

Full Length Research Paper

Development of course inspection skills of secondary and high school headmasters in Bartın province*

Gülsün Şahan

Department of Education Management, Faculty of Education, Bartın University, Turkey.

Received 22 January, 2018; Accepted 7 March, 2018

Headmasters are responsible for many things that take place in the school. One of the main duties of a headmaster is the task of teacher inspection. This study aims to evaluate education inspection skills of secondary and high school headmaster who work in the center of Bartın Province with the aim of also developing suggestions by identifying encountered problems during inspection. For this purpose, an audit seminar is given to 42 secondary and high school headmasters who work in Bartın province center, and study data is collected from headmasters at the end of seminar. The opinions of headmasters were obtained by "Headmaster Educational Inspection Behaviors Scale" prepared by İlğan. In addition, problems encountered by the headmasters during inspection as well as their solutions were taken in written form using semi-structured forms prepared by experts. The data were analyzed using content analysis method. At the end of the research, it is understood that there is no difference between the opinions of the headmasters according to school type, age, branch and seniority. Headmasters think inspection is necessary. Inspection is mostly carried out in the form of class visits, and additionally teachers are evaluated by observation, yearlong watching and evaluation of the obtained data. There are some ambiguities about how inspection can be done according to some headmasters. It is stated that headmasters, experts, and inspectors can take part in inspection and the opinion of all stakeholders should be taken in into consideration. Inspection forms should have tangible criteria, encountered problems should be solved together, managers should have the right to give reward and punishment, they should focus on positive things more, be fair and objective, and results should have sanctions.

Key words: Teacher inspection, inspection, course inspection, headmaster.

INTRODUCTION

In teacher inspection guide published by multinational enterprise (MNE) Inspection Directorate in 2011 based on the aims and principles of 1739 numbered National Education Fundamental Law, it is stated that it is possible

to determine whether teachers realize their mission or not, and if there are difficulties and deviations from the aim this should be corrected by inspection. The duty of management is to "make organizations fulfill their

E-mail: gulsunsahan@hotmail.com. gsahan@bartin.edu.tr. Tel: +90 3785011000-1146.

*This study is presented verbally in International Education Management Forum (EYFOR8).

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

purpose". It is expected of management to control material and human sources (Bursaloğlu, 2000).

Headmasters of every institution are responsible for fulfilling management processes. This can be done by planning, organizing, directing coordinating and inspecting. Management mission is given to headmasters by several legal texts. It is required of them to do also some correction and improvements in addition to continuation and development of organization, inspection of staff and activities (Yengin, 2012). It is seen that the tasks such as managing performance of teacher under inspection of teacher, instructional leadership of headmaster and providing administrative support to teacher are seen as duties and responsibilities of headmasters (Bostancı, 2016).

Headmasters have many duties and responsibilities, and in Turkey management of education is not accepted as a profession, making education leadership and inspector roles difficult (Bayraktutan, 2011). According to a research which is related to course inspection of headmasters, it is put forward that headmasters use inspection to evaluate teachers and fulfill an official duty more than developing teachers and course. Teachers feel uncomfortable with inspection. They see it as an uncertain process and feel restless about it. The result obtained from conducting course inspections aren't realized based on its aim (Ünal and Şentürk, 2011). There are a lot of research works on inadequacy to raise province education inspectors who are determined to see that the aim of education is achieved and that it is improved. In all, it is not possible for headmasters to maintain their inspection duty successfully without being educated (Altun et al., 2015).

From the work of Can and Gündüz (2012) on "The Benefit Level of Primary School Teachers from Counselling Studies done by Province Education Inspectors and Headmasters", most of the participants express the following: headmasters do not carry out effective inspection, they do not benefit from counselling works, and counselling done by headmasters do not solve problems encountered. The role and position of headmasters in teacher inspection is quite restricted because teacher inspection is done by ministry and primary school inspectors who have graduated from school for long.

It can be said that this restricts the inspection behaviors of headmasters, making them not to see teacher inspection and teacher development as a priority. The restriction of the role of headmasters in teacher inspection reflects also on academic studies. It can be said that much research has not been done on this topic (İlgan, 2013). It is required for headmasters to inspect the education and teaching activities of teachers in class, and arrange several activities to develop them.

Education leadership role of headmasters is more important than other bureaucratic works of school. In this sense, headmasters should inspect in-class activities,

have close relations with teachers and guide them. The aim of all these activities is to develop education activities (Fırıncioğulları, 2014). It is often said that headmasters encounter difficulties when doing their inspection jobs and remain incapable. Course inspection consists of generally just formality.

