

Degree of Inspector Behaviors that Display Universal Values During the Inspection of Administrators

Mahmut SAĞIR¹

¹(Faculty of Education, Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University, Turkey)

ABSTRACT: *This study aimed to present school administrators' views regarding the degree of inspector behaviors that display universal values during school inspections. The study was conducted as a quantitative and descriptive study. "Development of Universal Values in School Management Scale (UVISMS)" developed by Sağır (2014) was utilized in the study. Data were collected from 176 school administrators in Kahramanmaraş province via "simple random sampling method". According to results show that during the inspection of school administrators, inspectors partially display all behaviors regarding human relations, professional discipline and social responsibility dimensions of universal values. In this case, it can be stated that inspectors do not completely satisfy the expectations of school administrators in school management regarding universal values. Being primary school, secondary school and high school administrator, level of education and gender do not affect school administrators' views on inspectors' behaviors that reflect universal values. However, period of service affects school administrators' views on inspectors' behaviors that reflect universal values.*

KEYWORDS - *School Management, Inspector, Universal Values*

I. INTRODUCTION

Inspection

Organization and management theories have developed different perspectives regarding inspection. Classical organization and management theories that regard the human beings as machines and that adopt negative approaches regarding the nature of men define inspection as the process of controlling personnel behaviors whereas neo-classical organization and management theories that place emphasis on human relations and present a positive approach regarding the nature of men define inspection as on-the-job training for the personnel. Modern organization and management theories, on the other hand, adopt a more rational approach regarding the nature of men and define inspection as a process of self-control on behaviors by the personnel.

System of inspection is universal, it exists in all complex organizations and it is an organizational and administrative obligation in social organizations in which human element has a strong influence (Başaran, 1996; Aydın, 1993; Cengiz, 1992). Educational inspection is the adaptation of inspection for education for education and it aims to identify the degree of goal realization during the education and training process and increase the quality of education (Başaran, Bozkurt, Karabıyık, 2003, Bursalıoğlu, 1994). "Through inspection, organizational goals are better understood; procedures are followed; necessary measures are taken when goals are no realized" (Seçkin, 1991).

Educational inspection is defined as the process that includes confirming the realization of identified goals, monitoring and readjusting organizational operations, controlling personnel behavior and providing professional support and guidance services for teachers and all personnel in order to improve instruction (Gökçe, 2004; Dağlı, 2003; Taymaz, 1997; Başaran, 1996; Bursalıoğlu, 1994; Aydın, 1993). Therefore, inspection has a crucial function and value in all organizational systems in general and in educational systems and at schools in particular (Aslan, 1999).

Another concept that is cited with inspection is evaluation. Evaluation, one of the administrative processes, is an extension of inspection (Erçetin, 1997; Başaran, 1996, Başar, 1995, Aydın, 1994). Evaluation is defined as making judgments as a result of comparing the data obtained after inspection or measurement with a criterion and thereby attaining information about the achievement of the organization and the personnel (Sabuncuoğlu, 2000; Gözübüyük, 1998; Başaran, 1996; Turgut, 1995; Başar, 1995; Taymaz, 1993). All the activities related to inspection and evaluation of the school organizations are undertaken by inspectors.

School management and school administrators

Açıklalın (2004) states that educational institutions have special positions and that schools receive human resources from the society as a whole and present this source to all other organizations as relatively developed human resources through differentiating it via education. School management is the implementation

of educational management to a limited area and school management is comprised of applying educational management to schools (Bursalioglu, 1994). School management is an educational community consisting of students, teachers and administrators and educational institutions where educational management is regularly utilized and various knowledge, skills and habits are provided based on specific goals (Erdoğan, 2000). School management is a sub area in which educational management is implemented (Şişman and Turan, 2004). The significance of school management essentially comes from the significance of management and the responsibility of the management is to sustain the organization based on its goals (Bursalioglu, 1994). School management can change the behavior of educational staff via communication, develop relationships among them, decrease conflicts, ensure coordination and school management can be inspected (Başaran, 1996).

