



Participatory Educational Research (PER)
Vol.9(6), pp. 156-172, November 2022
Available online at <http://www.perjournal.com>
ISSN: 2148-6123
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17275/per.22.133.9.6>

Id: 1094408

School Principals' Views on Classroom Inspection

Hilmi Gölcük*

Department of Educational Administration, Institute of Educational Sciences, Inonu University, Malatya, Türkiye. ORCID: 0000-0002-4906-2320

Servet Atik

Faculty of Education, Inonu University, Malatya, Türkiye. ORCID: 0000-0003-2841-6182

Article history

Received:
28.03.2022

Received in revised form:
22.05.2022

Accepted:
14.07.2022

Key words:

Classroom inspection;
inspection and supervision;
school principal; teacher

School principals were charged with classroom supervision which had been in the supervisors' area of responsibility by the regulations effectuated in 2014. The aim of this study was to find out the views of school principals on classroom supervision based on the amendment of regulations. The research was conducted by a qualitative design and phenomenological method was used. Study group of the research was school principals working in the districts of Battalgazi and Yeşilyurt in Malatya, Türkiye in the academic year of 2019-2020. The semi-structured interview guide, which was designed by the researchers, was used as the data collection tool after the expert opinions were obtained and corrections were made on it. 15 school principals, who were chosen by convenience sampling, were interviewed. Interviews were recorded based on the approval of participants. Code names were given to all participants as M1, M2, M3, ... Qualitative data gathered from the participants during the interviews were analyzed by content analysis. First, the researcher coded the data separately. After that, both the researcher and another field member coded the data synchronically and reached a consensus. New codes were created where divergence appeared. It can be stated that school principals have positive views on being charged with classroom supervision. In fact, school principals state that they are not troubled with their supervision duty on teachers, but supervisors should also take part in the supervision process in order to make the process more effective and active.

Introduction

Inspection is a process containing collaborative work with teachers and other educators to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000). Inspection process aims to improve teaching and enhance student success, and it is essential to be in communication with teachers about teaching in this process (Sullivan & Glanz, 2013/2015). Inspection is the process of understanding whether organisational activities are in accordance with the specified principals, rules, and criteria in line with the

* Correspondency: servet.atik@inonu.edu.tr

accepted objectives. The main purpose of the inspection is to determine the goal attainment level of the organisation, to take due precautions to get better results and to improve the process (Aydın, 2013). The general purpose of inspection in education is to promote teachers' professional development. In this process, it is aimed to improve the teachers' knowledge and skill competencies, efficiency in the process of teaching and learning, ability to make a decision and to solve a problem and teaching application skills (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002).

The Turkish Ministry of National Education has been inspecting educational institutions by various regulations mainly through education inspectors since the early years of proclamation of the republic in Türkiye (MEB, 1926). The powers and responsibilities of education inspectors are explained in detail with various regulations. However, the Ministry sometimes makes legislative amendments concerning education inspectors' titles, duties, powers, and responsibilities (Baysal & Ada, 2015). According to Bean (2004), the roles of inspectors consist of three stages. In the first stage, the focal point is informal activities based on the curriculum development process. In the second stage, the focus is on the processes of analysing the student performance and planning the lesson. In the third stage, inspectors give feedback to the teachers after their classroom observations as the official and the most extensive duties of them (Gibson, 2006). Improving the efficiency of the process of teaching and learning in the functioning of schools is the primary objective of almost all efforts in inspection (Harris, 1985).

When there is a quality problem in education in developed countries, inspectors make examinations in the classroom instead of the institution, observe the teaching and learning activities in the classroom, define the problems and try to make useful proposals (O'Sullivan, 2006). The results of the teacher selection examinations give us limited information about the teachers. It is important to be successful teachers in their fields but application level of their knowledge and skills is more important (Davey, 1991). Classroom inspection is conducted to reveal the teaching and learning behaviours in the teaching process objectively (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000). From a different viewpoint, classroom inspection is the maintenance or modification of school functioning to directly affect the teaching processes used to enhance the student learning and the school personnel's activities with the students (Harris, 1985).

The efficiency of the classroom inspection depends on three factors substantially. First, the inspector should have the ability to reveal the improvable aspects of the teachers. Second, the inspector should have the ability to establish an effective communication with the teachers. Third, the teachers should be eager to follow the proposals of the inspector (Brimblecombe et al., 1995, as cited in Chapman, 2001). During the inspection, schools are observed, and teachers try to prove that they are in a good school (Perryman, 2007). The inspection may sometimes be deviated from the aim. There should be openness and reliability between the inspector and the teachers so that the teachers can talk about their own deficiencies and improve themselves. However, if the inspector misuses these deficiencies they talked about, their openness and reliability get damaged. Moreover, excluding teachers from the process, absence of self-evaluation and lack of inspection criteria are some of the mistakes made in inspections (Daresh, 2006).