In-service well planned and operative programs which are prepared by specialists should be given priority to increase the efficiency of headmasters in inspection field. Development of headmasters in performance, evaluation, clinic inspection, communication, conflict management and information management fields should be done through in-service education programs (Yalçınkaya, 2014). It can be said that headmasters do not have sufficient inspection matter, since they did not study inspection of education. Raising headmasters in education inspection is important. Headmasters who have education would contribute to the development of teachers. Quality of education is directly proportional to teacher quality. Teacher quality should be increased to increase education quality. Inspection education would reveal teacher quality. It is believed that this study would bring positive contribution to education quality in schools directly.

The research aims to evaluate the abilities of secondary and high school headmasters who work in center of Bartın City in relation to their inspection mission, and to contribute to the development of headmasters' education inspection skills through seminars on inspection education. The followings are the research questions:

- (1) Is there any difference between educational behaviors of headmasters based on their school type, branch and seniority?
- (2) Is teacher inspection necessary according to headmasters?
- (3) How is teacher inspection carried out?
- (4) How is information for year-end teacher evaluation forms gathered?
- (5) What are the problems that are encountered in teacher inspection?
- (6) How should teacher inspection be done and who should do it?
- (7) What kind of path should be followed in solving teacher inspection problem?

METHODOLOGY

In this research, mixed method research approach was used. This method is a research approach which comprises of qualitative and quantitative data in one research. It is designed simultaneously and has equal status (Christensen et al., 2015).

The study covers the headmasters who work in secondary and high school Bartın City Center. In Bartın City Center, there are 52 secondary and high school headmasters, and 42 (82%) headmasters who participated in the seminar and took part in the sample and working group of the study. The opinions of participants

Table 1. Demographic information on headmasters.

Variable	N	Percentage
School type		
Secondary school	22	52
High school	7	16
Technical High School	13	30
Gender		
Woman	3	8
Man	39	92
Branch		
Social studies	25	59
Science	6	14
Profession studies	5	11
Art and sport	5	11
Class teaching	1	0.2
Seniority		
21 years and more	25	59
16-20 years	9	21
11-15 years	7	16
3-5 years	1	0.2
Total	42	100

(N=42) were taken in document through qualitative data scale. The examination of the document covers the analysis of written documents related to the research topic (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2008).

Half-structured interview forms were prepared by taking the opinions of two specialists: one education management specialist and one language field specialist. Data were taken in document and analyzed using content and qualitative analysis method. The findings which shows the individuals who are interviewed by qualitative analysis are evaluated; the data were defined by content analysis. Data having similarity or any relation with each other were commented on by combining specific terms and themes. The opinions of the participants are defined automatically by content analysis (Altunışık et al., 2010).

The written data were evaluated by reading; titled findings were also evaluated by qualitative analysis, while other findings were evaluated by content analysis. Themes were formed by using content analysis. Findings took place in two groups (qualitative and quantitative). The study was investigated by a field specialist in terms of consistency, and consistency of topic was evaluated by obtained data. Validity study was obtained by subjecting the results to the participants' opinions. The final form of the themes which are formed from the data is presented to opinions of specialists; the frequency and percentage of the themes are determined and findings are analyzed.

In the study, direct quotations are given. The opinions of the headmasters were taken by "Headmaster Educational Inspection Behaviors Scale" prepared by İlğan (2013) for qualitative dimension; the abilities of the headmasters are put in the dimensions of "developing teacher and education" and "class visits and presenting feedback". The scaling tool consists of 23 expressions and it is determined that it is possible to use scaling tool in one and two

dimensions in committed analysis. The first dimension of the scale is named as developing teacher and education, and consists of 15 clauses. These clauses are 1,2,8,9,10,11,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22 and 23 numbered clauses. The second dimension of the scale is titled *class visits and presenting feedback* which consists of 8 clauses. These clauses are 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13 and 14 numbered clauses.

Cronbach's Alpha coefficient item-total correlations ranged from 0.703 to 0.849. This puts forward the validity and reliability of this scale. Data are tested by Kruskal- Wallis test which is one of the non-parametric tests in statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) program to determine whether there is difference between school type, seniority and branches or not. 42 of 52 headmasters who work in secondary and high schools in Bartın City center participated in the seminar; the data of the study are limited by opinions of 42 (82%) headmasters. In two sessions for a day, education inspection seminar was given to the headmasters; later, education scale and half-structured interview forms are filled by the headmasters. In qualitative analysis, men are coded in the form of YE1 and YE2, while women coded as YK1 and YK2. Information on headmasters is seen in Table 1.

