

**Primary school teacher's inspection in Turkey:  
Primary school teacher's expectations about  
inspectors' guidance roles and the realisation level of  
these expectations**

Asst. Prof. Dr. Soner POLAT

Kocaeli University,  
Faculty of Education  
[spolat@kocaeli.edu.tr](mailto:spolat@kocaeli.edu.tr)

**Celal Teyyar UĞURLU**

Turkish Ministry of Education  
Primary School Inspector  
celalteyyar@yahoo.com

This summary of article, the 10th International Conference on "Further Education in the Balkan Countries", Konya-Turkey proposed verbal announcement on 23-26 October 2008.

---

# Primary school teacher's inspection in Turkey: Primary school teacher's expectations about inspectors' guidance roles and the realisation level of these expectations

## Abstract

*The aim of this research is to point out primary school teachers' expectations about inspectors' guidance roles and the realisation level of these expectations. The data used in this research that will be done in descriptive scanning model is collected from the views of primary school teachers selected randomly from Balıkesir, Batman and Hatay. When selecting data for the research, a scale developed by the researchers leaning against the Guidance and Inspection Directives of Ministry of Education, Directorate of Primary School Inspectors. At the end of the research, it is discovered that inspectors could not meet the expectations of primary school teachers. While the expectations of primary school teachers center mostly around guidance on professional development and issues about educational environment, it is revealed that inspectors, couldn't generally meet primary school teachers' expectations in all fields.*

**Key Words:** *Inspection, inspector, guidance, primary school, teacher*

## INTRODUCTION

An organisation is the coordination of the efforts made by at least two people to attain a goal (Aydın, 1986). Every organization is placed inside a system and all systems set up their own inspection sub systems to prevent deviations from the previously determined goals, to follow and revise the works of the organization and to realise a level of organisational effectiveness (Saglamer, 1985; Aydın, 1986; Bursalıoğlu 1994; Başaran, 1994; Taymaz, 1997).

It is necessary to have a control over the education processes in order to raise individuals, who are the outcomes of educational organisations, in line with the expectations of society. Inspection makes it possible to improve the education system by alleviating disruptions and also to raise individuals in line with previously determined aims and qualities. Moreover, organisational evaluation and inspection is required to determine the success rates of the activities held in educational organisations even-handedly (Bozkurt, 1995).

As it is seen, inspection is an organisational and administrative necessity. To make educational organisations more effective, it is highly important to establish and run an inspection system which comprises activities to control, follow, analyse, evaluate and improve the organisational structure as well as the inputs, processes and outputs of the organisation (Aydın, 1986).

Inspection is a process that includes all kinds of occupational aids and guidance services provided by inspectors and experts for teachers and other personnel in order to maximise the effectiveness and efficiency of educational activities at schools (Karagozlu, 1972). Inspection process comprises of such operations as offering suggestions concerning the efficiency of the organisation through inspecting the activities of the organisation, helping the personnel in their activities and development through guidance, investigating undisciplined or illegal acts and informing higher authorities about them (Su, 1974).

Recent strands have brought about changes in both the definition of inspection and the quality of activities held during the inspection process and created different views about inspection. For instance, as a result of these new strands, the term inspection has started to be called modern inspection, democratic inspection, effective inspection and some other inspection types have emerged such as clinical inspection and equal inspection (Aydın, 1986). Effective educational inspection process gives importance to the development of human resources and includes functions of identification, evaluation and development. In effective educational inspection, it is essential for the inspector to collect data about the person and activity that will be inspected, to put forth the positive and negative aspects after evaluating the situation with the data collected and to try to improve the educational processes by negotiating with the educational personnel in line with what is determined in the inspection process (Köklü, 1996).

According to 1739 the Fundamental Law of National Education (TBMM, 1973) and 3797 Law about the Organisation and Duties of the Ministry of National Education (TBMM, 1992), inspection system is established on the central and provincial organisation of the ministry. It is called “Ministry of National Education Inspection Board” in the central organisation and “Provincial National Education Directorate Primary Education Inspection Presidency” in the provincial organisation. Inspectors working for the central organisation are called “ministerial inspector” and the ones in the provincial organisations are called “primary education inspectors”.

