



# Comparison of inspection instruments in centrally governed Cypriot Turkish education with some European Union countries which adopted participatory government approach

Merve Uysal <sup>a \*</sup>, Behçet Öznacar <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of City Island, Famagusta, 99450, North Cyprus

<sup>b</sup> Near East University, Nicosia, 99010, North Cyprus

---

## Abstract

The purpose of this study is to compare education and inspection systems and to reveal their similarities and differences in terms of structuring and functioning. Thus, it is aimed to make suggestions about education supervision in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus by determining its current state. In the study, the educational supervision systems of England, Germany, Finland, Spain, and France all member states of the European Union, which adopt the participatory management approach, were analysed and compared taking into account the availability of sufficient data. As a result of the research based on the document analysis technique, it is seen that France and Northern Cyprus have a more centralized control structure compared to other countries, whereas the schools in Germany, Finland and Spain are more autonomous. In England, schools are authorised to act more freely by choosing to obtain professional help from outside under the supervision of schools. In order to increase the quality of education in Northern Cyprus, it would be useful to carry out regular inspections, to include teachers in this process, and to establish a guidance approach.

**Keywords:** Education supervision system, centralized administration, participatory government approach, European Union countries, Northern Cyprus

---

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Countries striving to secure their future through education systems are more likely to achieve their long-term goals when they have well-structured systems. The proper configuration of the systems and accurate operation of this structure are different processes. The mechanism that is effective in determining the extent to which the system

---

\* Corresponding author name. ORCID ID.: <https://orcid.org/0000-0000-0000-0000>  
E-mail address: [author@institution.xxx](mailto:author@institution.xxx)

in question can achieve its objectives is called the control system. Considering that the development of societies will be shaped by achievements and victories in the field of education, the method of structuring and operating the supervision of the education system reflects the investment made in the future of the country.

Inspection, which has its origins in ancient times, includes the monitoring of organizations and individuals at regular intervals for the purpose of information and guidance (Hovde, 2010). Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2007) describe inspection as the glue of school success. This process is based on the school's effort to take individuals to the place they want to be. In this context, it is a process carried out by people who are responsible for ensuring the interaction between the goals of the institution and the needs of the teachers so that the school and the individual can work in harmony. When the concept of inspection is considered, it is seen that there has been a development from strict and simple bureaucratic practices, which is a projection of the 19th century's management approach, to more flexible and participatory democratic practices. Today, the phenomenon of inspection is approached in terms of reflective practices and constructivist learning approaches. As most researchers agree, the conventional inspection approach, which expresses human behavior only with the concepts of stimulus-response link, reward, punishment and reinforcement, has almost lost its validity, especially in developed countries. In the understanding of the 20th century, educational institutions began to be administered with a control mechanism on the basis of representative democracy and hierarchical inspection. Again, in the light of conventional administration theories, in this period when conventional inspection, which is based on control and reporting and limited only to determining the current situation, was applied, teacher-inspector affairs were in the form of subordinate-superior relations. As a matter of fact, in today's post-industrial society, where large-scale social transformations are experienced, the production of knowledge spreads rapidly, participatory democracy is seen as an added value, and organizational institutions are shaped under the influence of the foregoing. In addition to socioeconomic, political and technological changes, the understanding of education is also changing rapidly, and new initiatives are emerging on how education inspection should be structured (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). The 21st century, shaped by contemporary educational inspection trends, is a period in which various approaches, primarily differentiated inspection, instructional inspection, clinical inspection and mentoring, emerged. It can be said that this period is based on teacher development and especially student success (Marzano, Frontier & Livingston, 2011). With these contemporary approaches, the idea of educational administration, which is perceived as controlling the teacher, has lost its validity. Today, the idea of modern education inspection, which can be summarized as professional guidance and assistance to the teacher, has gained momentum. The aim of modern education inspection is to improve the educational process and increase effectiveness and efficiency of learning-teaching activities. This goal can be achieved by reviewing all the factors affecting the education process as a whole (Ayдын, 2014). Contemporary education inspection attaches considerable importance to teachers' self-development and catching up with change, as they are the most important building blocks in the education process. In this context, teachers need to be in a continuous and sustainable renewal in order to monitor developments and changes (Köybaşı, Uğurlu & Demir, 2017). Contemporary

educational inspection approaches prepare the groundwork for the development of the teachers in several ways.

It can be seen that contemporary inspection approaches focus on guidance in order to develop and effectively use human resources. The point reached in this historical process is a logical and questionable contemporary understanding of inspection that is motivating, analytic, unifying, directing both the past and the future (Aydın, 2014), and giving importance to personal development. In addition to determining the current situation, such inspection aims to attach importance to cooperation, to act with a rational approach, to use technology, and to develop learning environments in a scientific way. The inspection system, which has been able to adapt itself to today's conditions and has gained a modern structure with the scientific studies, is becoming more and more visible today. As a matter of fact, it is undeniable that the contemporary inspection approach in question varies from country to country and can take on different tasks in democratic systems compared to others. In other words, the inspection systems of countries differ according to their level of development. Although the focus is the same, different applications draw attention in practice. For example, in today's information society, it is seen that the education inspections of developed countries mostly focus on issues such as individual and professional guidance of employees, motivating them to work, and creating suitable working conditions. On the other hand, in developing countries, it is limited to detecting deficiencies and taking relevant measures (Sağlam & Aydoğmuş, 2016).

When we look closely at the new trends in inspection practices in the world, it can be said that the improvement of the quality of education both in the European Union countries and internationally in recent years has been an important part of the debates in the field of education. In this respect, according to Grauwe (2004), most studies on education show that the quality of education in schools is declining, and that inadequate inspection and evaluation systems play a leading role in this decline. Therefore, inspection practices aimed at monitoring and improving the quality of education offered at school have come to the fore, and these practices have begun to be referred to as a quality assurance at the European level.