According to the demographic information of participants, it is seen that more than half of the respondents are secondary headmasters, 30% of them are from technical high schools and 16% are high schools. 92% of the headmasters are men while 8% are women. 59% of the participants are from social science branch; 14%, science; 11%, shop class; 11%, art and sport; 0.2% is class teacher; 59% of the headmasters have more than 21 years' work experience; 21% have 16 to 20 years work experience; 16% have 11 to 15 years work experience; 0.2% have 3 to 5 years' work experience. Number of women headmasters is few compared to women teachers.

Table 2. Inspection behaviors according to school type.

Variable	School type	N	Mean	X	Sd	P
Developing education	Secondary	22	20.73	-	-	-
	High	7	27.00	1.74	2	-
	Technical high	13	19.85	-	-	0.41
	Total	42	-	-	-	-
Class visit	Secondary	22	22.09	-	-	-
	High	7	23.57	-	-	-
	Technical high	13	19.38	0.64	2	0.72
	Total	42	-	-	-	-

FINDINGS

In this part, qualitative and quantitative analysis of the data obtained in the study was done in relation to the development of the inspection abilities of secondary and high headmasters.

Findings regarding educational inspection behaviors of headmasters

The study evaluated existence of any significant relationship between developing teachers and school visit based on school type, branch and seniority. 3 women and 39 men were among the participants. The research isn't based on sex comparison because women headmasters were few. Their distribution is accepted as normal.

Findings regarding evaluation of educational inspection behaviors of the headmasters according to school type

Educational inspection behaviors scale of the headmasters is examined based on the type of school they work. The result is seen in Table 2. In Table 2, it is seen that there is no significant correlation between school type and inspection behaviors of the headmasters ($p>0.05$).

Findings regarding evaluation of educational inspection behaviors of the headmasters according to their branches

The opinions of the headmasters are evaluated based on their branches. The results of the Kruskal Wallis test are in Table 3. It is apparent in Table 3 that there is no meaningful relation between branches of the headmasters and educational inspection behaviors ($p>0.05$).

Findings regarding evaluation of educational inspection behaviors according to seniority of the headmasters

The test conducted shows there no difference between opinions of the headmasters regarding seniority (length of service). The findings are given in Table 4. As seen in Table 4, it is understood that there is no significant correlation between seniority of the headmasters and their educational inspection behaviors ($p>0.05$). From the result of the tests conducted, it is understood that there is no significant difference between the opinions of the groups according to school type, branch and seniority. According to the result obtained from it, it can be seen that, secondary and high school headmasters who work in Bartın center didn't differ on school type, branch and seniority. Written opinions which are taken from participants before and after the seminar are evaluated by content analysis in qualitative dimension of the study; obtained findings and direct quotations are given in this part. Findings regarding the study question of whether teacher inspection is necessary or not, how inspection is done, how information is gathered for year-end teacher evaluation form, what problems are encountered in the inspection, how to solve the problems and who should inspect teachers were analyzed.

Findings regarding opinions of the headmasters

In this part, findings regarding necessity of teacher inspection, how to do teacher inspection, fill teacher evaluation forms, problems encountered during teacher inspection, how teacher inspection should be done and recommendations on teacher inspection are given. The headmasters' opinions were taken in written form using half structured interview form.

Findings regarding necessity of teacher inspection;

Headmasters were asked whether they needed to be

Table 3. Inspection behaviors according to branches.

Variable		N	Mean	X	sd	p
Developing teaching	Social studies	10	16.45	20.96	18	0.28
	Turkish	6	24.83	-	-	-
	Mathematic	2	21.00	-	-	-
	Religion-culture education	5	13.20	-	-	-
	Gym	2	20.50	-	-	-
	Class education	1	37.00	-	-	-
	Philosophy	1	28.00	-	-	-
	Metal works	1	23.00	-	-	-
	History	1	40.50	-	-	-
	Geography	1	23.00	-	-	-
	Science	2	17.25	-	-	-
	Psychological counseling	1	32.00	-	-	-
	Chemistry	2	6.50	-	-	-
	Technical design	1	23.00	-	-	-
	Music	2	34.50	-	-	-
	Accounting	1	40.50	-	-	-
	Handcraft class	1	12.00	-	-	-
Child development	1	23.00	-	-	-	
Special education	1	42.00	-	-	-	
	Total	42	-	-	-	-
Class visit	Social studies	10	20.60	17.96	18	0.45
	Turkish	6	19.83	-	-	-
	Math	2	16.50	-	-	-
	Religion	5	14.90	-	-	-
	Gym	2	19.75	-	-	-
	Class	1	41.00	-	-	-
	Philosophy	1	28.50	-	-	-
	Metal	1	37.50	-	-	-
	History	1	40.00	-	-	-
	Geography	1	21.00	-	-	-
	Science	2	17.75	-	-	-
	Counseling	1	17.50	-	-	-
	Chemistry	2	11.25	-	-	-
	Tech-design	1	39.00	-	-	-
	Music	2	33.50	-	-	-
	Accounting	1	35.00	-	-	-
	Shop class	1	19.00	-	-	-
Child	1	3.50	-	-	-	
Special education	1	24.00	-	-	-	
	Total	42	-	-	-	-