Primary education inspectors work in the provincial organisation, that's, they are under the control of Provincial National Education Directorate. Their responsibilities are determined by 3797 Law about the Organisation and Duties of the Ministry of National Education (TBMM, 1992), law numbered 4359, Ministry of National Education Primary Education Inspection Presidency Regulation (MEB, 1999) and Primary Education Inspectors Presidency Guidance and an Inspection Directive (MEB, 2001).

Primary school inspectors have such roles as guidance, training at the workplace, inspection and evaluation, investigation and questioning. Leaning on these roles, primary education inspectors inspect organisations, principals, teachers and other personnel working in the inspection region that the inspector is responsible from. Inspectors also inspect the courses and seminars held in the educational organisations. During the inspection, inspectors inform the personnel about developments, determines the reasons that complicates or weakens the functioning of the organisation, observes the educational and managerial processes according to the related legislation and evaluates them in the light of previously determined criteria, and finally give guidance to make the educational and managerial processes more effective (TBMM, 1993; MEB, 1999; MEB, 2001).

According to the related regulation (MEB, 1993; MEB, 1999) and directive (MEB, 1998; MEB, 2001) Primary Education Inspectors generally make two kinds of inspection which are called inspection of organisation and inspection of courses-seminars. Inspection of organisation includes the inspection of the principal, of the teacher and of the other coworkers.

### **An Institution Inspection**

**Organisation Inspection:** During the organisation inspection, the physical conditions, general educational conditions, office work, student affairs, personnel affairs, accounting of materials, working capital and assets issues are inspected by at least two inspectors. At the end of inspection, the results of the observations concerning the organisation are recorded and positive and negative aspects are reported using an organisation report form.

**Manager Inspection:** Inspectors observe the work of the managers in educational organisations and report it in “Manager Inspection Form” considering the related criteria.

**Teacher Inspection:** Inspectors observe and evaluate teachers’ activities considering the 24 expected teacher behaviour listed in “Teacher Inspection Form” (MEB, 2001). According to the regulation, inspectors have to visit schools for guidance purposes at the beginning of the term and for inspection purposes at the end of the term. During the observation process, the inspector: a) have a pre-conference with teachers, b) observe at least two lessons of the teacher and record the results of the observation in teacher observation form, c) write the inspection form, d) informs the teacher about the results of the observation, points out the positive and negative aspects and gives advice, e) asks another inspector to observe a lesson when required and completes the inspection.

**Inspection of the Other Personnel:** This is the inspection of the personnel other than managers and teachers in the educational organisations. The results of the inspection are attached to the organisation inspection form including the positive and negative aspects.

### **Inspection of Courses and Seminar**

It's the inspection of the activities and courses done by the teacher according to the schedules made by the teachers at the beginning of the term. At the end of the inspection, the inspector designs a “Seminar and Course Inspection Form”.

Reflections of modern inspection approach are visible in both Primary Education Inspectors’ Presidency Guidance and Inspection Directive (MEB, 2001) and the inspection of primary education organisations. Some of these reflections are the focus on the importance and necessity of inspection, rewarding success, the investigating role of inspectors, in-service training need of the inspected personnel, using the statistics of educational sciences in guidance and inspection.

## **THE PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH**

The main purpose of this research is to find out the level of teachers’ expectations from the primary education inspectors, the extend to which the inspectors realize these expectations, whether there is a meaningful relationship between the teachers’ expectations from the inspectors and the realisation level of these expectations by the inspectors. In addition, the research aims to analyse the relationship of gender, the city worked in, age and seniority with both the level of expectations and the realisation level of these expectations.

## **METHOD**

### **Design of the Research**

This study is done in descriptive study model because it aims to find out the relationship between the level of teachers’ expectations from the primary education inspectors and the realisation level of these expectations by the inspectors.

### **Research Universe and Sample**

The universe of this research comprises 11612 primary school teachers working in Balıkesir, Batman and Hatay, which are the cities located in different regions of Turkey, during the 2006–2007 school year. 204 of 450 teachers who were chosen as samples work in Hatay, 131 of them work in Balıkesir and 125 of them work in Batman. The number of teachers taken as samples is given in considering the statistics of MEB 2006-2007 teaching year.

### Tool for Data Collection

The tool used to collect data for this research is designed by the researchers based on the observation form in Ministry of National Education Primary Education Inspection Presidency Guidance and Inspection Directive (MEB, 2001). Items in likert scale data collection tool are ranged between (1) *I certainly disagree* and (5) *I certainly agree*. Before the scales are applied, the validity and reliability of the scales are determined based on expert views and the results of pilot scheme.