Administrators and teachers are the leading human resources at schools which are the most important variables that affect personal improvement and social development and which are the most strategic parts of the education system (Çetinkanat, 1988). School administrators should utilize both material and human resources in the direction of school goals by benefiting from the input provided by management and educational sciences. The basic performance indicator of school management is the degree of realizing school goals.

It is thought that school administrators have critical roles in forming organizational values at schools since school administrators are educational administrators that are located at the forefront of the educational system (Aydın, 1994). School administrators have first degree responsibility towards upper management, teachers, students, parents and the society in terms of providing higher quality educational services (Dönmez, 2004), they are formal educational leaders (Çelik, 2003). With the level of significance they carry, school administrators should be both leaders and managers at schools. Based on this role, school administrators are regarded as the individuals with the highest responsibility in embedding universal values at schools.

Universal Values

Universal values in all fields emerge as a result of the acceleration of globalization due to rapid advances in transportation and communication technologies. As a result, a new period in human history is experienced in which local values are getting weaker and almost becoming nonexistent and replaced by universal values. "Values develop not only at individual but also at organizational levels" (Aydın, 2010) hence it is believed that those emerging values do not only affect individuals but also affect organizations.

The concept of value which was first introduced to social sciences by Znaniecki is derived from the Latin root "valere" which means "be valuable" or "be strong" (Bilgin, 1995). "Values are basic ethical principles and beliefs accepted as true or necessary by the majority of the members of a social group or a community to provide and continue their existence, unity, operation and continuance and that reflect their common emotions, goals and interests (Kızılçelik & Erjem, 1994). Like all individuals, school administrators are also affected by their religious beliefs, philosophical views and values while responding to any stimuli.

Values determine the required foundation to comprehend human behavior and motivation and affect our perceptions. The majority of our values have been provided in our youth by parents, teachers and the society (Robins and Judge, 2012). Rokeach (1973: 28) who conducted a comprehensive study on values classified values as follows:

Table 1. Rokeach's Value Classification

Instrumental Values	Terminal Values
Ambitious (Hard working, aspiring)	A comfortable life (A prosperous life)
Broad-minded (Open-minded)	An exciting life (A stimulating, active life)
Capable (Competent, effective)	A sense of accomplishment (Lasting contribution)
Cheerful (Lighthearted, joyful)	A world at peace (Free of war and conflict)
Clean (Neat, tidy)	A world of beauty (Beauty of nature and arts)
Courageous (Standing up for your belief)	Equality (Brotherhood, equal opportunity)
Forgiving (Willing to pardon others)	Family security (Taking care of loved ones)
Helpful (Working for others= welfare)	Freedom (Independence, free choice)
Honest (Sincere, truthful)	Happiness (Contentedness)
Imaginative (Daring, creative)	Inner harmony (Freedom from inner conflict)
Independent (Self reliant, self-sufficient)	Mature love (Sexual, spiritual intimacy)
Intellectual (Intelligent, reflective)	National security (Protection from attack)
Logical (Consistent, rational)	Pleasure (An enjoyable, leisurely life)
Loving (Affectionate, tender)	Salvation (Saved, eternal life)
Obedient (Dutiful, respectful)	Self-respect (Self esteem)
Polite (Courteous, well-mannered)	Social recognition (Respect, admiration)
Responsible (Dependable, reliable)	True friendship (Close companionship)
Self-Controlled (Restrained self disciplined)	Wisdom (A mature understanding of life)

Universal Values in school management are collected under the following dimensions: “Human Relations”, “Professional Discipline” and “Social Responsibility” (Sağır, 2014). In “Human Relations” dimension, school administrators are expected to be fair, impartial, polite, respectful and valuing in their relationships and communication with the members of the school community. In Professional Discipline dimension, being experts in the field of management and self development are accepted as universal values for school administrators. Being sensitive to events and concepts around the environment and contributing to the solution of social problems are regarded as universal duties for school administrators.