supervised. All headmasters state that supervision is necessary. In this topic, we show some of respondents' comments;

"It is necessary; inspection mechanism gives acceleration to teacher workouts, makes teachers to be controlled and orderly in schools" (YE28).

"Do the teachers achieve their aim, how do they perform their classes or is necessary to know which studies should be done" (YE34).

When the findings obtained from the analysis of the answers of headmasters on whether inspection is necessary or not are evaluated, it is understood that

Table 4. Educational inspection behaviors of the headmasters based on their seniority.

Variable	Years	N	Mean rank	X	SD	p
Developing education	3-5	1	1.00	4.72	3	0.19
	11-15	7	17.43	-	-	-
	16-20	8	19.88	-	-	-
	21	26	23.88	-	-	-
	Total	42				
Class visit	3-5	1	1.00	7.13	3	0.068
	11-15	7	24.50	-	-	-
	16-2	8	14.00	-	-	-
	21	26	23.79	-	-	-
	Total	42	-	-	-	-

Table 5. How to do class inspection.

Class	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Class visit	17	40
Observation and data analyze	7	16
By specific periods	3	7
In accordance with regulations	3	7
Yearlong observation	2	4.7
Observation, chase, follow	2	4.7
As needed	1	2
I am inadequate	1	2

almost all of the headmasters have the same opinions. Arguments on these ideas are given in results.

Findings regarding way of conducting teacher inspection

Themes that are obtained from the opinions of the headmasters on how to do inspection are seen in Table 5. It is clear from statistic data that 17 of 42 the headmasters (N=42) argue common classroom visit, 7 are of the opinion of observation and data analysis, 3 says specific periods, 3 says it should be done in accordance with regulations, 2 says yearlong observation and 2 says observation, chasing and follow up. One person says he is unable to do inspection. Most of the headmasters indicate they have done class visits. Some of respondent's comments are;

"Pre-information, evaluating course activities, revising results together" (YE9).

A headmaster who says inspection can be done by observation and data analysis says;

"Class inspection is controlled depending on students' success and observation" (YE34).

"It is done by taking feedback from students and student parents, making observation in class and school environment, and meeting teachers face to face" (YE36).

Some headmasters say it can be done in specific periods and some say it should be done in accordance with regulation. Few headmasters say yearlong observations. One of the headmasters says I used specified criteria and observations through my experience:

"I didn't feel I'm adequate because I was new in management. This seminar was quite beneficial to me; number of inspection related educations should be increased. I applied in service education but it didn't come out; I wanted help from inspectors who I know" (YK39).

When findings regarding this question are evaluated, more than half of the headmasters do inspection by class visit, others make evaluation by observation, yearlong chase and using data by analysis.

Table 6. Filling inspection forms according to the headmasters.

The way to fill forms	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Fair, based on document	12	28
By looking researches	9	21
By using inspection forms	8	19
Taken notes during inspection	7	16
While indicating complete inspection by observation	7	16
There is uncertainty in inspection	3	7

Table 7. Problems encountered in inspection according to the headmasters.

Problems	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Teachers aren't open to inspection	12	28
There isn't enough time for inspection, works are too busy	7	16
Teachers don't perform their jobs professionally	7	16
Teachers don't show their real performance during inspection	5	11
Inspection standards aren't available	5	11
Inspection grades cause to disturbance in school	3	7
Headmasters aren't adequate in inspection	3	7
Results of inspection don't have any effect	3	7
Inspection and management should belong to same person	2	4
There isn't problem	2	4

Findings regarding how to fill teacher evaluation forms

Questions regarding how to fill inspection forms are directed to the headmasters. The themes obtained from the analysis are seen in Table 6. In Table 6, 12 headmasters (N=42) say complete inspection using document, 9 headmasters say by looking at works, 8 headmasters by using inspection, 7 headmasters by taken notes during inspection, 7 headmasters by making observation. Additionally, 3 headmasters are uncertain about how to do inspection. In the first rank, it is indicated inspection should be based on document.