Based on the foregoing, education inspection bears considerable importance in education management in terms of obtaining feedback for the applications, determining the existing situation, and being able to make necessary corrections for development in line with certain goals. Within this framework, nations tend to put into practice different applications so as to obtain effectiveness in education inspection considering the qualifications of their respective education systems. Therefore, in order for Northern Cyprus to claim its place among developed countries, it is an obligation that it does not lag behind developed countries in its education inspection mechanism. For this purpose, in order to plan the inspection system, successful examples and practices in other countries should be compared and examined and important points should be adapted to the local context. It is important to benefit from the experiences of best practice country cases in solving the problems that may arise during this period. In other words, it is considered important to research and analyze the systems of other countries and to

identify solutions to possible problems in order to follow the developments in the world in terms of modern education inspection systems and to provide necessary solutions to the problems that may arise in this field. For example, according to Bereday (1964), systematic investigation of the quality of education in a different country is an effective tool for evaluating the education system of the country of origin. It is inevitable for Northern Cyprus, which is striving to progress in the process of becoming a member of the European Union, to make harmonization efforts and innovations in several areas. In the context of these innovations, the ideal education inspection system to be achieved can be designed by aiming to identify the problems with the results to be obtained from the evaluations. In order to provide an effective education inspection, it is considered that knowledge of the inspection practices in the education system of some selected European Union (EU) countries and benefiting from best practices will provide more functional results. In the relevant literature, there are various studies comparing the inspection systems of different countries. For example, Katitaş, Coşkun, and Turpçu (2019) compared the inspection systems of some selected countries and made recommendations for Turkey. Yalçın and Ayan (2020) compared the education and training inspection systems of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC), Turkey and Sweden. Toprakçı and Yüce (2021), on the other hand, compared the education inspectors and inspection processes of the member countries of the International Organization of Inspection Boards. Therefore, this study aims to compare the educational inspection systems of England, Germany, Finland, France, and Spain theoretically, to determine the similarities and differences in terms of structure and operation, and to determine the current situation of inspection in education in the developing Northern Cyprus; it also offers recommendations for improving inspection. In the literature, there are studies that compare the education systems of countries. However, there is only one study in Northern Cyprus (Yalçın & Ayan, 2020) on the comparison of inspection systems. It is believed that this study will contribute to the literature in terms of being the first which compares five different countries, is directly related to the ‘inspection’ subsystem, and offers recommendations.

## **2. Method**

### *2.1. Research Design*

In this study, since it is aimed to compare the inspection instruments in Turkish Cypriot education with the inspection systems of England, Germany, Finland, France, and Spain document review method, which is one of the qualitative research methods, was adopted. Qualitative research, which is a research method frequently used in social sciences, allows the subject to be examined in depth in its respective environment (Bayyurt & Seggie, 2018). Document review is a process for the systematic analysis and evaluation of written and electronic documents that provide information about the subject in question (Bowen, 2009). The stages of the process are listed as reaching the documents, checking the originality of the documents, understanding the documents, and analyzing and using the data (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2018). Therefore, relevant studies and legal documents in the literature containing the inspection system of countries were

determined as appropriate sources for document review and analyzed according to the mentioned stages.

## *2.2. Data collection*

In this study, data were collected through document review, which is a qualitative research technique, and reports, books, theses and periodicals about the education systems and education inspection systems in force in the examined countries (England, Germany, Finland, France, Spain, and Northern Cyprus) were utilized.

## *2.3. Data analysis*

Data obtained within the study were examined according to Bereday Model (1964) which is known as a comparative analysis method. The main reason for choosing the comparative analysis method is not only to reveal the current state of the education inspection systems of the countries compared, but also to offer a broad perspective and solution proposals for the improvement of the system in Northern Cyprus. Revealing the similarities and differences with other countries or comparing other country systems is also important for countries to view their own systems from a different perspective and to better understand the system as a whole (Bray, Adamson, & Mason, 2014). The Bereday Model consists of four different stages: description, interpretation, juxtaposition and simultaneous comparison. In the descriptive stage, education systems are classified after the sources such as related written documents and reports are scanned and examined. In the interpretation phase, it is ensured that the collected data are transferred meaningfully. In the juxtaposition stage, the data collected from the studied countries are examined by putting their similarities and differences side by side, in separate columns. In the juxtaposition and comparison stages, the areas examined in the light of Bereday's horizontal approach technique are systematically compared.

## **3. Findings and Interpretations**

Based on the findings on the inspection systems of the examined countries, first the inspection systems of the member states of the European Union and then of Northern Cyprus will be explained. Although the selected EU countries apply the participatory management approach in terms of education inspection, there are policy and implementation differences from country to country. An overview of the structure and functioning of education inspection in England, Germany, Finland, France, and Spain is provided below.