School principals have been charged with classroom inspection which was formerly in the area of responsibility of education inspectors since the regulations of the Turkish Ministry of National Education Department for Guidance and Inspection and Department for Education Inspectors, published in official gazette on the 24th of May 2014, and it can be said these

regulations have caused a fundamental change in the classroom inspection implementations. There are several studies examining the classroom inspection implementations of the school principals in the literature. Cook and Richards (1972) determined that both the inspectors and the school principals reflected their own viewpoints instead of the teachers' performance in classroom while they were evaluating the teacher performance. Gray (2010) revealed that the school principals could determine the efficient math teachers in the inspections, but they could not determine the efficiencies of the teachers of lessons based on verbal communication and made their evaluations accordingly. Firıncıoğulları Bige (2014) discovered that the teachers' views on the classroom inspections of the elementary school principals were positive. Furthermore, the expectations of the teachers from classroom inspections were prioritised as guidance, feedback, remedy for the deficiency of the materials, defining professional inadequacy, award and appreciation and improving the quality of the education. Lee and Nie (2014) stated that both the inspectors and the school principals played a key role to motivate the teachers during the inspections. Winslow (2015) found that the teachers responded more positively to face-to-face feedback rather than written feedback after the school principals conducted classroom observations for the inspection. Alagöz (2016) remarked that the school principals regarded themselves as competent in classroom inspection, but the teachers did not regard them as competent in classroom inspection. It was proposed that the school principals should be provided training to improve their competence level related to classroom inspection.

Bayar (2017) determined that the legislative change concerning classroom inspections was responded positively by the school principals and the teachers but negatively by the inspectors. Koç (2018) revealed that the teachers' views on the quality of classroom inspections conducted by the school principals were substantially negative, and the teachers expressed the main disadvantage of the school principals' inspections as inclusion of external factors like personal relationships and political views to classroom inspection. Marangoz (2019) stated that the school principals pay attention to the teaching processes mostly in the classroom inspections and they give feedback to the teachers for guidance and aim to overcome the deficiencies in consequence of the classroom inspections. Moreover, it was emphasised that the inspectors should be experts in their fields, a teacher evaluation model based on multiple data sources should be developed and the inspections should be conducted periodically and consistently. Reckmeyer (2020) found that the interaction frequency and quality between the school principals and the teachers concerning the inspection have a significant effect on teachers' satisfaction.

The aim of this study was to find out the views of the school principals on classroom inspection they were charged with based on the latest amendment of regulations in Türkiye. A semi-structured interview guide was used to elicit information from the school principals working in all types of schools in the research. It is thought that this research will help overcome the deficiencies of the current inspection regulations by revealing its positive and negative sides in the light of the data gathered from the school principals. This research was conducted in Türkiye, but it is estimated that the research can be useful for the inspection systems in education varying from country to country around the world. The fact that the systems where school principals are held responsible for classroom supervision is crucial for education systems and thereupon the findings of the current research are believed to be meaningful for the relevant literature. To this end, the statement of problem of the research was 'What are the views of the school principals on classroom inspection?'

Method

Qualitative method was employed to gather information about the school principals' views on classroom inspection in this research. Qualitative method is the most practical way to comprehend and identify the limited situations (Christensen, Johnson & Turner, 2011). Phenomenological research design was used in the research. Phenomenology is the most appropriate research design for a problem in which it is important to understand several individuals' common and shared experiences of a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007).

Study Group

The study group of the research consisted of 15 school principals working in Malatya, which is located in Eastern Türkiye, in the academic year of 2019-2020. The school principals in the study group were chosen by convenience sampling among the school principals who had supervised the course at least four times previously. Convenience sampling is easy, quick, and more economical way (Singleton, Straits, Straits & McAllister, 1988).

The fields of study of the school principals taking part in the research are elementary school teaching (f=9), Turkish teaching (f=2), Turkish philology teaching (f=1), mathematics teaching (f=1), chemistry teaching (f=1) and geography teaching (f=1). In terms of the total length of service as a school principal, 6 school principals have been working for 0-5 years, 7 school principals have been working for 6-10 years and 2 school principals have been working for 11 and more years in the study group. In terms of the types of institutions, 4 school principals work in elementary schools, 4 school principals work in secondary schools, 5 school principals work in primary schools (both elementary and secondary schools) and 2 school principals work in high schools. In terms of educational attainments, 9 school principals have bachelor's degree and 6 school principals have master's degree in the study group of the research.

Data Collection Tool

The semi-structured interview guide was designed by the researchers after the literature review. Interview method enables researchers to investigate situations which cannot be observed by the other methods (Wellington & Szczerbinski, 2007). The interviewer has a checklist of the titles concerning the content, the assumed statements and the interview guide showing the order of the questions in semi-structured interviews, but the order of expressions and questions can be changed in compliance with the flow of the interview and unplanned questions can also be asked (Robson, 2011/2015).

The expert opinion was sought on the semi-structured interview guide from 3 academic members from different universities who took doctorate in the field of educational administration and the interview guide was pilot tested with 3 school principals after the corrections on it. Following the necessary corrections and arrangements, the semi-structured interview guide was revised into its final form. The interview guide was comprised of two sections. There are questions about the demographic information of the participants in the first section of the guide and taking their opinions on classroom inspections of the school principals in the second section.

Data Collection Process

15 school principals working in Malatya, which is located in Eastern Türkiye, in the academic year of 2019-2020 were interviewed to collect the data of the research. Interviews

can be made face to face, through phone calls or on electronic media (Christensen et al., 2011). The school principals were interviewed through phone calls because of the COVID-19 pandemic. The participants were informed about the aim and the importance of the study at first. The phone calls were recorded based on the approval of the participants. The length of interviews with the participants varies between 7 and 29 minutes.

Data Analysis

The qualitative data gathered from the participants during the interviews were analysed by descriptive and content analysis. Descriptive analysis is used to process the data not requiring in-depth analysis, but the main aim of content analysis is to develop concepts and relationships which can define the data. Qualitative research data are analysed in four stages. First, the data are coded. Next, the themes are found. After that, the codes and the themes are revised. Finally, the findings are identified and interpreted (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013).