"Year-end evaluation is mostly done on document because register grade implementation has been removed" (YE3).

Works done by teachers yearly are also used in inspection. Uncertainty about inspection is also among the ideas. A headmaster says that;

"This topic is full of suspense and year-end evaluation process is unfortunately uncertain" (YE13).

From the findings regarding how inspection forms are evaluated, it is understood that inspection forms are filled as fair, by looking at the works of teachers, and using of

inspection forms. Even if it is few, it is expressed that there is also uncertainty on how to make inspection.

Findings regarding problems encountered during teacher inspection

Themes regarding problems encountered in inspection according to opinions of the headmasters are shown in Table 7.

In Table 7, it is understood that the headmasters rank encountered problems. In the first rank, 12 headmasters think teachers are not open to inspection, 7 headmasters say they do not have enough time for inspection. 7 headmasters say teachers do not perform their jobs professionally, 5 headmasters say teachers do not show their real performance in inspection, 5 headmasters express there are no standards in inspection, 3 headmasters say inspection grades cause disturbance in school, 3 headmasters say headmasters are not efficient in inspection, 3 headmasters say inspection results are not effective, 2 headmasters express inspection and management should not be done by the same person, and 2 headmasters indicate that there is no problem. Additionally, they say inspection is not objective, there are intangible expressions in evaluation forms, teachers cannot keep pace with change, responsibility and authorization of headmaster are not balanced, inspection

process is not adequate and inspection is used as a threat tool. Some of the headmasters say some teachers feel unease with inspection. Here are some of the headmasters who have this opinion:

“Some teachers feel unease with inspection; it is seen that they get bored in inspection and go out of plan” (YE38).

Another headmaster says;

“They are not able to give time to evaluation because of intensity of administrative jobs” (YE35).

Some of the headmasters think teachers do not perform their jobs professionally. Another headmaster says;

“Most of them do not know legislation work” (YE18).

Related to inspection forms, a headmaster says:

“Some courses do not cover inspection and needs of school; it should be updated according to school” (YE26).

In this topic, it can be said that inspection forms should be updated and respond to the schools' needs.

“Lack of knowledge related to how inspection mission would be done” (YE9).

A headmaster also says inspection should be done by school graduates:

“When the inspector and the inspected are from the same institution, it affects the atmosphere of the institution negatively. Inspection mission of headmasters removes leadership feature and highlights just headmaster profile” (YE40).

However, inspection which is the last step of management process is an evaluation at the same time. It is necessary to evaluate work conducted and see whether it reaches its aim or not, otherwise management wouldn't be completed. From the findings regarding the problems encountered in inspection, it seen that teachers are not open to inspection, headmasters cannot find enough time for inspection, teachers do not perform their jobs professionally, teachers do not show their real performance in inspection, they have no standards in inspection, inspection grades cause disturbance in school, headmasters are not efficient in inspection, inspection results are not effective, inspection and management should not be done by the same person, inspections should be objective, teachers cannot keep pace with change, responsibility and authorization of headmaster are not distributed in balance, inspection process is not adequate and inspection is used as a minatory tool.

Findings regarding way to implement teacher inspection

The question on how should inspection be done is directed to the headmasters; the data obtained are seen in Table 8. As seen in Table 8, 22 headmasters express inspection should be done by the headmasters, 8 say by specialists, 3 say by headmaster and inspectors, 2 by all shareholders, 1 by headmaster, 1 by students and students' parent, 1 by headmasters and committee, 1 by inspection committee and 1 by national education headmasters and headmasters. In the most of the answers, half of the headmasters claim inspection should be done by headmasters. One of these headmasters says;

“Headmasters know their teachers in school and course environment better” (YE37).

Another one says;

“It should be done by headmasters, be transparent, fair and leads to vocational development of teacher rather than being judgmental ” (YE28).

Some of the headmasters say that inspection should be done by specialists.

“Teacher inspection should be done by an exact specialist and it should have a specific frame” (YE11).

Another headmaster says;

“It should be done by specialists who are educated like inspector” (YK25).

Few of the headmasters are of the opinion that it should be done by all shareholders like performance evaluation.