### *Education Inspection in England*

The British education system is both central and local government oriented. The education system is centrally managed through the National Program, but some decisions on education are made at the local level. Basic laws on education are enacted by Parliament of England. Parliament has empowered ministers or other authorities to create representative or lower level laws to regulate the details of government. The central administration is responsible for the education service, the determination of

national policies, the planning of the system, the education management in the local administration and independent institute regions. The British education system is shaped by the central government and formulated by the local governments. The secretary of state and the Ministry of Education are the highest authorities dealing with education (Korkmaz, 2013). The secretary of state, appointed by the Prime Minister and responsible for education, is charged with directing the education system and ensuring coordination with the Parliament. He/she is assisted by two state ministers and three parliamentary secretaries. The secretary of state is also responsible for the Ministry of Education and its education policies, strategies, funding, training expenditures and appointments. The authority of the central government in education is quite dominant. His Majesty's inspectors are subordinate to the central authority and have a significant influence on the functioning of the education system. Inspectors are obliged to inform the central authority about the status of educational institutions in their regions. They inform the secretary of state about the form and methods of education and make recommendations on problems of policy concern. Inspectors work with the secretariat in the preparation of brochures and handbooks to assist administrators and teachers. In addition, as the representatives of the secretariat, they can make suggestions to local education administrations on issues related to general education policy (Özmen & Yasan, 2007).

Within the framework of the 1992 Education Law, some arrangements were made to ensure that schools are regularly inspected at certain intervals. As one of the most important of these arrangements, His Majesty's inspectors were dismissed from the task of supervising schools and appointed as consultants to the independent inspection system. In line with this aim, OFSTED (Office of Standards in Education), a new government office led by a senior chief inspector and seven subordinate inspectors, was established. Although OFSTED is independent from the country's Ministry of Education and all related institutions, it is responsible for carrying out certain inspections at the request of the minister in cooperation with the foregoing. The office, which can act autonomously, ensures that the inspection and reporting of educational issues is objective (Sağlam & Aydoğmuş, 2016). The office aims to improve the qualifications of the education provided to students in all aspects by regularly inspecting all aspects of the education given in schools, preparing reports on this subject and providing guidance when necessary (Süngü, 2005). In addition to the foregoing, self-evaluations are carried out by the school boards of directors in order to evaluate the activities at the school. At the same time, individual schools are responsible for monitoring and managing the performance of teachers. The systematic implementation of the performance management policy followed in schools is the duty of the school principal (Eurydice, 2001).

### *Education Inspection in Germany*

The education systems of schools in the 16 states of the Federal Republic of Germany are the responsibility of the respective state. According to the constitution (Grundgesetz), legislation and administration of education actually depend on 16 Education Regions (Länder). In this framework, a federal education policy is followed as a requirement of a

state-based administration. Since the states have autonomy within this structure, education and training affairs were designed directly as their powers and responsibilities. Therefore, the decisions taken by the states may have different and specific characteristics. However, the general principles and aims, compulsory education, school education steps, orientation classes, and vocational training have been largely aligned among the states. In all German states there are three authorities that have a say in the management and inspection of the education system: the ministry of education of the relevant state, the governorship, and the education administration in the respective city or smaller settlement. The constitution clearly states the government's obligations as regards education (Eurydice, 2019). The Ministries of Education and Culture are responsible for the supervision of schools. In this context, each school has a teachers' board that takes responsibility for the educational process, and a school council (consisting of teachers, parents and students) that decides on school regulations and disciplinary rules. The powers of these boards vary within the Education Region. Inspection criteria have been prepared by the Ministries of Education and Culture for the inspection of teachers in public schools. Generally, the inspection is prepared in the form of an evaluation report containing recommendations for future careers and performance improvements of teachers (Sağlam & Aydoğmuş, 2016).

Inspection of schools in each state includes statutory inspection, academic inspection, and inspection of public sector personnel. Statutory inspection usually ensures that non-educational matters are checked by local authorities. For example, the construction of the school building and meeting its needs, the provision of textbooks and other teaching materials are looked into. Academic inspection is concerned with the studies and teaching performed at school. The duties of school inspectors are to ensure that the curriculum and pre-determined rules are applied while carrying out educational activities, that education is carried out in a professional manner using appropriate techniques, and that necessary improvements are made at the points of failure. Academic inspection is carried out by visiting schools, watching lectures and providing advice at school level. The authority to carry out the academic inspection is based on the Basic Education Law. By law, the entire school system is under state inspection. Inspectors have the authority to check the school's compliance with the determined curriculum and exam rules by visiting the classrooms and attending the classes, and to take the necessary measures when needed. In addition, at the end of the inspection, authorized inspectors inspect the teachers and head teachers of public schools. Thus, it is ensured that the personnel fulfil their duties (Özenç, 2013).

### *Education Inspection in Finland*

Education policies in Finland are determined by the parliament and the government. At the central government level, the Ministry of Education and Culture is the highest authority responsible for publicly funded education. While the main objectives and limits in education are determined at the central level, their implementation is based on the principle of decentralization. Also, the Finnish National Department of Education, established in 1991, is a national development body responsible for pre-school education, basic education, secondary education and adult education. This department works in

coordination with the Ministry and monitors the educational objectives and content and development of teaching methods (Uysal & Çağanağa, 2022). The National Department of Education also assists the Ministry of Education in drafting education policies. The department is managed by a board of directors with members representing education professionals, local authorities and teachers. Educational institutions in the country do not have any other central administrative structure. As for regional administration, the country is divided into six provinces, and each province has a general administrative structure that deals with educational and cultural issues (Certel, 2013). Local government is the responsibility of local authorities (municipalities) which play very important roles in providing education. Most of the institutions that offer primary or secondary education are administered by local authorities or joint municipal boards.