II. METHODOLOGY

Research model used in the study ensures that the researcher arranges the conditions to conduct the study according to the purpose of the research and to collect and analyze the data appropriately and economically (Karasar, 1994). Since the current study aimed to identify the level of guidance provided by inspectors to school administrators in terms of universal values, descriptive survey method was utilized. Descriptive studies aim to explain the interactions between current and previous events based on their relationships (Kaptan, 1995).

STUDY GROUP

Study sample was composed of 176 school administrators employed in Kahramanmaraş province primary, secondary and high schools in 2014-2015 academic year. The sample was identified via “simple random sampling method”. Table 2 presents data regarding school administrators’ personal variables.

Table 2. Findings regarding school administrators’ personal variables

Gender	f	%	Period of Service	f	%	Level of Education	f	%	Organization	f	%
Female	61	34.7	1-5 Years	56	31.8	4 year faculty	159	90.3	Primary	159	90.3
			6-10 Years	37	21						
			11-15 Years	27	15.3						
			16-20 Years	27	15.3						
Male	115	65.3	21-25 Years	14	8	Graduate	17	9.7	Secondary	17	9.7
			26 Years +	15	8.5						
			TOTAL	176	100						

Based on the Levene test conducted to observe whether groups displayed homogenous distribution, groups were found to display homogenous distribution for all analyses ($p > 0.05$). One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov analysis was conducted to find whether data showed normal distribution and it was observed that data displayed normal distribution ($p > 0.05$).

DATA COLLECTION TOOL

"Development of Universal Values in School Management Scale (UVISMS)" developed by Sağır (2014) was utilized in the study. internal consistency and test-retest methods were used for reliability analyses of the scale and Cronbach alpha value was found to be 0,972 for the whole scale; Spearman-Brown split halves reliability value was found to be 0,943 and test-retest reliability coefficient was observed to be 0,970. In the current study, reliability coefficient was found to be 0,969. In order to ensure suitability of data for factor analysis, first of all correlation matrix (*R matrix*) was examined and significant relationships were observed which pointed to goodness of fit. Sağır (2014) conducted sample goodness of fit (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin goodness of fit analysis) and Barlett Sphericity analyses and KMO goodness of fit coefficient was found as 0,962 and Barlett Sphericity test χ^2 value was found to be 8379,655 ($p=0,000$). In order for the data to be fit for factor analysis, KMO values should be higher than 0,60 and Barlett test should be significant (Büyüköztürk, 2004). The fact that KMO value was higher than 0,90 shows perfect fit for factor analysis (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999).

A 5-point Likert type scale was used for interpreting administrator views on inspectors’ level of utilizing universal values during inspection of the school management. The scale was rated as: None (1), Very little (2), Partially (3) Mostly (4) and Completely (5). Rating of the 5-point Likert scale is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Rating for 5-point Likert Scale

Options	Points	Rating
None	1	1.00-1.79
Few	2	1.80-2.59
Partially	3	2.60-3.39
Mostly	4	3.40-4.19
Completely	5	4.20-4.99

III. FINDINGS

Table 4, Table 5 and Table 6 present the findings regarding the degree of inspectors' use of behaviors related to universal values during school administrators' inspection.