**Table 1. Question numbers about scales and cronbachs' alpha**

Variables	Root Numbers	Expectation Alpha Exponent	Real Alpha Exponent
Preparation of Classrooms For The Education and Teaching	4	.84	.85
Education and Teaching Condition	18	.95	.95
Environment Relations	3	.89	.90
Occupational Improvement	14	.94	.96
Total	39	.97	.98

When the reliability coefficients for the real application are evaluated, they are proven reliable. In addition, when we look at the reliability coefficients of expectation form and realisation form scales, the reliability coefficients are found nearly similar and consistent (Table 1).

### Distribution and Collection of Data Collection Tools

Schools in cities were listed in the order of their success rates and socio-economic status. From this ordered list, first schools and then teachers were randomly selected by chance. In order to increase returning and processing rates of the tools, researchers sent more scales than the number of selected teachers and schools. 380 out of 450 scales returned, which makes the 84, 4%. 9 of 380 returned scales weren't analysed due to various reasons. 371 scales were analysed.

### Analysis of the Data

In order to determine the level of primary school teachers' expectations from the inspectors concerning their guidance roles and perceived realisation of these expectations, researchers have looked at the arithmetical average. To test if the difference between the perception levels regarding the expectations and their realisation is meaningful and if these levels change due to personal and organisational characteristics, researchers have done t test and one-way variance analysis.

### FINDINGS AND COMMENTARY

In general, there is a meaningful difference between the expectations of primary school teachers regarding the guidance roles of primary education inspectors ( $\bar{x}=3.56$ ) and perceived realisation of these roles ( $\bar{x}= 3.00$ ). Generally primary school teachers can not take advantage of primary education inspectors' guidance role. While primary school teachers have higher expectations of

guidance, primary education inspectors have a lower perception of realising teachers' expectations. In general, the level of expectations concerning all the subheadings and aspects of guidance roles are higher than their realisation level. Except item 3. a meaningful difference between the level of expectations and their realisation level in all items and aspects have been found (Table 2).

When sub-aspects of inspection roles of inspectors are considered, among all the guidance roles, primary school teachers need professional development roles the most ( $\bar{x}=3.77$ ). This is followed respectively by educational conditions ( $\bar{x}=3.53$ ), environmental relations ( $\bar{x}=3.30$ ) and preparation of classroom for education ( $\bar{x}=3.14$ ).

According to the primary school teachers' perceptions, inspectors realise the educational condition roles the most ( $\bar{x}=3.05$ ). This is followed respectively by professional development ( $\bar{x}=2.99$ ), environmental relations ( $\bar{x}=2.91$ ) and preparation of classroom for education.

When we examine how meaningful is the difference between the level of primary school teachers' expectations regarding guidance roles and their realisation levels, the biggest difference is observed in professional development aspect ( $\bar{x}_e - \bar{x}_r = 0.73$ ;  $t = 14.68$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). This aspect is followed by educational condition ( $\bar{x}_e - \bar{x}_r = 0.48$ ;  $t = 10.09$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) environmental relations ( $\bar{x}_e - \bar{x}_r = 0.40$ ;  $t = 6.20$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) preparation of classroom for education ( $\bar{x}_e - \bar{x}_r = 0.26$ ;  $t = 4.11$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) respectively (Table 2).

When the correlation coefficients between expectations and realisation levels are analysed, the biggest correlation is found between the expectations and perceived realisation regarding educational conditions ( $r = 0.35$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). This is followed by the correlation coefficients of professional development ( $r = 0.28$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) environmental relations ( $r = 0.28$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and preparation of classroom for education ( $r = 0.20$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) respectively. As the level of expectation increases, a rise is observed in the realisation levels of these expectations.

Primary school teachers have higher expectations from inspectors in all aspects of professional development. It's interesting that primary school teachers perceive inspectors as a resource for morale, job satisfaction and motivation. In addition, teachers see primary education inspectors as an expert to inform them about professional issues such as educational developments, legal changes and they have higher expectations regarding these issues.

On the other hand, it's observed that primary education inspectors couldn't meet primary school teachers' expectations in these aspects. Inspectors mostly realise teachers' expectations by helping them about routines such as how to fill in notebooks, files and how to keep records about their classes and lessons, professional meetings, general teachers' meeting and decision making. The fact that teachers' expectations from inspectors regarding professional development and that the inspectors cannot meet these expectations at the desired level puts a "professional efficacy problem" under discussion. This gives a clue about the fact that inspectors take up their inspection roles more seriously than their guidance roles. Some of the reasons for inspectors not being able to meet teachers' expectations might be that professional development activities take time, which is usually scarce, and require a higher level of professional skills.