Private institutions in Finland are monitored by the state. These institutions follow the main national curricula and qualification charters approved by the National Department of Education. Local authorities form the mechanism that decides the level of independence to be granted to schools. The central government does not interfere with the municipalities in terms of how inspections are conducted. Therefore, local governments in the country are legally responsible for the provision and organization of education, as well as the preparation and implementation of school education programs. The National Board of Education has organized some internet databases in order to announce the practices that have been used in education with good results and to ensure that the tools and materials used by schools in self-evaluation are published. In other words, schools can perform their own self-evaluations through these databases (Özmen & Yasan, 2007). In Finland, no visits have been made by the state authorities for the inspection of schools in recent years. However, the practices carried out under the name of ‘evaluation’ in Finland have a significant impact on educational administration. Schools can provide education according to their own administrative procedures as long as they do not violate the law. Therefore, teachers’ activities are managed within the framework of regulations and compliance with the objectives specified in the main national curriculum (Certel, 2013). The central structure of the evaluation system according to the national laws is as follows:

- a. The national-external evaluation of the education system is implemented by the National Board of Education in line with the principles of the Ministry of Education.
- b. Evaluation carried out by education providers: Education providers can be evaluated by the National Board of Education as well as provide their own self-checks by self-assessment.

There is no national guideline for external inspection of schools in the country. This issue is entirely at the discretion of the municipalities. According to the legislation, education providers are required to use the same concepts and procedures in inspection, but these inspections are not enforceable. Evaluation data is collected from municipalities and schools when national evaluation takes place (Sağlam & Aydoğmuş, 2016).



### *Education Inspection in France*

In France, as in other countries where the central government is effective, inspection powers are concentrated in the hands of the Ministry of National Education. In addition, there are other supervisory units responsible for educational inspection within the framework of the principles of national education. In addition to the national inspection boards, there are also regional inspection boards, among which, the 'National Education Inspectors' are responsible for primary education institutions, vocational training, apprenticeship training, general education, counselling and guidance services, inspecting and evaluating teachers as well as organizing ongoing education programs and expressing opinions on the promotion and appointment of teachers. In addition, the Regional Academy Inspectors are responsible for the guidance and counselling services of the administrators and the inspection of secondary school teachers, who are charged with the inspection of general and technological education in secondary education institutions (Eurydice, 2008).

The French education system is divided into three administrative units at the regional level, namely the university district, the provincial organization and the local units, in order of size. The university district is the largest administrative unit at the local level. France is divided into 28 university districts. There is a rector at the head of each university district, who is also the director of the university in that region. The rector is the representative of the Ministry of National Education and is appointed by the President. He/she is responsible for the management of primary and secondary schools and the implementation of national regulations within the university district. The provincial organization is managed by a governor appointed by the central government. It is the governor's responsibility to appoint teachers within the provincial organization and control the scholarships awarded to students. In addition, there is an inspector at the provincial level, as the representative of the rector, who is responsible for supervising primary education. The head of the local units is the mayor. Each local unit is also divided into cantons. There are inspectors at the head of these cantons, and these inspectors supervise the institutions in the regions they are responsible for by ensuring the coordination between the cantons (Süngü, 2005).

In the evaluation of the quality of the education system of France, the focus is on teachers rather than schools. Inspection activities are carried out to evaluate teachers, to ensure that they receive the necessary advice and support they need, and to report to the school administration teachers who fall below the standards (Standaert, 2000). The inspection mechanism is designed to assist schools, not to put pressure on them (Meuret & Bellat, 2003).

### *Education Inspection in Spain*

Since the 1978 constitution was put into effect, most of the responsibilities for the general organization of inspection system in the country have been shared between 17 regional governments (autonomous regions). However, general authority in some areas belongs to the central government in order to preserve the common structure and principles of the education system. Provided that the same basic structure is preserved, all autonomous regions have powers and responsibilities in the field of education within

their own limits of autonomy. In addition, the general authority and responsibility in education in regions that are not fully autonomous belong to the Ministry of Education and Science. This ministry is the supreme authority which all educational institutions report to, and it is also the centre of coordination for public and private educational organizations. This institution formulates government policies for all levels of education (Korkmaz & Karadağ, 2013).

In the Spanish education system, there are two levels of inspection, namely high inspection and technical inspection. The high inspection is carried out by an institution called the Supreme Supervisory Board. The board, which carries out its work as responsible to the Ministry, checks whether laws and regulations are complied with. The board also decides the conditions of transition from one education level to another and the conditions for obtaining diplomas and certificates in academic and professional fields (Kodde & Ritzen, 1988). The various duties of this board towards the government can be listed as providing scholarships, reporting on resource and personnel expenditures to authorized institutions, collecting statistical data for the purposes of the government, and presenting an annual report to government officials on the education systems of various autonomous communities (Erginer, 2006). Technical inspection includes inspection processes specific to their region. This type of inspection has two purposes; the first is to help the execution of educational work within a certain framework, and the second is the control and evaluation of the education system in order to achieve the general education objectives. Both the ministry and the autonomous regions carry out their central and regional inspection tasks in their jurisdictions with the school inspection units in the regions (Korkmaz & Karadağ, 2013). The State School Council is a national body established for social participation in the general planning of education and for recommendations on regulations or laws promulgated or proposed by the government. In addition, every institution financially supported by the government has a school council. School councils are the participatory organism that manages and oversees the establishment of the various sectors that make up the educational community. This council consists of elected representatives of teachers, students and parents, and service personnel. If the school is a private, government-funded institution, representatives of the owners are also placed on the board. The main functions of the school council are to decide on student admission, approve the institution's budget, examine the functioning, and inform the education authorities about the appointment/removal of the members of the management team (Özmen & Yasan, 2007).