The recorded phone calls were computerised as audio files and redacted. The audio files and the written files were compared with each other to check the accuracy. After the answers to the open-ended questions were examined, they were separated into the significant parts with the help of NVIVO software. These significant parts were named with the expressions related to their meanings; that is, they were coded. Researchers try to categorise the data in these identification, classification, and interpretation processes (Creswell, 2007). After coding, the codes are grouped and separated into the themes (Robson, 2011/2015). Categories are outcomes of codes and themes are outcomes of categories (Saldaña, 2013). In qualitative data analysis process, expert opinion is sought on codes and themes generated by the researcher for the coding accuracy (Kabakçı Yurdakul, 2016). Firstly, the first researcher coded the data separately and wrote 68 codes. After that, the second researcher with field expertise coded the data and wrote 59 codes. Both researchers then reached a consensus on 54 codes. 8 new codes were created where divergence appeared. Intercoder agreement was calculated as 86%. According to Miles & Huberman (1994), intercoder agreement in qualitative data analysis should approach or exceed 90%. Code names were given to all participants as M1, M2, M3, ...

Validity and Reliability

Some practices were implemented for the validity and reliability of the research. The interviews were recorded based on the approval of the participants in order to increase the reliability and avoid the data loss. Investigator triangulation is existence of more than one researcher to interpret the data (Christensen et al., 2011). For this purpose, the same data set was coded by both the first researcher and the expert second researcher. Participant feedback is to check the concurrence between the participant and the researcher's expressions, interpretations and conclusions (Christensen et al., 2011). Thus, the findings of the research were shared with the interviewed participants. Peer review is to discuss the conclusions with a peer or a colleague to provide a different viewpoint (Christensen et al., 2011). Thus, the first researcher and the expert second researcher exchanged views on the conclusions of the research. Conclusions of the researchers on participants' views should be pointed out by verbatim quotations with the help of low-inference descriptors (Christensen et al., 2011; Silverman, 2010). For this reason, verbatim quotations were used in the findings for the views of the participants with the code names.

Strategies promoting the participant honesty should be used (Shenton, 2004, as cited in



Arastaman, Öztürk Fidan & Fidan, 2018). Thus, all participants were told that they could refuse to take part in the research and finish the interview at any time during the interview. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), if two researchers codify the same data set, identifications become clearer. In this way, it is possible to reach a consensus on what the codes mean and which data refer to which code. The essential point of this method is whether the coders use similar codes for the same data set. If there is a divergence, it shows that the codes should be revised (Arastaman et al., 2018). For this reason, both the first researcher and the expert second researcher coded the same data set and the inter-coder consistency was calculated as 86%. Another method is to check the parallelism between the results of the research and those of studies conducted in the past (Silverman, 2000, as cited in Arastaman et al., 2018). Thus, the results of the research were compared with those of other studies in the literature.

Findings

Findings about the School Principals Informing the Teachers for the Classroom Inspections Beforehand and Preparing a Classroom Inspection Plan with the Teachers

The school principals were asked whether they inform the teachers before the classroom inspections. Almost all school principals expressed that they inform the teachers before all the inspections. *M10: "I generally inform the teachers about the classroom inspections and their contents beforehand."* Very few of the school principals remarked that the purpose of the classroom inspection affects whether they inform the teachers beforehand or not. The classroom inspections can be for the purpose of guidance or inspection. *M8: "I do not inform the teachers beforehand when I conduct a classroom inspection for the purpose of guidance, but I inform them beforehand when I conduct a classroom inspection for the purpose of inspection."*

Some of the school principals stated how long ago they inform the teachers for the classroom inspections. According to these views, these school principals inform the teachers for the classroom inspections on the last day, nearly a week ago, nearly a month ago or at the beginning of term. *M10: "I informed the teachers on the last day on which the classroom inspections would be conducted."* Some school principals talked about the way of informing the teachers before the classroom inspections. Three school principals expressed that they send messages via SMS or school WhatsApp groups, two school principals expressed that they inform the teachers through an official writing, a school principal remarked that he informs the teachers in the meeting with them at the beginning of the term and a school principal stated that he informs the teachers orally. *M2: "I text a message to inform the teachers about the classroom inspections."*

Another key point is that all school principals expressed that they inform the teachers for the classroom inspections beforehand when they go for the purpose of inspection but only one school principal stated that he prepares a classroom inspection plan with the teachers before the classroom inspections. *M14: "... I come together with the teachers, tell them that I will come to the classroom inspection at the scheduled time, state my expectations from them during the classroom inspection and ask their expectations from the inspection and eventually we prepare a classroom inspection plan together."*

Findings Concerning the Considered Points of the Classroom Inspections by the School Principals

The school principals were asked which points they pay attention to during the classroom inspections. The answers regarding this matter were examined based on the necessary competencies for teaching clarified by the Turkish Ministry of National Education Directorate General for Teacher Training and Improvement (2017) and the codes were categorised into three as ‘Professional knowledge and ability’, ‘Attitudes and values’ and ‘Official papers and other’. The findings based on these categories are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The Considered Points of the Classroom Inspections by the School Principals