Table 2. Classroom teachers' expectation level from controllers' guiding role, answer level To these expectations, t test and correlation expectations, t test and correlation exponents between expectation and answer levels.

DIMENSIONS	Expectation Mean ( $\bar{X}_e$ )	Std Dev	Realization Mean ( $\bar{X}_r$ )	Std Dev	Mean Diffe. ( $\bar{X}_e - \bar{X}_r$ )	t
<b>Classroom Preparation For Education And Teaching</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>4.11**</b>
Preparation of activity ports in the classroom	3.21	1.27	2.87	1.12	0.35	4.44**
Preparation and usage of classroom library	3.18	1.23	2.92	1.10	0.26	3.27**
Classroom seat plan	2.80	1.30	2.68	1.10	0.12	1.51
Equipments and tools which have to be in classroom all the time and their effective use	3.39	1.14	3.07	1.06	0.32	4.24**
<b>Educational Conditions</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>10.09**</b>
Education of students who need special education	3.86	0.99	3.03	1.09	0.83	11.93**
Effective use of teaching methods, strategies and techniques	3.77	1.02	3.11	1.03	0.66	9.65**
Use of general education and teaching methods	3.71	1.02	3.15	1.04	0.56	8.71**
Use of measurement and evaluating methods.	3.69	1.01	3.29	0.96	0.39	6.12**
Use of information technology in class and at school.	3.64	1.07	2.94	1.06	0.70	9.71**
Increasing student participation	3.53	1.09	3.05	1.05	0.47	6.80**
Effective organisation and use of excursions and observations	3.53	1.10	2.98	1.05	0.54	7.93**
Helping students reach information and make them curious individuals	3.50	1.10	3.10	1.04	0.40	5.88**
Making lesson plan	3.49	1.14	3.04	1.05	0.44	6.07**
Teaching effective use of Turkish	3.47	1.13	2.99	1.03	0.49	7.27**
Effective use of equipment and tools during lesson	3.46	1.08	3.08	1.03	0.37	5.64**
Giving homework at students' level	3.44	1.11	3.17	1.04	0.27	4.05**
Serving the principles of Atatürk	3.44	1.16	3.08	1.07	0.37	5.59**
Making students effective readers	3.44	1.13	2.98	1.00	0.46	6.96**
Improving their contact satisfaction	3.43	1.15	2.90	1.04	0.53	7.24**
Effective use time in lessons	3.41	1.19	3.02	1.03	0.39	5.47**
Showing their own leadership features as a model to improve teachers' leadership skills	3.40	1.16	2.86	1.10	0.54	7.30**
Effective use of National Anthem, Turkish Oath and Address to Youth to improve their national consciousness.	3.33	1.20	3.11	1.04	0.22	3.26**
<b>Environmental Relations</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>6.20**</b>
Developing a relation between parents and teacher	3.27	1.17	2.97	1.08	0.30	4.35**
Taking advantage of environment for teaching activities	3.34	1.14	2.95	1.06	0.40	5.48**
Introducing school to increase the school image.	3.30	1.21	2.81	1.08	0.49	6.69**
<b>Professional Improvement</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>14.68**</b>
Motivating teachers to make their work better.	3.78	1.13	2.91	1.12	0.87	11.16**
Teachers job satisfaction	3.84	1.11	2.83	1.12	1.02	13.64**
Teachers morale	4.04	1.01	2.81	1.18	1.24	16.53**
Improving teacher's weaknesses and announcing new developments in education	3.99	0.98	2.96	1.16	1.03	14.54**
Giving information about branches meeting, general teachers' meeting educational clubs, pointing out the importance of these meetings and participation and decision making in these meeting.	3.78	1.04	3.09	1.14	0.69	9.53**
Giving information about educational clubs, organizations	3.66	1.10	3.04	1.08	0.61	8.45**
Guiding about the celebration of special occasions	3.43	1.15	2.96	1.05	0.47	7.13**
Informing teachers about their own rights.	3.77	1.16	2.96	1.13	0.81	10.75**
Improving scientific behaviours and attitudes	3.71	1.13	3.05	1.09	0.66	9.03**
Encourage teachers to improve themselves	3.88	1.14	2.99	1.09	0.88	11.90**
Giving information about regulations	3.86	1.09	3.07	1.09	0.79	10.84**
Giving information about group work	3.72	1.14	2.99	1.08	0.73	9.67**
Effective use of files and notebooks of class.	3.64	1.09	3.15	1.05	0.49	7.18**
Training teachers to make them love their occupation and its requirements	3.74	1.13	3.01	1.03	0.73	10.54**
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>12.23**</b>