#### *Education Inspection in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC)*

Education in the country is provided by public and private institutions. The general purpose of the TRNC National Education was determined by the TRNC National Education Law, which was published in the Official Gazette No. 51 on 11 June 1986 and amended in 1987, 1992, 2002 and 2006. TRNC Ministry of National Education is responsible for the administration of education-teaching activities inspections to be conducted at schools on behalf of the state (Manolova-Yalçın & Ayan 2020). The inspection of all education and training institutions in the country with the exception of universities is regulated by the Law on the National Education Inspection, Evaluation

and Steering Board affiliated to the Ministry. Based on this law, branch inspectors working under the board are responsible for secondary education, while primary education inspectors are responsible for primary education. According to the aforementioned law, the inspection of schools is carried out by education chief inspectors and education inspectors in line with the duties determined by the boards. Inspection and evaluation boards can be grouped under four headings: Education Supervision, Evaluation and Guidance Supreme Board (Supreme Board), Education Inspectors General Board (General Board), District Education Supervision, Evaluation and Guidance Boards (District Boards) and School Education Supervision, Evaluation and Steering Boards (School Boards) (TRNC MEDDYK, 2006).

- a. *Supreme Board:* Supreme Board, which has comprehensive tasks, authorities and responsibilities, consists of a Deputy Chairperson (Deputy Director), Education Chief Inspectors and five Education Inspectors to be elected by the General Board.
- b. *General Board:* Education Inspectors General Board is a consultancy body in the fields of inspection and evaluation of education, which consists of Chairperson of Supreme Board, Deputy Chairperson (Deputy Director), Education Chief Inspectors and Education Inspectors. Education inspectors present opinions to the Chairperson and Supreme Board in certain matters. The General Board holds its ordinary meeting at least twice a year at the beginning of each semester in the academic calendar, and convenes extraordinarily upon the call of the Chairperson or the written request of 1/5 of the education supervisors. The General Board convenes with the greatest possible majority of the participants, and finally, the proposals to be presented to the Chairperson and the Supreme Board are decided with the approval of 2/3 (two-thirds) of the attendees.
- c. *District Boards:* The District Education Supervision, Evaluation and Guidance Boards consist of the Education Chief Inspector appointed by the Ministry, Education Inspectors, as well as representatives of district schools and parent-teacher associations. District Boards have the right to invite to a meeting the municipality, district governorship, relevant professional organizations, student representatives and other legal organizations related to the meeting agenda, when necessary, in order to obtain their opinions. The Chief Education Inspector is appointed by the Ministry who chairs the District Boards. District Boards meet at least twice in an academic year regularly. In addition, upon the request of the Ministry or with the written request of 1/3 (one-third) of the schools in the district, an extraordinary meeting may be held. District Boards take decisions with the participation of all representatives, if possible. A 2/3 majority of votes is required for a decision to be taken. District Boards gather and evaluate their works related to primary or secondary education separately in accordance with the rules of law and submit them to the Ministry in the form of a report.
- d. *School Boards:* The School Education Supervision, Evaluation and Guidance Boards consist of the school's assistant principal(s), workshop chiefs, department heads, teacher(s), parent-teacher union representative, relevant teacher union representatives and student representatives, if any, under the chairmanship of the school principal. School boards meet regularly, at least twice, at the beginning

and the end of each academic year. Extraordinary meetings can also be held if requested by the school principal. It convenes with an absolute majority and the quorum for decision is two-thirds of the attendees.

During inspections of schools in TRNC, the following documents and criteria are taken into consideration: (i) general condition of the school, (ii) documents regarding students, teachers and other personnel, (iii) correspondences, accounts, fixed assets and revolving fund, (iv) the teaching status, (v) the education status, (vi) contributions of school parent associations, and (vii) management of the school. In addition to the examined documents and criteria, a “Management Inspection Report” is prepared regarding the school administrator. In this report, beyond providing general information about the inspected principal, evaluations are made on the following issues: knowledge of legislation, education and management information, equality of opportunity provided to teachers and students, efforts to develop their personnel, setting an example, maintaining Atatürk’s Principles and Revolutions, keeping correspondences and records, effectiveness of teacher-student-parent communication, cooperation with other institutions, preserving the building and inventory, encouraging events and competitions, establishing good relations with superiors, and providing a positive school climate (Manolova-Yalçın & Ayan 2020). In short, the main objective of this report is to ensure the development of education and teaching programs offered at schools and to provide recommendations for the correction of mistakes and rectification of deficiencies observed during inspection. In addition, by law, inspection should be conducted using contemporary techniques, cover all areas, be within the teacher’s knowledge, and aim to improve the teacher through positive feedback. The inspection is carried out by a commission which prepares reports showing the results of the study and submits them to the Supreme Board for evaluation. As a result of the work of the Supreme Board, General Inspection Report, Personnel Inspection Report, Preliminary Research and Investigation Report, Investigation, Research and Evaluation Report and Program Inspection Report are prepared in accordance with the content and purpose of the inspection (TRNC MEDDYK, 2006).

### *3.2. Comparison of inspection systems of selected countries*

In this section, the inspection systems of countries selected for the study will be compared first and the findings will be analysed and interpreted according to certain variables. Then, the roles and authorities of education inspectors in relevant units will be compared and interpreted. Thus, the education inspection systems in Germany, France, Finland, the United Kingdom, Spain and Northern Cyprus will be examined. In this context, as regards the education inspection practices of selected countries, information on the “structure of inspection and responsible units”, “purpose of the inspection”, “frequency of inspection” and “outputs of inspection” variables are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Comparison of countries' education inspection systems