Category	Code	Participants	f
Professional Knowledge and Ability	Pedagogical Competence	M3, M6, M8, M9, M12, M14, M15	7
	Teacher’s Classroom Authority	M3, M6, M9, M11, M13, M15	6
	Time Management	M2, M7, M11, M12, M14	5
	Student Achievements	M1, M6, M9, M12, M15	5
	Student Activity- Contemporary Approaches	M4, M6, M8, M14, M15	5
	Preparations for Teaching	M5, M6, M7, M13, M14	5
	Use of Course Material and Smart Boards in Classroom	M6, M7, M13, M14	4
	Classroom Arrangement and Notice Boards	M4, M8, M10, M14	4
	Teacher’s Questions to Students	M1, M6, M11	3
	Motivating Students	M6, M10	2
	Students Taking Notes from Lectures	M4, M7	2
	Giving Homework to Students	M10	1
	Student Readiness	M10	1
	Twofer	M14	1
	Practices for Students with Special Needs	M14	1
Attitudes and Values	Communication Between Teacher and Students	M1, M3, M4, M5, M7, M8, M10, M11, M12, M13, M14, M15	12
	Taking Part in School Activities	M6, M14	2
	In-service Training Activities	M14	1
	Parent-Teacher Interaction	M14	1
Official and Other Papers	Contribution to National Consciousness of Students	M14	1
	Readiness of Teacher’s Official Papers	M2, M5, M7, M8, M10, M14	6
	Points in Classroom Inspection Guide	M1, M3, M10	3
Twofer	M14	1	

As can be seen in Table 1, the school principals pay attention to the teacher’s pedagogical competence, classroom authority, time management, student achievements, student activity, teacher’s preparations for teaching, use of course material and smart boards in classroom and classroom arrangements and notice boards most in terms of the teacher’s professional knowledge and ability during the classroom inspections. The school principals also consider the teacher’s questions to students, motivating students, giving homework to students, students taking notes from lectures, student readiness, readiness of classroom to education and



teaching and practices for the students with special needs. *M4: "I watch the sitting arrangements of the students at first. I pay attention to the order of desks, formation of notice boards, student attendance to lesson, student activity and whether the teacher recognise all students. Furthermore, I consider the notes of the students taken from the lessons."*

The school principals said that they pay attention to the communication between the teacher and the students most during the classroom inspections in terms of attitudes and values. The school principals also expressed that they consider their taking part in the school activities, their in-service training activities, their contribution to the national consciousness of students and parent-teacher interaction. *M6: "I evaluate the teachers according to their teaching styles, their after-school activities, their social activities, their willingness to take part in the science fairs and projects ..."*

Apart from these two categories, the school principals pay attention to the readiness of the teacher's official papers, the points in the classroom inspection guide and whether the janitors do their job or not during the classroom inspections. *M14: "When I come to the classroom, I watch the arrangement and neatness of the classroom at first. This gives me the opportunity to check both the classroom arrangement of teacher and the cleaning duties of the janitors."*

Another key point is that the classroom arrangement and the notice boards are important in elementary schools but they are not so important in secondary and high schools for the school principals during the classroom inspections.

Findings Concerning the Feedback of the School Principals After the Observations in Classroom

What the school principals do with the teachers after classroom inspections were examined. Almost all school principals expressed that they make evaluation with the teachers after the classroom observations. *M8: "The teachers and I exchange opinions with each other after all classroom inspections."* A school principal said that he does not come together and talk with the teachers unless he sees an important problem during the classroom inspections.

Very few of the school principals stated that they fill in the inspection forms after the classroom inspections. A school principal remarked that he shows the inspection forms to the teachers directly after filling. *M14: "I make the teachers look at the inspection forms after the classroom inspections. I tell everything that I see in the classroom."*

Another remarkable finding is that the school principals' communication with the teachers after the classroom inspections is individual, not in group. The school principals expressed that the meetings after the classroom observations are held conversationally. More than half of the school principals remarked that after the classroom observations, they give suggestions to the teachers having deficiency in classroom practices. Another key point is that very few of the school principals stated that they appreciate the teachers in meetings after the classroom inspections. Nearly half of the school principals remarked that they offer the teachers tea or coffee during the meetings after the classroom observations.

Findings Concerning the Positive Sides of the Current Regulations about the Classroom Inspection in Türkiye According to the Views of the School Principals

The positive views of the school principals on the latest amendment of regulations concerning the classroom inspection in Türkiye were examined. The findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The Positive Views on the Current Regulations Concerning the Classroom Inspections According to the School Principals

Views of Participants	Participants	f
It gives the opportunity to evaluate the teachers with a process-based way	M1, M3, M4, M5, M6, M8, M9, M12, M13, M14, M15	11
School principals are more familiar to school than education inspectors	M3, M5, M6, M8, M9, M10, M12, M14, M15	9
It reduces the anxiety in teachers	M1, M7, M14	3
There are not any positive sides of it	M2, M11	2

As can be seen in Table 2, more than half of the school principals expressed that the current regulations give the opportunity to evaluate the teachers with a process-based way. *M1*: “The best side of the classroom inspections conducted by the school principals is that the teachers are not evaluated for just one day. I can see, watch and observe the teachers in the school for a whole year. For this reason, the evaluation of the school principal becomes more objective and realist.” More than half of the school principals stated that the school principals are more familiar to the school than the education inspectors. Very few of the school principals remarked that the classroom inspections conducted by the school principals reduce the anxiety in the teachers. Very few of the school principals said that there is no positive side of the current regulations. *M11*: “I cannot see any positive side. The inspections should be done by someone outside the institution. Someone you are together with in the organization cannot see the mistakes, even if they see the mistakes, they will tolerate them.”

