.sosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr). Teachers express that length professional seniority enhances knowledge of school principals. It is observed that school principals do not make observations about teachers on motivating the class and student centered learning. Teachers express that school principals fail to make legal, democratic and participatory decisions. Teachers express that school principals do not discuss results of assessment and evaluation with teachers, they do not approve grading of school principal at the end of inspections. We can conclude that teachers think school principals treat fairly when rewarding successful teacher at end of inspections. Concordantly, these proposals are brought forward about perceptions of teachers on role of administrative inspectors of achieving the goals of organization and enhancing quality: Administrative inspections should be announced in advance, the inspector attend classes with the teachers. Regulations of administrative inspections for primary education institutions should be made and standards administrative inspection should be restored immediately. Sample lessons should be given by school

principals for purpose of counseling. In administrative inspection, assessment and evaluation requires technical competence and hence administrative inspectors should attend in-service training. School principals should be trained by MEB in fields of educational administration and administrative inspection, graduate education should be trained by universities for teachers.

REFERENCES

Aydın M (2005). Modern Education Discipline. Ankara. Pegem A Publication, p. 14.

Aydın M(1986). Education Management, Ankara. IM Publication.

Başar H (2004). Education and School Administration. Ankara. Pegem A Publication, p. 25.

Basar H (1988). Teachers' Assessment Ankara. Hacettep University.Education Faculty.

Baron T (1989). Ed Cowling AG, Mailer CJB. Managing Human Pesources, London. Hodder Stoughton, p. 35.

Brengelman JC (1995). Vision and Charismatic Administration According to Behavioral Psychology, Vision Administration, Istanbul. Evrim Publication, p. 25.

Bursalıoğlu Z (1982). New Construction and Behavior at School Administration, Ankara. Pegem A Publication, p. 125.

Bursalıoğlu Z (1998). New Construction and Behavior at School Administration, Ankara. Pegem A Publication, p. 3.

Bursalıoğlu Z (1991) New Construction and Behavior at School Administration, Ankara. Pegem, No: 2.

Cole GA (1993). Management theory in practice, DP, London. Publications Ltd., p. 316.

Coveg TR (1996). The Leader in the New Paradşgm, the Leader of the Future San: Jossey Buss Publishers, Francisco, Pp. 151.

Drucker PF (1995). Management for Future, (Translater:. F. Üçcan) Ankara. Is Bank Publication. Pp. 130. E-mail: ozbas68@gmail.com.

Gürsel M (1997). School Administration, Konya. Mikro Publication, p. 104.

Kurt S (2009). Research The Opinion Concerning of Elementary Schools Managers' inspection, Edirne. Trakya University Social Science Institute. Administrator.

Karagözoğlu G (1977). Control Practice at Elementary Schools. Ankara. Unpublicated Doctoral Thesis, 24: 25.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB) (1991). Register Chiefs Regulations of The National Education of Ministiry, Ankara. Gazette. S, 20890. www.sosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr.

Ishıkowa K (1995). Control of Total Quality, Istanbul. Quality Association Publication, p. 42.

Öz F (2003). Visitorial at The National Education of Turkey Republiaction, Eskisehir. Osmangazi University Publication No:88. Ankara. Publication of T.C. Department of The National Education of Ministiry Supervisory Governance Unit.

Schlechty PC (1998). Schools the Twenty-First Century. San Francisco. Third Printing Jossey Bass Inc., p. 41.

Su K (1974). Importance of Visitorial at The Turkish Education System. Istanbul. The National Education Printing House, p. 36.

Taymaz H (1997). Visitorial at Education System (Concepts, Principles, Methods) Ankara.TAKAV Printing Press. tanergok35@mynet.com.