Countries	Inspection structure and responsible units	Purpose of inspection	Frequency of inspection	Outputs of inspection
England	<p>- Tripartite: At national, local, institutional level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At national level: OFSTED</li> <li>• At local level: Local Education Directorate</li> <li>• At the institution level: Institution staff, stakeholders of education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving quality and standards in education</li> <li>• Professional accountability</li> <li>• Improving schools as a whole</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once in every 7 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best practices in education and training</li> </ul>
Germany	<p>- Single: At state level</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) State Ministry of Education and Culture</li> <li>2) Provincial administration</li> <li>3) Local government</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing guidance to education stakeholders</li> <li>• Professional accountability</li> <li>• Improvement of schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once in every 5 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional improvement of the teacher</li> </ul>
Finland	<p>- Double: at national and local level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At national level: Finnish Education Evaluation Centre under the Ministry of Education and Culture</li> <li>• At the local level: Education providers (local authorities, school boards, school principals)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving and supporting quality in education</li> <li>• Establishing performance-based orientation and training policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constantly at regular intervals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional improvement of the teacher</li> </ul>
France	<p>- Tripartite: at national, local, institutional level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At national level: OFSTED</li> <li>• At local level: Local Education Directorate</li> <li>• At the institution level: Institution staff, stakeholders of education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving quality and standards in education</li> <li>• Professional accountability</li> <li>• Improving schools as a whole</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once in every 7 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best practices in education and training</li> </ul>

Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dual: At national and local level</li> <li>• At national level: Ministry of Education and Science</li> <li>• At local level: District Inspectors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving quality in education</li> <li>• Providing guidance to education stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No data available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best practices in education and training</li> </ul>
Northern Cyprus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Single: At national level</li> <li>• Ministry of National Education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving quality in education</li> <li>• Making recommendations for the elimination of the deficiencies of the inspected school</li> <li>• Providing guidance to education stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irregular</li> <li>• There is no information about when the Ministry will inspect schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct functioning of educational activities according to education legislation</li> </ul>

A view of the inspection systems of selected countries in Table 1 shows that Germany and Northern Cyprus are organized in a single structure, Finland and Spain in a dual structure, and England and France in a tripartite structure. The inspection structures of these countries are generally shaped in tripartite structures at national, local and institutional level. Inspection in France shows a centralized outlook, and information regarding the inspection activities carried out by the central government units in local governments is collected in the Ministry. In other EU countries, inspection units are primarily responsible to local government authorities. Among the institutions responsible for the inspection of primary and secondary education levels in the countries studied, only OFSTED in England has an independent status from the ministry or the central government. In Northern Cyprus, on the other hand, since the Ministry is the only institution responsible for inspection, there is no local or institutional level inspection. From the point of view of the general objectives of inspection, there is an expectation that inspection will improve education in all countries. In addition, through the inspection mechanism, both teachers and administrators can ensure their professional development. When the frequency of education inspections of the countries is evaluated, it is seen that inspection is performed once in every 5 years in Germany and France. England performs inspection once in every 7 years, and Finland has inspections in regular intervals within the year. Schools in Northern Cyprus do not have information about when the inspection will be carried out, and the frequency of inspections in Spain could not be reached. Finally, the outputs of the inspection are discussed in the same table. In the light of the evaluations, it can be claimed that teachers in Germany, Finland and France have improved themselves professionally, and the best practices in education and training are identified through inspections in England and Spain. The quality improvements achieved in this way can also be reflected in the performance of teachers working in other educational institutions. In Northern Cyprus, education inspections are carried out with a more conventional approach.

### 3.3. Comparison of education inspectors and their duties and powers in selected countries

Information on the variables of “actors responsible for inspection” and “duties and powers of inspectors” in England, Germany, Finland, France, Spain and Northern Cyprus, which are the countries examined within the scope of the research, are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Education inspectors of countries and their duties and powers

Countries	Inspectors	Duties and powers of inspectors
England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the National Level: His Majesty's Inspectors</li> <li>• At local level:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Education Inspectors</li> <li>2) Branch/Field Inspectors</li> <li>3) Lay Inspectors</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is responsible for ensuring quality in the education system and reporting inspection findings.</li> </ul>
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no board of inspectors at the national level.</li> <li>• Provincial administration: Inspectors</li> <li>• Local Level: Director of Education</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Guiding teachers, school principal and education staff</li> <li>2) Conducting an instructional inspection</li> <li>3) Overseeing the development of the school</li> <li>4) Checking the general operation of the school by visiting the schools and taking the necessary precautions</li> </ol>
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School self-assessments</li> <li>• School administrators</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The self-assessment is performed through group work between school administrators and teachers.</li> <li>2) Principals who come from the teaching profession share their knowledge and experience with teachers, and help them to recognize their professional strengths and weaknesses and improve themselves.</li> </ol>
France	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the National Level: General Inspectorate of National Education and Research Administration (IGEANR) and Inspectors of the General Supervisory Board of National Education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspection, evaluation, development and guidance for the services of personnel within the framework of the holistic evaluation of the education system.</li> </ul>
Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspectors on the Supreme Board of Inspectors</li> <li>• School Inspection Level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervision and development of education and training and ensuring the realization of educational objectives.</li> <li>• Providing counselling services to schools and teachers.</li> </ul>
Northern Cyprus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspectors on the Inspection Board (Education Inspectors)</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Inspection and Evaluation</li> <li>2) Review</li> <li>3) Investigation</li> <li>4) Research</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspection reports are filed, but findings are not shared with the school under inspection.</li> </ul>

As can be seen from the Table 2 above on inspectors who are responsible for inspection and their duties and powers, evaluation and supervision of the education system is usually carried out by inspectorates operating at any level. However, there is no national inspection unit at the basic education level in Germany, so inspectors are appointed at the regional or local level in this country. Similarly, there are no inspection visits to schools in Finland, as there is no school inspection system. For this reason, schools are responsible for conducting their self-evaluations. In general, education providers (local governments, school management boards, school principals) evaluate the quality of education they provide; they are also part of the external evaluation. However, it can be said that the duties of inspectors across countries are mainly focused on the supervision, evaluation and development of the legality of the practices. In addition, the inspectors have the duty to offer recommendations for the improvement of the education system and to provide guidance and consultancy as a result of the evaluations they perform.