Findings Concerning the Negative Sides of the Current Regulations about the Classroom Inspection in Türkiye According to the Views of the School Principals

The negative views of the school principals on the latest amendment of regulations concerning the classroom inspection in Türkiye were examined. The findings are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The Negative Views on the Current Regulations Concerning the Classroom Inspections According to the School Principals

Views of Participants	Participants	f
Classroom inspections of the school principals are not taken seriously by the teachers	M2, M3, M7, M9, M10, M11, M13	7
The school principal's relationship with the teacher may prevent the objectivity	M1, M4, M5, M6, M14, M15	6
The school principals have no competence in the classroom inspection	M2, M6, M8, M10, M14	5
The school principal's inspection may harm the school climate	M2, M9, M14	3
The school principals cannot guide for the lessons out of their fields	M2, M12	2

As can be seen in Table 3, half of the school principals expressed that their classroom

inspections are not taken seriously by the teachers. M10: “... *Even if the teachers and the school principals keep the formality between each other, they have a closer relationship than the education inspectors. Therefore, it can cause the classroom inspections not to be taken seriously by the teachers.*” Nearly half of the school principals stated that the school principal’s relationship with the teacher may prevent the objectivity. Nearly half of the school principals stressed that the school principals have no competence in the classroom inspection. Very few of the school principals said that their inspections may harm the school climate and very few of the school principals remarked that the school principals cannot guide for the lessons out of their fields.

Findings Concerning Who Should Conduct the Classroom Inspections in Schools

Who should conduct the classroom inspections was examined according to the views of the school principals was another salient question. Nearly half of the school principals expressed that both the school principals and the education inspectors should conduct the classroom inspections. M9: “*Both of them are necessary. The school principals should inspect the teachers and the education inspectors should inspect the inspections of the school principals.*” Nearly half of the school principals remarked that school principals should conduct the classroom inspections. M8: “*Definitely, the school principals. I think they inspect better than the education inspectors under any circumstances when process-based evaluation is taken into consideration.*” Very few of the school principals expressed that the education inspectors should conduct the classroom inspections. M7: “*The education inspectors conducted the classroom inspections previously and this was better than the inspections conducted by the school principals. The school principal must not be both the school principal and the inspector in the school.*” A school principal stated that he had no idea about who should conduct the classroom inspections in schools.

Findings Concerning What Qualifications the School Principals Should Have for the Classroom Inspections

The school principals’ views on the required qualifications they should have for the effective classroom inspections were examined. Half of the school principals emphasised that the school principals should have good human relations for the effective classroom inspections. M8: “*They should have good communication skills and good human relations. The person conducting inspections should be able to help the teachers overcome their uneasiness.*” Half of the school principals stated that the school principals should have comprehensive knowledge of the fields of the teachers. M3: “*For example, I conduct a classroom inspection on an English lesson but I do not know English. The teacher tells something in the classroom and I just look blankly because I do not understand.*” Nearly half of the school principals remarked that the school principals should be objective. M14: “*... political views of the teachers may be different or the teachers may be a part of different social organisation outside the school but they are just teachers inside the school and the definition of teacher is clear. The school principals should evaluate the teachers in this way.*” Nearly half of the school principals expressed that the school principals should have postgraduate education. M11: “*The school principals should have comprehensive knowledge of the classroom inspection. They should have education for the inspection. It is very important to receive the education for the inspection.*” Very few of the school principals stressed that the school principals should have comprehensive knowledge of the regulations. M2: “*I think the school principals should know the regulations very well. Every step we take and everything we say are official so the person conducting inspections should know the regulations very well.*” Very few of the school principals expressed that the school principals

should be more qualified than the teachers. *M14: "... The person inspecting me should be superior to me in terms of education and training. If I am a teacher taking doctorate, the person inspecting my lesson should not be inferior to me in terms of my education vision."*

Findings Concerning Whether Differences of Opinion Between School Principals and Teachers Have an Effect on Classroom Inspections

The school principals were asked whether the disagreements or differences of opinion between the school principals and the teachers have an effect on the classroom inspections. All school principals stated that any disagreement or difference of opinion between the teachers and them does not influence their classroom inspections. *M7: "I have no political, unionization or religious view in school. Everybody has a view outside the school. I do not reflect in the school. I do not know who holds which view and it is none of my business. I focus on what they do. ..."*

Discussion and Conclusion

The fact that the school principals have been charged with the classroom inspection which was formerly in responsibility of the education inspectors in Türkiye was generally reacted positively by the school principals in this research. The reasons for this were expressed as the opportunity for teachers to be evaluated in a process-based way, the fact that the principals know the school better, and the reduction of teachers' anxiety towards inspections. Some studies in the literature also revealed that the school principals should conduct the classroom inspections (Oliva & Pawlas, 2004; Peterson, 2004; Yeşil & Kış, 2015; Demirtaş & Akarsu, 2016; Donaldson & Mavrogordato, 2018). Many school principals supported the current regulations, which allow only the school principals to conduct the classroom inspections but some of them emphasised that a new inspection system allowing not only the school principals but also the education inspectors to conduct the classroom inspections is needed. Actually, the school principals expressed that they are not troubled with the classroom inspections they conduct but it is necessary to include the education inspectors in the process to make the process more effective and active. Thus, it can be said that developing a classroom inspection system both the school principals and the education inspectors conduct the inspections together has great importance. It is also stressed in total quality management that double-check can be a method to improve the quality (Oakland, 2014).