“It should be done by all shareholders of education in education environments indissolubly with evaluation and feedback forms” (YE36).

When findings related to the topic are evaluated, half of the headmasters think teacher inspection should be done by headmasters, some headmasters say by specialists, some of them express headmasters and inspectors, a few headmasters say all shareholders; headmasters should take the opinions of students and students' parents also. Others say it should be done by headmasters and committee, inspection committee and national education headmaster and headmasters.

Findings regarding solving encountered problems in teacher inspection

Problems encountered in teacher inspection are in seen

Table 8. Who should do inspection according to the headmasters?

Who should make inspection	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Headmaster	22	52
Specialist	8	19
Headmaster and inspector	3	7
All shareholders	1	2
Headmaster	1	2
Student and parent	1	2
Headmaster and committee	1	2
Inspection committee	1	2
National education head and headmaster	1	2

Table 9. How inspection should be done according to the headmasters.

Recommendations	Frequency (f)	Percentage
There should be tangible criteria in inspection forms	9	21
Headmaster should solve problems together	5	11
Headmasters should have ability to reward and penalty	4	9
They should focus on positive things more than negatives	4	9
Inspection should be fair and objective	4	9
Sanction of results should exist	4	9
Inspectors should take education in this topic	3	7
Firstly, guidance should be done	2	4
It is important to select headmasters according to objective criteria	2	4
In-service educations should be done	2	4
In inspection, inspectors should take role	1	2
It is important to investigate results of inspection by National Education Directorate	1	2
Selected coterie leaders can make inspection	1	2
Inspection should lead to change	1	2
Inspection should lead teachers to make self-control	1	2
Headmasters have too much work load so time doesn't remain for inspection	1	2
Extra time should be created for inspection	1	2

Table 9. Table 9 shows how headmasters create solutions for problems encountered during inspection. In the first rank, 9 headmasters indicate tangible criteria should take place in inspection forms. 5 headmasters express problems should be solved together, 4 headmasters say headmasters should have reward and penalty allowance, 4 headmasters indicate the necessity of focusing on positive more than negative things. 4 headmasters say inspection should be fair and objective, 4 headmasters say results should have sanctions, 3 headmasters say inspectors should take education course in school, 2 headmasters think counseling should be done. Two headmasters indicate it is important to select headmasters based on objective criteria, two headmasters say in - service education should be done, one headmaster expresses inspectors should also take charge of inspection. One headmaster expresses evaluation of inspection results by National Education Directorate is

important, one headmaster says selected coterie leaders can also do inspection, one person thinks inspection should lead to change too. One person thinks inspection should lead to self-control, one person thinks work in schools is too much and headmasters cannot find time for inspection, one headmaster thinks extra time should be created. In the first rank, there is the opinion that inspection should be done in standard forms. Some of the thoughts are;

"In teacher inspection, tangible criteria should be shared by teachers by transforming them to more clear and understandable charts" (YE18).

Another headmaster says;

"It is required of the system not to break peace in school environment; headmasters should have authority to work

as inspectors. There is no sanction in current inspection, it should be powered by reward and penalty, officially headmasters do not have any rewarding power” (YE34).

Inspection results should have sanctions. One headmaster says that;

“Gain in financial term, performance and career should be in scales which are taken in inspection and evaluation” (YE29).

Another headmaster thinks:

“In this point, headmasters should be educated and trained” (YK39).

A headmaster says:

“Selection of headmasters should be done among teachers who re-new themselves and by objective criteria (YE13).

A headmaster expresses that inspectors should take part in inspection mission:

“Inspectorship should be open to teacher inspection again; seminars should be done to educate teachers” (YE7).

Another headmaster thinks results of inspection should be evaluated by sending National Education Directorate; a headmaster thinks selected coterie leaders can do also inspection.

“Self-control ability should be possessed by teachers, inspection should have features which support vocational development or create environment for development rather than teacher observation; researches on process dimensional inspection should be done on instantaneous inspection” (YE28).

Another headmaster indicates principal mission is inspection, but complain about not being able to find time for inspection among other obligations, assistant headmasters should be charged for technical subjects. Another headmaster says inspection needs extra time too. Findings from this research are: inspection forms should have tangible criteria, problems should be solved together with teachers, headmasters should have the right to give reward and penalty, inspection should focus on positive more than negative things, inspectors should be fair and objective, results should have sanctions, inspectors should be well educated, counselling should be done for inspectors, headmasters should be elected based on objective criteria, in service education is necessary, education inspectors should take charge in inspection, inspection results should be examined by

National Education Directorate, elected coterie leaders can do inspection, inspection should lead to change and self-control, headmasters have much overloaded work so lack time for inspection and extra time should be created for inspection.