### **3. Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations**

The results of the study indicate that, the findings related to the structuring of education inspection revealed that central organization is at the forefront in most of the countries, while local organizations are also visible. Studies have shown that local governments are more effective in inspection in developed countries such as France and Germany, where local organizations are strong. Considering that the central workload can decrease as a result of the distribution of tasks with local governments, it is an expected result that the effectiveness and efficiency of inspection will be improved (Sağlam & Aydoğmuş 2016). In Northern Cyprus, which is organized as 28 municipalities on the basis of a centralized structure, it can be argued that local governments should be given a voice in order to effectively meet regional needs. However, in countries where local governments are more powerful, local education institutions have more authority and responsibilities in inspection organizations. Among the countries covered in this study, Her Majesty's Inspectors, who have national level inspection powers in England, are the most authoritative inspection group as they are independent and autonomous from the Ministry. Considering the structuring and changes in the inspection systems in the examined countries in recent years, trends towards increasing the autonomy of the inspection boards and ensuring the participation of all stakeholders in the management and supervision of the institutions are observed. For example, OFSTED was established in England to offer an independent inspection.

When the findings as regards the objectives of the countries included in the study for executing education inspection are reviewed, it can be seen that quality development in education is at the forefront. Considering that the ultimate aim of education inspection is improving education practices and outcomes, it can be argued that focusing on quality education is an expected result. It is observed that the schools in the countries that are at the top according to the success results in education are not those that are at the forefront with their academic achievements, but those that can provide a quality and holistic education, which means that quality education is considered to be an investment for the future (Ng & Chan, 2008). Findings about the inspection frequency of education inspectors in EU member states revealed that education inspection is usually carried out once every 5 years. In Northern Cyprus, on the other hand, there is no regulation on the



duration of the inspection; even the time inspection is supposed to be conducted is uncertain. In terms of increasing the quality of education and the continuity of the achievements, which is the ultimate goal of education inspection, it has been concluded that inspections conducted once in every 5 years is not frequent enough. As a result of Lyimo's (2015) study, it has been revealed that the academic success of the schools that are inspected more frequently is higher. In addition, in the study of Şanlı, Altun, and Tan (2015) on the low frequency of education inspections and the negative consequences experienced as a result, 80% of the education inspectors stated that conducting school inspections every 3 years may cause a loss of power in the institution and cause serious problems in the institution. It is considered important to increase the frequency of educational inspections in order to provide the necessary guidance and support to the institutions inspected. When the inspection outputs of the countries are examined, it can be said that in most of the countries, teachers have improved themselves professionally. In addition, best practices in education and training are identified through inspections. Finally, all countries considered, it can be seen that the duties of inspectors are evaluating and improving the system with a holistic approach, and providing guidance and counselling to the education personnel. Among these countries, only in the Turkish Cypriot Education System inspectors have an investigative duty. At this point, it can be argued that the investigative roles of inspectors and their guidance and professional counselling duties contradict each other. As in many developed countries, it may be more useful in Northern Cyprus for all education stakeholders to concentrate the duties of inspectors in areas such as quality assurance in inspection and education consultancy. Based on the results of the research, recommendations for the Turkish Cypriot education inspection system can be listed as follows:

1. In order for the education inspection system in Northern Cyprus to function effectively and effectively, the legal bases of the Ministry of National Education should be reviewed.
2. Considering the opinions of teachers, administrators and unions, the need for inspection can be met with more modern approaches such as accreditation, self-assessments, satisfaction surveys, needs analysis, performance evaluations and career steps, rather than the conventional control approach.
3. Performing the inspection regularly can be beneficial to prevent malfunctions that may occur at long intervals and to make necessary corrections immediately.
4. In addition to publishing a report using the findings obtained as a result of the inspection, putting focus on school, teacher and student development can help to obtain more holistic results.
5. Transparency should be the norm and the results of inspection activities should be shared with the schools and the relevant environment.
6. In-service training, seminars and similar activities can be organized for inspectors working in the country in order to increase their knowledge, skills and awareness about contemporary inspection practices.

## References

- Aydın, M. (2014). *Çağdaş eğitim denetimi* (6.Baskı). Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Bayyurt, Y., & Seggie, F. N. (2018). *Nitel araştırma yöntem, teknik, analiz ve yaklaşımları*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Bereday, G. Z.F. (1964). *Comparative method in education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bray, M., Adamson, B. & Mason, M. (Eds.). (2014). Different models, different emphases, different insights. In *Comparative Education Research: Approaches and methods* (pp. 417-436). Hong Kong: Springer International Publishing.
- Bowen, G. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27- 40. doi: 10.3316/QRJ0902027.
- Certel, S. S. (2013). Finlandiya Eğitim Sistemi. S. Ada. & Z. N. Baysal (Ed.), *Eğitim yapıları ve yönetimleri açısından çeşitli ülkelere bir bakış* (2. Baskı). (ss.171-196). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Erginer, A. (2006). *Avrupa Birliği eğitim sistemleri. Türk Eğitim Sistemiyle karşılaştırmalar*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Eurydice, (2001). Approaches to the evaluation of schools which provide compulsory education. The Situation in Scotland, United Kingdom. *Evaluation of schools providing compulsory education in Europe- Country Reports*. 1-34.
- Eurydice (2008). *The information database on Education Systems in Europe, The Education System in France*. Directorate General for Education and Culture, European Commission.
- Eurydice (2019). *The Education System in the Federal Republic of Germany 2018/2019*, KMK: Bonn.
- European Commission (2015). *Assuring quality in education: Policies and approaches to school evaluation In Europe. Eurydice Report*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- Grauwe, A. D. (2004). School self-evaluation and external inspection: A complex couple. In A. D. Grauwe, J. P. Naidoo (Eds.) *School evaluation for quality improvement*, (pp: 71-83). Asian Network of Training and Research Institutions in Educational Planning Reports. Paris: UNESCO-IIEP.
- Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P., & J.M. Ross-Gordon (2014). *Supervision an instructional leadership: A developmental approach*. Boston: MaAllyn and Bacon.
- Hovde, K. (2010). Supervision and support of primary and secondary education: A policy note for the government of Poland. *New York: World Bank*.
- Katıtaş, S., Coşkun, B., & Turpçu, M. (2019). Seçilmiş bazı ülkelerin denetim sistemlerinin karşılaştırılması ve Türk eğitim sistemi için bir model önerisi. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, 6(48), 4681- 4696.