It can be said that the school principals make more proper evaluations because of the fact that they are more familiar to the school and the teachers, have the opportunity to evaluate the teachers with a process-based way instead of evaluating through just one lesson like the education inspectors and help the teachers feel less anxious about the classroom inspections thanks to the current regulations. The school principals generally think that the familiarity with the teachers and performance of the teachers in the process makes the inspections easier. It was also found in the studies in the literature that the opportunity to evaluate the teachers with a process-based way was the most emphasised positive side (Demirtaş & Akarsu, 2016; Dönmez & Demirtaş 2018; Akbaşlı & Tunç, 2019). However, it was discovered that due to the current regulations, the classroom inspections of the school principals are not taken seriously by the teachers, the school principal's relationship with the teacher may prevent the objectivity, the school principals have no competence in the classroom inspections, the school principal's inspection may harm the school climate and the school principals cannot guide for the lessons out of their fields. The fact that the teachers do not take the classroom inspections

of the school principals seriously may be due to the fact that the school principal and the teachers spend long working hours together, damaging the professionalism of the process. Gray (2010) revealed that the school principals cannot determine the effectiveness of the teachers of the verbal lessons. It was also found in the literature that one of the biggest problems the education inspectors confronted in the classroom inspections was the difference of the fields with the teachers (Demirtaş & Akarsu, 2016; Koç, 2018; Altunay, 2020). It can be stated that if an inspector or a school principal from the same field inspects on a teacher, it will be more appropriate and improve their motivations.

The school principals conduct the classroom inspections on a teacher at least twice in an academic year and often make observations in the classroom for the purpose of guidance. It was expressed that these inspections can be conducted more frequently according to the school types, especially if there are students with special needs or a nursery class. The school principals are responsible for managing and developing the special education in schools, taking steps for the students with special needs and collaboration with the special education teachers based on the Turkish Ministry of National Education Regulations for Special Education Services (2018). Thus, the school principals need to observe the special education classes constantly. It was discovered that the number of classroom inspections across the world is not limited to twice in an academic year and varies from school to school (Kuligowski, Holdzkom & French, 1993; Oliva & Pawlas, 2004). Reckmeyer (2020) discovered that the frequency and the quality of the interaction between the school principals and the teachers improve the satisfaction of the teachers.

It can be said that the school principals inform the teachers for the classroom inspections beforehand, but they do not prepare a classroom inspection plan with the teachers before the classroom inspections. It can be stated that the school principals and the teachers do not come together and prepare a classroom inspection plan together before the inspections and this affects the classroom inspections negatively. It was also found in the literature that the school principals do not prepare a classroom inspection plan with the teachers before classroom inspections (Kunduz, 2007; Uğurlu, 2012, Altınok, 2013; Kipici, 2019; Yiğit, 2019). The school principals may inform the teachers for the classroom inspections on the last day, a week ago, a month ago or at the beginning of the term. The way of informing the teachers before the classroom inspections may be face-to-face, via messages or through an official writing. It was seen that some school principals take advantage of the social media and some of them prefer the bureaucratic ways while informing the teachers for the classroom inspections.

It was stated by the school principals in the research that they pay attention to the communication between the teacher and the students, the teacher's pedagogical competence, classroom authority of the teachers, readiness of the teacher's official papers, time management of the teachers, the teacher's preparations for teaching and comprehension level of student achievements most during the classroom inspections. This result shows parallelism with the other research in the literature (Scriven, 1988; Altınok, 2013; Yeşil & Kış, 2015). Cook and Richards (1972) found that the school principals focus on a teacher's desire, motivation, behaviour, attitude, and posture during the classroom inspections while the education inspectors focus on a teacher's performance in classroom.

It was expressed that the school principals' communication with the teachers after the classroom inspections is individual, not in group. These meetings and observations can be associated with clinical supervision. Inspection should be direct, classroom-centred, oriented

to teaching, collaborative and helpful for the teacher development according to the conception of clinical supervision (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). Thus, it is very important to give feedback to the teachers after the classroom inspections. The inspection system in Türkiye was no more scientific supervision and became mainly based on guidance and clinical supervision with the Regulations of the Committee of Primary Education Inspectors, published in official gazette on the 27th of October, 1990. It was expressed in the research that the meetings after the classroom observations are held conversationally. It was stated that the feedbacks of the school principals to the teachers were constructive and gently. Thus, the school principals having educational leadership skills create a positive environment in the school and keep this environment going in terms of the organisational process (Bozkurt, Yurdakul & Kahraman, 2020). It was said that some school principals offer the teachers tea or coffee during the meetings after the classroom observations. There are some sayings in the Turkish culture such as 'A cup of coffee causes forty years of memory' and 'Coffee is a labour of love' and these sayings explain the importance of the school principals' offerings to the teachers during the meetings after the classroom inspections. It is thought that these offerings improve the sincerity in the communication between the school principals and the teachers. It was found that the school principals give suggestions to the teachers having deficiency in classroom practices, but they do not appreciate the teachers in the meetings after the classroom inspections. There is another saying in the Turkish culture as 'The good performance should be complimented' and it stresses the importance of the appreciation of the success. If people's behaviours are reinforced by their environment, they attribute more meaning to this behaviour and stick to it heart and soul. It was determined in the studies in the literature that the appreciation of school principals on the teachers' efforts and good performance has a positive effect on the teachers (Blase & Blase, 1997; Uğurlu, Mermer & Ertaş, 2013; Fırıncıoğulları Bige, 2014; Lee & Nie, 2014).