DISCUSSION

In recent years, it is expected of headmasters to do inspection in schools. Opinions of the headmasters who participated in the seminar were taken by “*Headmaster Educational Inspection Behaviors Scale*” and half structured interview forms because education headmasters can perform their jobs well, if they take education course on inspection.

The result shows there is no difference between opinions of headmasters who work in secondary and high school in Bartın city center based on age, branch and seniority and they have similar opinions. The followings are evaluated: is inspection of secondary and high headmasters necessary or not, how is inspection done, how is information collected by year-end evaluation form, what are the problems encountered during inspection, how should inspection be done, which procedure is followed in solving problems encountered during inspection? It is understood that almost all of the headmasters have attitude on inspection. It is seen that half of the headmasters do inspection by visiting classes. Some of the headmasters do inspection by observation, watching teachers all year and using data by analyzing them. It is seen that headmasters fill inspection forms fairly by observing teaching of teachers, using inspection forms, observations and taking notes during inspection.

A few headmasters are uncertain on how inspection should be done. It is seen that headmasters encounter several problems during inspection. These problems are like; teachers are not open to inspection, headmasters cannot find enough time for inspection, teachers do not perform their jobs professionally, teachers do not show their real performance during inspection, inspection does not have standards, inspection grades provoke disturbance in school.

In many schools, headmasters are faced with problems such as school staff that resist inspection and inadequate teachers (Aseltine et al., 2006). The research which reveals the inspection effectiveness of headmasters by Özmen and Batmaz (2004) supports this result; it is determined that headmasters do not have enough knowledge and ability to do inspection; the inspection conditions are not quite suitable. Headmasters express that results of inspection are not effective, inspection and management should not be done by the same person, and people are not objective in inspection.

A similar research also supports this result. According to this research Yeşil and Kış (2015), teachers and headmasters working as friends in the same environment

is not healthy for inspection. It is understood that there are intangible expressions in evaluation forms and teachers cannot keep pace with change. According to the headmasters, authorization and responsibilities of headmasters are non-proportional. Açıkalın (1998) says that headmasters lack authority and responsibility in school; it is inversely proportional. They lack authority compared to the responsibility that they have.

Responsibility is defined based on job more than authority in schools, and it is seen that authority and responsibility balance cannot be achieved. Defining their authority clearly can prevent this situation. According to the headmasters, inspection process is not adequate and inspection is used as a threatening tool. 50% of headmasters have opinion that teacher inspection should be done by headmasters, some headmasters express that it should be done by experts, some of them say headmasters and inspectors, and a few indicate all shareholders. Headmasters should also take the opinions of students' parents and students. Headmasters express inspection should be done by headmasters together with committee and national education head. Headmasters gave some recommendations for encountered problems during inspection like inspection forms should have measurable criteria, problems should be solved together, headmasters should have reward and penalty authority, inspection should focus on positive things more than negative ones, fair and objective inspection is necessary, and results should have sanction. Additionally, taking education course on inspection would be beneficial.

A similar research also supports this result. According to the teacher opinions of school principals on course supervision, it is stated that school principals can receive in-service trainings on their supervisory skills and that their audits can be effective (Yeşil and Kış, 2015). According to the results of this study, it is thought that the inspectors will be in charge of the inspections. According to a similar study conducted by Tonbul and Baysülen (2017), inspectors sometimes suggest that they should attend classes with principals and directors of inspectors should direct which criteria should be taken into consideration (Tonbul and Baysülen, 2017). It is thought that inspectors doing inspections would be beneficial. A research done by Tonbul and Baysülen (2017) also supports these results. Headmasters as education inspectors should continue to guide teachers in occupation, headmasters should take education on course inspection and objective evaluation tools should be formed. The evaluations which are done according to performance criteria which are established according to a research increase quality of teacher (Goldstein, 2003).

Inspection results should be examined by National Education Directorate and selected coterie leaders also can conduct inspection. Headmasters express inspection should lead to transformation and self-control. Another similar research also supports this result.