\* p&lt;.01, \*\* p&lt;.01

However, due to the fact that there isn't a sufficient number of inspectors and inspection process is limited to two class hours, the teacher-inspector interaction mostly turns to routine activities. It doesn't seem possible for inspectors to meet teachers' needs for professional development.

Primary school teachers' expectations center mostly on application of new programmes. Among the issues which create bigger expectations can be listed as in-class education of students who need special education, effective use of teaching strategies, methods and techniques, effective use of measurement and evaluation methods, application of general education principles, use of information technology in classrooms and at school, having students actively participate in lessons, the place of excursions, observations, research experiments during the lesson and the effective organisation of excursions, researches and experiments and their integration in teaching activities, helping students find ways to get information effectively and become independent learners.

### **According to Administrative Province Factor**

In ANOVA test which was carried out to control whether the province teachers work in affect their expectations regarding the guidance roles of inspectors, it has been observed that the provinces where the primary school teachers work have created meaningful difference in teachers' expectations regarding the guidance role of primary education inspectors' (Table 3).

**Table 3. Primary school teachers' expectations regarding the guidance roles of primary education inspectors according to the provinces and ANOVA test results.**

Administrative provinces	n	Mean*	Std Dev	Resource of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Hatay	181	3.56a,b	.75	Between Groups Within Groups	13.547	2	6.773	12.085	.000
Balıkesir	91	3.28a,c	.84		206.259	368	.560		
Batman	99	3.82b,c	.66	Total	219.806	370			
TOTAL	371	3.56	.77						

\* same letters on columns that you find shows that the differences between opinions of group on the rows.

In LSD analysis, which is done to test the expectation levels according to provinces, it is seen that the expectations of teachers who work in three different provinces differ significantly. Teachers in Batman, which is in the south-east of Turkey, have the highest level of expectations about guidance. Hatay and Balıkesir follow it respectively. It can be concluded that expectations about guidance from inspectors increase gradually toward the east of the country, which could be resulted from such reasons as the number of younger and novice teachers in the eastern regions and the different development level of the provinces.

In ANOVA test which was carried out to control whether the province teachers work in affect the level of their perceptions about the realisation of inspectors' guidance roles, it has been identified that the province worked in creates a meaningful difference in teachers' perceptions about inspectors' realisation of their guidance roles (Table 4).

In LSD analysis to test the difference among perceived realisations according to provinces, it has been found that perception levels of teachers working in all three different provinces differed meaningfully.

**Table 4. The extent that primary school teachers' perception level of primary education inspectors' guidance roles according to administrative provinces factor and ANOVA test results**

Administrative provinces	n	Mean*	Std Dev	Resource of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Hatay	181	3.00a,b	.77	Between Groups	16.311	2	8.156	14.354	.000
Balıkesir	91	2.69a,c	.79	Within Groups	209.090	368	.568		
Batman	99	3.28b,c	.69	Total	225.401	370			
Total	371	3.00	.78						

\* same letters on columns that you find shows that the differences between opinions of group on the rows.

Teachers in Batman, where teachers have the highest expectations regarding inspectors' guidance roles, believe that inspectors' guidance roles are less performed. This is followed by Hatay and Balıkesir respectively. It's interesting that teachers in Balıkesir have both lower expectations and lower levels of perceived realisation. Therefore, it can be claimed these teachers have the belief that "there is nothing more to learn". The fact that teachers' expectations are higher in Batman, where especially novice teachers work, could be due to the number of young and idealist teachers working there.

#### Analyses According To Age Factor

In order to control whether teachers' level of expectations about primary education inspectors guidance roles are affected by the teachers' age, an ANOVA test is carried out. In the ANOVA test it is seen that age factor created a meaningful difference in primary school teachers' expectations of guidance role from primary school inspectors (Table 5).