It was expressed that the school principals should have good human relations, be objective, have comprehensive knowledge of the fields of the teachers and regulations, have postgraduate education and be more qualified than the teachers for the effective classroom inspections. In the literature, Yeşil and Kış (2015) found that the school principals should be experienced, have sophisticated evaluation skills, have comprehensive general knowledge, and have leadership skills in addition to these qualifications. Winslow (2015) found that the school principals should have the ability to lead the teachers for their developments.

The school principals stated that any disagreement in school or difference of opinion between the teachers and them does not influence their classroom inspections. However, there are some studies contradicting the result of this research in the literature. Thus, the most emphasised view of the teachers is that they are concerned about whether the personal relationships or differences of opinion between the school principals and the teachers have an effect on the classroom inspections (Demirtaş & Akarsu, 2016; Dönmez & Demirtaş 2018). Furthermore, the school principals stated in this research that one of the negative sides of the inspections conducted by the school principals is that the school principal's relationship with the teacher may prevent the objectivity but all of them expressed that they are objective in the classroom inspections.

Although the school principals take an active role in the classroom inspections in Türkiye, the education inspectors manage this process in different countries across the world (England, Hong Kong, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Scotland, Singapore) and it is seen that the teachers do not need for inspection in Finland (Whitby, 2010). Thus, it can be regarded as an important step to improve self-control of the teachers and create training programs helping



them improve their self-control.

Suggestions

These suggestions can be made in accordance with the results of this research:

- School principals can increase the number of the classroom inspections in an academic year unless there are a lot of teachers in schools.
- If a teacher does not feel ready for the classroom inspection, this inspection can be conducted another time by school principals.
- If classroom inspection forms for each field are created, it can be a positive contribution to the process of classroom inspection.
- School principals conducting classroom inspections can be encouraged to have postgraduate education or attend in-service training activities in order to be competent in the field of inspection.
- School principals who will conduct classroom inspections can come together with teachers and prepare an inspection plan together before the classroom inspections so that they can improve the efficiency of inspection.

Acknowledgments

The study received ethical approval from the Inonu University Ethics Committee, and all participants gave informed consent as a condition of submitting their responses. The authors did not receive support from any organization for the submitted work. There are no relevant financial or non-financial competing interests to report.

References

- Akbaşı, S. & Tunç, Z. (2019). The assessment of primary school teachers' opinions about course supervision of school principals. *Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty*, 21(3), 75-92.
- Alagöz, S. (2016). *Views of administrators and teachers about class supervision competency levels of school principals* (Unpublished master's thesis). Istanbul University Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Altınok, F. (2013). *Research of classroom supervision activities in primary and secondary schools in point of clinical supervision model* (Unpublished master's thesis). Akdeniz University Institute of Educational Sciences, Antalya.
- Altunay, E. (2020). Principal and teacher's opinions of school principals on course inspections. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 55, 95-127.
- Arastaman, G., Öztürk Fidan, İ. & Fidan, T. (2018). Validity and reliability in qualitative research: A theoretical analysis. *Van Yuzuncu Yil University Journal of Education*, 15(1), 37-75.
- Aydın, M. (2013). *Çağdaş eğitim denetimi [Modern educational supervision]*. (7th edn.). Ankara: Hatiboğlu Publishing.
- Bayar, T. (2017). *Teachers, school principals and education inspectors' opinions on annulment of guidance and auditing applications by education inspectors in classrooms* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Institute of Educational Sciences, Burdur.

- Baysal, Z. N. & Ada, S. (2015). *Dünden bugüne Türk eğitim sistemi ve yapısı [Turkish educational system and structure from past to present]*. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Beach, D. M. & Reinhartz, J. (2000). *Supervisory leadership: Focus on instruction*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Blase, J. & Blase, J. (1997). The micropolitical orientation of facilitative school principals and its effects on teachers' sense of empowerment. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(2), 138-164.
- Bozkurt, A., Yurdakul, A. & Kahraman, Ü. (2020). Okul yönetiminin öğretmen denetiminde rol ve sorumlulukları [Role and responsibilities of school administration in teacher supervision]. M. Sağır and S. Göksoy (Ed.), *Eğitimde denetim ve değerlendirme [Supervision and evaluation in education]* (pp. 229-260). Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Chapman, C. (2001). Changing classrooms through inspection. *School Leadership and Management*, 21(1), 59-73.
- Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B. & Turner, L. A. (2011). *Research methods, design, and analysis*. (11. edn.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Cook, M. A. & Richards, H. C. (1972). Dimensions of principal and supervisor ratings of teacher behavior. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 41(2), 11-14.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry research design*. (2. edn.). California: Sage Publications.
- Daresh, J. C. (2006). *Leading and supervising instruction*. California: Corwin Press.
- Davey, B. (1991). Evaluating teacher competence through the use of performance assessment tasks: an overview. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 5(2), 121-132.
- Demirtaş, H. & Akarsu, M. (2016). Opinions of teachers regarding the inspection of teachers by school principals instead of inspectors. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 17(2), 69-93.
- Donaldson, M. & Mavrogordato, M. (2018). Principals and teacher evaluation. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(6), 586-601.
- Dönmez, B. & Demirtaş, Ç. (2018). Opinions of school principals and teachers on the school principals' duties of lesson supervision. *Adiyaman University Journal of Social Sciences*, 29, 454-478.
- Fırınçoğulları Bige, E. (2014). *The view of teachers about primary school principals' classroom supervision* (Unpublished master's thesis). Adnan Menderes University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Aydın.
- Gibson, S. A. (2006). Lesson observation and feedback: the practice of an expert reading coach. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 45(4), 295-318.
- Gray, J. J. (2010). *Are principals good at identifying effective teachers? A comparison of teachers' principal ratings and residual gain on standardized tests* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Educational Leadership & Policy Studies and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas.
- Harris, B. M. (1985). *Supervisory behavior in education*. (3. edn.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Publishing.
- Kabakçı Yurdakul, I. (2016). Nitel veri analizinin temelleri [Basics of qualitative data analysis]. I. Kabakçı Yurdakul (Ed.), *Nitel veri analizinde adım adım NVivo kullanımı [Using NVivo step by step in qualitative data analysis]* (pp. 1-20). Ankara: Anı Publishing.
- Kipici, K. (2019). *Evaluation of school principals of elementary schools in terms of teacher view about the supervision of the lessons* (Unpublished master's thesis). Van Yuzuncu Yil University Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Koç, İ. (2018). *Evaluation of school principal's supervision duties by teachers* (Unpublished master's thesis). Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University Institute of Educational Sciences.