- Kodde, D. A., & Ritzen, J. M. (1988). Direct and indirect effects of parental education level on the demand for higher education. *Journal of Human Resources*, 356-371.
- Korkmaz, T. (2013). İngiltere Eğitim Sistemi. S. Ada. & Z. N. Baysal (Ed.), *Eğitim yapıları ve yönetimleri açısından çeşitli ülkelere bir bakış* (2. Baskı). (ss. 99-115). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Korkmaz, T., & Karadağ, E. (2013). İspanya Eğitim Sistemi. S. Ada. & Z. N. Baysal (Ed.), *Eğitim yapıları ve yönetimleri açısından çeşitli ülkelere bir bakış* (2. Baskı). (ss. 291-302). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Köybaşı, F., Uğurlu, C.T., & Demir, D. (2017). Çağdaş eğitim denetimi modeli olarak okullarda farklılaştırılmış denetim uygulamalarına ilişkin bir araştırma. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15(1), 43-57.
- Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti Milli Eğitim Denetleme, Değerlendirme ve Yönlendirme Kurulu (Kuruluş, Görev ve Çalışma Esasları) Yasası (KKTC MEDDYK) (2006). KKTC Resmi Gazete, 76, 2 Mayıs 2006. <http://www.mebnet.net/sites/default/files/yasalar/41-2006.pdf> (Accessed on: October 12 2022)
- Lyimo, L. P. (2015). *The impact of school inspection on the students' academic achievement* (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania).
- Marzano, R. J., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision- Supporting the art and science of teaching*. Virginia: ASCD Member Book.
- Meuret, D., & Duru-Bellat, M. (2003). English and French modes of regulation of the Education System: A comparison. *Comparative Education*, 39(4), 463-477.
- Naidoo, J. M., Anton, D. F., & Jordan, P. (2013). School evaluation for quality improvement. Kuala Lumpur: ANTREP, UNESCO.
- Ng, P., & Chan, D. (2008). A comparative study of Singapore's school excellence model with Hong Kong's school-based management. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 22, 488-505. 10.1108/09513540810895426.
- Özenç, E. G. (2013). Almanya Eğitim Sistemi. S. Ada. & Z. N. Baysal (Ed.), *Eğitim yapıları ve yönetimleri açısından çeşitli ülkelere bir bakış* (2. Baskı). (ss. 99-115). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Özmen, F., & Yasan, T. (2007). Türk Eğitim Sisteminde denetim ve Avrupa Birliği Ülkeleri ile karşılaştırılması. *Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi Araştırmaları*, 204-210.
- Sağlam, A. Ç., & Aydoğmuş, M. (2016). Gelişmiş ve gelişmekte olan ülkelerin eğitim sistemlerinin denetim yapıları karşılaştırıldığında Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Denetimi ne durumdadır? *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(1).
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2000). Alternative approaches to supervision: Cases from the Field. *Journal of curriculum and supervision*, 15(3), 212-35.
- Süngü, H. (2005). Fransa, İngiltere ve Almanya eğitim denetimi sistemlerinin yapı ve işleyişi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 33(167), 389-405.

- Standaert, R. (2000). *Inspectorates of education in Europe: A critical Analysis*. Utrecht: Sici.
- Şanlı, Ö., Altun, M., & Tan, Ç. (2015). Okulların genel denetimleri hakkındaki; maarif müfettişlerinin ve okul idarecilerinin görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 26, 78-99.
- Toprakçı, E., & Yüce, B. (2021). Uluslararası Denetim Kurulları Örgütü'ne üye ülkelerin eğitim denetmenleri ve denetim süreçlerinin karşılaştırılması/Comparison of educational inspector and Educational Inspection of Member Countries of the Standing International Conference of Inspectorates (SICI). VIII<sup>th</sup> International Eurasian Educational Research Congress Conference Proceedings. 7-10 July 2021 / Aksaray University pp.190-215. e-ISBN: 978-605-170-681-8
- Uysal, M., & Çağanağa Ç.K. (2022). *Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti'nde temel eğitim kademesindeki yabancı dil eğitim politikalarına ilişkin paydaş görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi ve gelecekte İngilizce eğitimi* (Doktora Tezi). Lefke Avrupa Üniversitesi, Lefke.
- Yalçın, O. M., & Ayan, M. (2020). Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti (KKTC), Türkiye ve İsveç eğitim ve eğitim denetimi sistemlerinin karşılaştırılması. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9(1), 12-26, ISSN: 1846-9199.

---

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (**CC BY-NC-ND**) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).