According to this result, guide mission of inspection is to keep pace with change. So rapid change in the society

directly help the society to have education systems that is dynamic in structure also (Yeşil and Kış, 2015).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Headmasters cannot find time for inspection because of work overload; creating extra time for inspection is necessary. A research done by Fırıncıoğulları (2014) supports that headmaster should create time for inspection. From the result of this paper, here are some recommendations:

- (1) Forms related to conducting way of inspection should be created, tangible and understandable statements should be given.
- (2) Research regarding why teachers do not open to inspection should be done.
- (3) Headmasters should create time for inspection at least twice a year.
- (4) Several lectures should be given to headmasters about inspection.
- (5) Results of inspection should include topics like teachers' reward, assignment, promotion.
- (6) In school inspections, headmaster should benefit from specialist inspectors in education field.
- (7) Inspections should be fair, unbiased and objective.
- (8) Teachers should be involved in in- service educations according to results of inspection.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Project No: 2016-SOS-A-016 is supported by Bartın University Scientific Research Projects Committee.

REFERENCES

- Açıkalın A (1998). Okul Yöneticiliği. Pegem Publisher. Ankara.
- Altun M, Şanlı Ö, Tan Ç (2015). Maarif müfettişlerin, okul müdürlerinin denetmenlik görevleri hakkındaki görüşlerinin incelenmesi Turkish Studies International Periodical For The Languages, Literature And History Of Turkish Or Turkic, 10(3):79-96.
- Altunışık R, Coşkun R, Bayraktaroğlu S, Yıldırım E (2010). Sosyal Bilimlerde Arastırma Yöntemleri SPSS Uygulamalı. Sakarya: Sakarya Yayıncılık.
- Asetline JM, Faryniarz JO, Rigazio-DiGilio AJ (2006). Supervision for Learning: A Performance-Based Approach to Teacher Development and School Improvement. ASCD.org.
- Bayraktutan İ (2011). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin denetim rolleri (Sivas ili örneği). Master Thesis. Cumhuriyet University Social Sciences Institute Education Science Department, Sivas.
- Bozkurt BA (2016). Okul yönetiminin öğretmen denetiminde rol ve sorumlulukları. Edit. Mahmut Sagır, Süleyman Göksoy. Eğitimde Denetim ve Değerlendirme. S: 242, Pegem Publisher, Ankara.
- Bursalioğlu Z (2000) Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış. Pegem Publisher, Ankara.

- Can E, Gündüz Y (2012). İlköğretimde çalışan öğretmenlerin, il eğitim denetmenleri ve okul müdürlerinin yapmış olduğu rehberlik çalışmalarından yararlanma düzeylerinin incelenmesi. 7. National Education Management Congress Abstract Book, Malatya. 106:172-173.
- Christensen LB, Johnson RB, Turner LA (2015). Research Methods Design and Analysis. Translate..Ed. Aypay, A. Anı Publisher. Ankara.
- Fırıncioğulları BE (2014) İlkokul müdürlerinin ders denetimleri ile ilgili öğretmen Görüşleri. Adnan Menderes University Social Sciences Institute.
- Goldstein J (2003). Teachers at the professional threshold: Distributing leadership responsibility for teacher evaluation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford School of Education, Stanford, University.
- İlğan A (2013). Okul müdürünün öğretimsel denetim davranışları ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [A validity and reliability study of the principals' instructional supervision behavior scale]. Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi – J. Educ. Sci. Res. 4(1):1-23. <http://ebad-jesr.com/>
- Özmen F, Batmaz C (2004). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretmen denetimindeki etkililikleri- cinsiyet ve yaş değişkenine göre öğretmen görüşleri. XIII. National Educational Sciences Congress 2004 İnönü University, Faculty of Education, Malatya.
- Tonbul Y, Baysülen E (2017). Ders Denetimi ile İlgili Yönetmelik Değişikliğinin Maarif Müfettişlerinin, Okul Yöneticilerinin ve Öğretmenlerin Görüşleri Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. Elementary Education Online. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17051/ieo.2017.24494>
- Ünal A, Şentürk R (2011). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin ders denetimi uygulamaları.20.Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı, National Educational Sciences Congress Burdur.
- Yalçınkaya Y (2014). Okul müdürlerinin ders denetimi nasıl olmalıdır? <http://www.mebpersonelleri.net/okul-mudurlerinin-ders-denetimi-nasil-olmalidirmakale,267.html>
- Yengin SP (2012). Okul müdürlerinin öğretmen denetiminde karşılaştığı sorunlar. Mugla, IV. International Conference on Education Supervision Abstract Book:
- Yeşil D, Kış A (2015). Okul Müdürlerinin Ders Denetimine İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi EBED İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi, İnönü University. J. Faculty Educ. 2(3):27
- Yıldırım A, Şimşek H (2008). Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri. Ankara: Seçkin Publisher.