Table 4. Degree of Inspector Behaviors that display universal values in human relations dimension

	Item	Statement	M	SD
Human Relations	1	Inspectors act democratically	3.18	.85
	2	Inspectors care for human relations	3.22	.93
	3	Inspectors value the ideas of others	2.82	.87
	4	Inspectors provide morale for the stakeholders of the school	2.65	.97
	5	Inspectors do not discriminate	3.36	.94
	6	Inspectors prioritize politeness in human relations	3.27	.94
	7	Inspectors are motivating	2.77	1.02
	8	Inspectors respect different ideas	2.88	1.00
	9	Inspectors act fairly to the stakeholders of the school	3.25	.91
	10	Inspectors give confidence to the stakeholders of the school	2.92	.99
	11	Inspectors help in finding solutions to the problems face by school staff and students	2.88	1.04
	12	Inspectors speak privately to the person who generates negative situations when there is a problem	3.50	1.12
	13	Inspectors act honestly to the stakeholders of the school	3.34	.91
	14	Inspectors approach students and other stakeholders with affection	2.97	1.00
	TOTAL		3,27	0,71

Table 4 shows that with M = 3.50 arithmetic mean, the most common behavior regarding the "Human Relations" dimension of universal values displayed by the inspectors during inspection was cited in the item "Inspectors speak privately to the person who generates negative situations when there is a problem". On the other hand, the least displayed behavior was found to be cited in the item "Inspectors provide morale for the stakeholders of the school" at partial levels with M = 3.65 arithmetic mean. Inspectors were found to display universal values in human relations with varying degrees that changed between S M = 3.02 and M = 3.69.

It was found that inspectors partially displayed all behaviors included in "Human Relations" dimension with M = 3.27 arithmetic mean. Accordingly, it can be stated that inspectors do not completely satisfy school administrators' expectations in school management regarding the behaviors included in "Human Relations" dimension of universal values.

Table 5. Degree of Inspector Behaviors that display universal values in Professional discipline

	Item	Statement	M	SD
Professional Discipline	15	Inspectors are committed to their duties	3.63	.94
	16	Inspectors come to inspection in time	3.55	.98
	17	Inspectors are responsible individuals in their duties	3.61	.86
	18	Inspectors use school resources rationally	3.35	.98
	19	Inspectors allow themselves to be accessed	3.02	1.06
	20	Inspectors are hard working	3.28	.96
	21	Inspectors are diligent in keeping professional secrets	3.61	1.01
	22	Inspectors do not speak negatively of their superiors	3.72	.95
	23	Inspectors strive for improving their professional competences	3.35	.96
	24	Inspectors are punctual in their appointments	3.55	1.01
	25	Inspectors follow legal requirements	3.69	.97
	TOTAL		3.49	0.73

Table 5 shows that with M = 3.69 arithmetic mean, the most common behavior regarding the "Professional Discipline" dimension of universal values displayed by the inspectors during inspection was cited in the item "Inspectors follow legal requirements". On the other hand, the least displayed behavior was found to be cited in the item "Inspectors allow themselves to be accessed" at partial levels with M = 3.02 arithmetic

mean. Inspectors were found to display universal values in professional discipline with varying degrees that changed between $S M = 3.02$ and $M = 3.69$.

It was found that inspectors partially displayed all behaviors included in " Professional Discipline " dimension with $M = 3.49$ arithmetic mean. Accordingly, it can be stated that inspectors do not completely satisfy school administrators' expectations in school management regarding the behaviors included in " Professional Discipline " dimension of universal values.

Table 6. Degree of Inspector Behaviors that display universal values in social responsibility

	Item	Statement	M	SD
Social Responsibility	26	Inspectors are sensitive to the values in the environment	3,43	,94
	27	Inspectors share both success and failure at schools	3,18	1,03
	28	Inspectors have awareness regarding the conservation of the school environment	3,21	1,01
	29	Inspectors are willing to help individuals who need support at schools	2,95	1,11
	30	Inspectors are diligent in preserving school materials and equipment	3,40	1,08
	31	Inspectors provide suitable environments for disabled students	2,99	1,12
	32	Inspectors lead activities related to art	2,71	1,11
	33	Inspectors encourage stakeholders of the school to take part in social activities	2,88	1,15
	34	Inspectors are willing and actively involved to ensure school participation in social projects	2,82	1,08
		TOTAL		3,06

Table 6 that with $M = 3.43$ arithmetic mean, the most common behavior regarding the "Social Responsibility " dimension of universal values displayed by the inspectors during inspection was cited in the item "Inspectors are sensitive to the values in the environment ". On the other hand, the least displayed behavior was found to be cited in the item "Inspectors lead activities related to art" at partial levels with $M = 2.71$ arithmetic mean. Inspectors were found to display universal values in Social Responsibility with varying degrees that changed between $S M = 3.02$ and $M = 3.69$.