- Kuligowski, B., Holdzkom, D. & French, R. L. (1993). Teacher performance evaluation in the southeastern states: Forms and functions. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 6, 335-358.
- Kunduz, E. (2007). *The perceptions of teachers about the behaviours of elementary school supervisors on contemporary educational supervision principles and clinical supervision* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yildiz Technical University Graduate School of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Lee, A. N. & Nie, Y. (2014). Understanding teacher empowerment: Teachers' perceptions of principal's and immediate supervisor's empowering behaviours, psychological empowerment and work-related outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 41, 67–79.
- Marangoz, S. (2019). *The views of secondary school teachers and administrators on course supervision* (Unpublished master's thesis). Istanbul University Cerrahpaşa Institute of Graduate Studies.
- MEB [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (1926). *Law on Educational Organization*.
- MEB [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (1990). *Regulations for the Committee of Primary Education Inspectors*.
- MEB [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (2014). *Regulations for Education Department for Guidance and Inspection and Department for Education Inspectors*.
- MEB [Turkish Ministry of National Education. (2018). *Regulations for Special Education Services*.
- MEB [Turkish Ministry of National Education] Directorate General For Teacher Training And Improvement (2017). *The necessary competencies for teaching*.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. (2. edn.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Oakland, J. S. (2014). *Total quality management and operational excellence: Text with cases*. (4.edn.). New York: Routledge.
- Oliva, P. F. & Pawlas, G. E. (2004). *Supervision for today's schools*. (7. edn.). New Jersey: Wiley Publishing.
- O'Sullivan, M. (2006). Lesson observation and quality in primary education as contextual teaching and learning processes. *International Journal of Educational Development*, (26)3, 246-260.
- Perryman, J. (2007). Inspection and emotion. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 37(2), 173-190.
- Peterson, K. (2004). Research on school teacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin*, 88(639), 60-79.
- Reckmeyer, M. C. (2020). *The effects of a principal's interactions with teachers on teachers' well-being* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). The Faculty of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development of the George Washington University.
- Robson, C. (2015). *Real world research: A resource for users of social research methods in applied settings*. (Ş. Çinkır & N. Demirkasımoğlu, Trans.). Ankara: Anı Publishing. (Original work published in 2011).
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. (2. edn.). California: Sage Publications.
- Scriven, M. (1988). Duty-based teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1, 319-334.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition*. (7. edn.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Silverman, D. (2010). *Doing qualitative research*. (3. edn.). California: Sage Publications.
- Singleton, R., Straits, B. C., Straits, M. M. & McAllister, R. J. (1988). *Approaches to social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Sullivan, S. & Glanz, J. (2015). *Supervision that improves teaching and learning*. (A. Ünal, Trans.). Ankara: Anı Publishing. (Original work published in 2013).
- Uğurlu, C. T. (2012). Opinions of preschool teachers on clinical supervision behaviors of supervisors. *Journal of Egitisim*, 34.
- Uğurlu, C. T., Mermer, S. & Ertaş, B. (2013). Teachers' views on the compliance of supervisions with the concept of artistic supervision. *Elementary Education Online*, 12(2), 597-613.
- Wellington, J. & Szczerbinski, M. (2007). *Research methods for the social sciences*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Whitby, K. (2010). *School inspection: Recent experiences in high performing education systems*. Reading: CfBT Education Trust.
- Winslow, R. A. (2015). *Administrative feedback following classroom observations as part of a Danielson-based teacher evaluation system: Teacher and administrator perceptions* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Graduate School of Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville.
- Yamamoto, K. (1963). Evaluating teacher effectiveness: a review of research. *Journal of School Psychology* (2)1, 60-71.
- Yeşil, D. & Kış, A. (2015). Examining the views of teachers on school principals' classroom supervision. *Inonu University Journal of the Graduate School of Education*, 2(3), 27-45.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Qualitative research methods in the social sciences*. (9. edn.). Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.
- Yiğit, M. (2019). *School administrators' opinions about guidance and inspection practices on preschool education* (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.