**Table 5. Primary school teachers guidance role expectation level from primary school inspectors according to age factor and ANOVA test results**

Age groups	n	Mean*	Std Dev	Resource of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
23-32 years	91	3.18a,b,c	.69	Between Groups	17.567	3	5.856	10.626	.000
33-41 years	91	3.06a,d	.86	Within Groups	202.239	367	.551		
42-48 years	102	2.84b	.78	Total	219.806	370			
49 and olders	87	2.93c,d	.74						
Total	371	3.00	.78						

\* same letters on columns that you find shows that the differences between opinions of group on the rows.

In LSD analysis to test the expectation levels according to age groups, it is seen that expectations of 23-32 age group differed from those of "33 -41", "42-48" and "49 – above" age groups , and expectations of "33-41" age group was different from those of "49 – above" age groups. It's evident that younger teachers have higher expectations of guidance than older teachers.

In the ANOVA test carried out to control if teachers' ages affect their perceptions about primary education inspectors' realisation of their guidance roles, it has been found that age variable

created a meaningful difference in teachers' perceptions about primary education inspectors' guidance roles (Table 6).

**Table 6. The level of primary school teachers' perception about to what extent primary school inspectors realise their guidance roles according to age factor and ANOVA test results**

Age groups	n	Mean*	Std Dev	Resource of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
23-32 age	91	3.90a,b	.56	Between Groups	6.396	3	2.132	3.573	.014
33-41 age	91	3.60	.87	Within Groups	219.006	367	.597		
42-48 age	102	3.42a	.76	Total	225.401	370			
49 and older	87	3.33b	.75						
Total	371	3.56	.77						

\* same letters on columns that you find shows that the differences between opinions of group on the rows.

In LSD analysis to determine in what age group there is a meaningful difference regarding perceived realisation, it has been observed that the views of "23-32 age group", "42-48 age group" and "49- above age group" differed. Compared to older teachers, younger teachers were more convinced that inspectors perform their guidance roles.

#### According To Seniority Factor

In the ANOVA test carried out to control if teachers' seniority affect their expectations about primary education inspectors' guidance roles, it has been found that seniority variable created a meaningful difference in teachers' expectations about primary education inspectors' guidance roles (Table 7).

**Table 7. Primary school teachers' level of expectations from primary education inspectors' guidance roles according to seniority factor and ANOVA test results**

Seniority groups	n	Mean*	Std Dev	Resource of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1-8 years	89	3.94a,b,c	.51	Between Groups	23.584	3	7.861	14.703	.000
9-19 years	97	3.63a,d	.77	Within Groups	196.222	367	.535		
20-26 years	90	3.44b	.81	Total	219.806	370			
27 years and over	95	3.25c,d	.78						
Total	371	3.56	.77						

\* same letters on columns that you find shows that the differences between opinions of group on the rows.

In the ANOVA test carried out to control if teachers' seniority affect their perceptions about primary education inspectors' realisation of their guidance roles, it has been found that seniority variable created a meaningful difference in teachers' perceptions about primary education inspectors' guidance roles (Table 8).

**Table 8. The level of primary school teachers' perception about to what extent primary school inspectors realise their guidance roles according to seniority factor and ANOVA test results**

Seniority groups	n	Mean*	Std Dev	Resource of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1-8 years	89	3.27a,b,c	.65	Between Groups	11.443	3	3.814	6.543	.000
9-19 years	97	3.04a,d	.84	Within Groups	213.958	367	.583		
20-26 years	90	2.81b,d	.82	Total	225.401	370			
27 years and over	95	2.88c	.72						
Total	371	3.00	.78						

\* same letters on columns that you find shows that the differences between opinions of group on the rows.

In LSD analysis to determine in what seniority group there is a meaningful difference about perception levels, it has been observed that the views of "1-8 seniority group", differed from those of "9-19 seniority group" and "20-26 seniority group", and also the views of "9-19 seniority group" differed from those of "27-above seniority group". Compared to teachers with a longer length of service, teachers with a shorter length of service were more convinced that primary education inspectors perform their guidance roles.

#### Analyses According To Gender

Gender hasn't created a meaningful difference in primary school teachers' expectations about guidance roles of the inspectors and their perceptions about the realisation level of these roles.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As a result, while the expectations of primary school teachers from the guidance roles of primary education instructors are quite high, their expectations aren't fully met by the instructors. This situation can be interpreted as that the primary school teachers are in need of guidance but their expectations weren't sufficiently met by the inspectors.