It was found that inspectors partially displayed all behaviors included in " Social Responsibility" dimension with $M = 3.06$ arithmetic mean. Accordingly, it can be stated that inspectors do not completely satisfy school administrators' expectations of role models in school management regarding the behaviors included in "Social Responsibility" dimension of universal values.

School administrators believed that during inspection, inspectors partially displayed all behaviors in "human relations" dimension of universal values with $M = 3.27$ arithmetic mean, all behaviors in "professional discipline" dimension of universal values with $M = 3.49$ arithmetic mean and all behaviors in "social responsibility" dimension of universal values with $M = 3.06$ arithmetic mean. Inspectors were found to partially display all behaviors included in all three dimensions of universal values with $M = 3.27$ arithmetic mean. Therefore, it can be argued that inspectors cannot fully satisfy school administrators' expectations regarding the use of universal values in school inspection.

Table 7 presents the degree of inspector behaviors that display universal values based on school administrators' gender.

Table 7. Degree of Inspector Behaviors that display universal values based on school administrators' gender

Factor	Gender	N	M	Sd	df	t	p
Human Relations	Female	61	3,78	3,29	174	,163	,871
	Male	115	3,75	3,27			
Professional Discipline	Female	61	3,29	3,52	174	,348	,728
	Male	115	3,27	3,48			
Social Responsibility	Female	61	3,52	3,09	174	,196	,845
	Male	115	3,48	3,06			
TOTAL	Female	61	3,09	3,78	174	,225	,823
	Male	15	3,06	3,75			

t-test was conducted to observe whether there were meaningful differences in school administrators' views regarding inspector behaviors that display universal values in the inspection of administrators based on gender. Results of t-test presented no significant differences in behaviors that displayed all three dimensions of universal values included in the scale ($p > 0.05$). Therefore, inspectors were found to display universal values-based behaviors at the same level to both genders during the inspection of administrators.

Table 8 presents the degree of inspector behaviors that display universal values based on school administrators' place of employment.

Table 8. Degree of Inspector Behaviors that display universal values based on school administrators' place of employment

Factor	Place of Employment	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sum of Squares	df	F	p
Human Relations	primary school	54	3,3	0,82				
	secondary school	105	3,28	0,79	0,184	2	,148	,863
	high school	17	3,18	0,66	107,809	173		
Professional Discipline	primary school	54	3,41	0,77				
	secondary school	105	3,52	0,73	0,519	2	,484	,617
	high school	17	3,56	0,58	92,760	173		
Social Responsibility	primary school	54	3,03	0,91				
	secondary school	105	3,14	0,85	2,263	2	1,548	,216
	high school	17	2,76	0,66	126,449	173		
TOTAL	primary school	54	3,74	0,76				
	secondary school	105	3,79	0,72	,270	2	,265	,768
	high school	17	3,66	0,53	87,984	173		

ANOVA was conducted to observe whether there were meaningful differences in school administrators' views regarding inspector behaviors that display universal values in the inspection of administrators based on place of employment. Results of ANOVA presented no significant differences in behaviors that displayed all three dimensions of universal values included in the scale ($p > 0.05$). Therefore, inspectors were found to display universal values-based behaviors at the same level in primary school, secondary school and high schools during the inspection of administrators.

Table 9 presents the degree of inspector behaviors that display universal values based on school administrators' period of service.