While primary education teachers' expectations center around the guidance on professional development and educational practises, they have lower expectations about guidance on preparation of classroom for teaching and relationships between the school and the environment. This can be interpreted as that teachers are willing to follow the new developments in education and thus to make their teaching more effective, which indicates that teachers are ready to put an effort into improving their teaching skills. This is also an important indication of teachers' need for in-service training.

Primary school teachers' expectations are generally not met in any areas. According to their perceptions, most of the guidance roles realised by inspectors are related to educational environment.

The research shows that teachers are willing to be aware of the new developments about education and to improve their professional skills and they are also in need of professional training. That's why they have higher expectations from the inspectors in this respect. However,

it's evident that the present inspection activities are far below meeting primary school inspectors' expectations. For the inspectors to be able to perform their guidance roles better, it could be beneficial to determine teachers' expectations and to give school or even teacher based guidance in line with these expectations.

In order to make the inspection process more effective, it is essential for inspectors to improve their professional skills following the new developments in education and transfer this information to teachers through thrusting their educational leadership roles.

This study has also shown that expectations about guidance and their level of realisation are affected by age, seniority and the province worked in, but not by gender. Therefore, it would be more practical to plan and perform inspection activities according to the needs of teachers from different provinces, age and seniority groups. Younger teachers with a shorter length of service and teachers working in the eastern regions of the country seem to have higher expectations from inspectors. Therefore, focusing inspection processes on these teachers might help to make use of these teachers more effectively. For the senior teachers and teachers working in the western regions of the country, however, it could be more beneficial to give awareness training and training on subject areas.

## REFERENCES

- Aydın, M. (1986). *Çağdaş Eğitim Denetimi*. Ankara: İM Araştırma Yayın Danışmanlık A.Ş.
- Başaran, İ.E. (1994). *Türkiye Eğitim Sistemi*. Ankara: Gül Yayınevi.
- Bozkurt, E. (1995). Eğitimde Değerlendirmenin Gerekliliği. *Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*. Ankara: Pegem Yayınevi.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1994). *Okul Yönetiminde Yeni Yapı ve Davranış*. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları, Yayın No:9.
- Karagözoglu, G. (1972). *Türk Eğitim Sisteminde Bakanlık Müfettislerinin Rolü*, Arastırma Özeti.
- Köklü, M. (1996). "Etkili Denetim", *Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*. Bahar.
- MEB (1993). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Teftiş Kurulu Yönetmeliği *Tebliğler Dergisi*. EKİM 1993/2393. <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/108.html>
- MEB (1998). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Teftiş Kurulu Başkanlığı İnceleme ve Değerlendirme Biriminin Çalışma Esas ve Usulleri Hakkında Yönerge *Tebliğler Dergisi*. 2/12/1998/ 8162 <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/955.html>
- MEB (1999). *Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı İlköğretim Müfettişleri Başkanlıkları Yönetmeliği Resmi Gazete*. 13.08.1999/ 23785 <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/55.html>
- MEB (2001). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı İlköğretim Müfettişleri Başkanlıkları Rehberlik ve Teftiş Yönergesi. *Tebliğler Dergisi*. ŞUBAT 2001/2521. <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/54.html>
- Sağlamer, E (1985). *Eğitimde Teftiş ve Teknikleri*. 2. Baskı, Ankara: Gül Yayınevi.
- Su, K. (1974) *Türk Eğitim Sisteminde Teftisin Yeri ve Önemi*, İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi.
- Taymaz, H. (1997). *Teftiş: Kavramlar, İlkeler, Yöntemler*. Ankara: TAKAV Matbaası.
- TBMM (1973). Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu. (Kanun no: 1739, Kabul tarihi: 14.6.1973) *Resmi Gazete*. 24.6.1973/14574. <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/88.html>
- TBMM (1992). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığının Teşkilat Ve Görevleri Hakkında Kanun (Kanun no: 3797, Kabul tarihi: 30.4.1992) *Resmi Gazete*. 12.5.1992/21226 Düzeltme: 27.5.1992/21240 . <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/73.html>
- TBMM (1993). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Teftiş Kurulu Tüzüğü (Tüzük no:4444, Kabul tarihi: 20.1.1993) *Resmi Gazete*. 19.2.1993/21501. <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/72.html>