Table 9. Degree of Inspector Behaviors that display universal values based on school administrators' period of service

Factor		N	M	Std. Deviation	Sum of Squares	df	F	p	Difference
Human Relations	1 - 5 years	56	3,48	0,60					
	6 - 10 years	37	3,11	0,86	5,845	5	1,946	,089	-
	11 - 15 years	27	3,35	0,73					
	16 - 20 years	27	3,00	0,84					
	21 - 25 years	14	3,35	0,99					
26 years +	15	3,19	0,88						
Professional Discipline	1 - 5 years	56	3,67	0,51					
	6 - 10 years	37	3,25	0,75	5,173	5	1,996	,082	-
	11 - 15 years	27	3,57	0,76					
	16 - 20 years	27	3,32	0,78					
	21 - 25 years	14	3,60	0,84					
26 years +	15	3,47	0,98						
Social Responsibility	1 - 5 years	56	3,36	0,7					
	6 - 10 years	37	2,85	0,83	11,536	5	3,347	,007	1-2 (in favor of 1)
	11 - 15 years	27	3,18	0,76					
	16 - 20 years	27	2,67	0,92					
	21 - 25 years	14	2,94	0,99					
26 year+	15	3,15	1,05						
TOTAL	1 - 5 years	56	3,98	0,52					
	6 - 10 years	37	3,56	0,74	6,229	5	2,582	,028	1-2 (in favor of 1)
	11 - 15 years	27	3,85	0,67					
	16 - 20 years	27	3,5	0,75					
	21 - 25 years	14	3,79	0,86					
26 years +	15	3,73	0,9						

ANOVA was conducted to observe whether there were meaningful differences in school administrators' views regarding inspector behaviors that display universal values in the inspection of

administrators based on period of service. Results of ANOVA presented no significant differences in behaviors that displayed human relations and professional discipline dimensions of universal values included in the scale whereas meaningful differences were found in social responsibility dimension ($p > 0.05$). The LSD test conducted to find the source of difference showed that the difference existed between administrators that served 1-5 years and the administrators that served 6-10 and 16-20 years. In other words, compared to the school administrators that served 6-10 and 16- 20 years, the school administrators that served for 1-5 years believed that inspectors displayed more behaviors that reflected universal values. Thereby, it can be argued that during inspection of school administrators, inspectors display behaviors based on universal values towards the newly appointed school administrators.

Table 10 presents the degree of inspector behaviors that display universal values based on school administrators' level of education.

Table 10. Degree of Inspector Behaviors that display universal values based on school administrators' educational levels

Factor		N	Mean	Sd	df	t	p
Human Relations	Undergraduate	159	3,27	0,78	174	,308	,758
	Graduate	17	3,33	0,88			
Professional Discipline	Undergraduate	159	3,5	0,73	174	,192	,848
	Graduate	17	3,46	0,76			
Social Responsibility	Undergraduate	159	3,08	0,86	174	,542	,588
	Graduate	17	2,96	0,83			
TOTAL	Undergraduate	159	3,76	0,71	174	,102	,919
	Graduate	17	3,74	0,75			

t-test was conducted to observe whether there were meaningful differences in school administrators' views regarding inspector behaviors that display universal values in the inspection of administrators based on level of education. Results of t-test presented no significant differences in behaviors that displayed all three dimensions of universal values included in the scale ($p > 0.05$). Therefore, inspectors were found to display universal values-based behaviors at the same level regardless of the educational level of administrators during the inspection of administrators.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study aimed to present school administrators' views regarding the degree of inspector behaviors that display universal values during school inspections. Results show that during the inspection of school administrators, inspectors partially display all behaviors regarding human relations, professional discipline and social responsibility dimensions of universal values. In this case, it can be stated that inspectors do not completely satisfy the expectations of school administrators in school management regarding universal values. Being primary school, secondary school and high school administrator, level of education and gender do not affect school administrators' views on inspectors' behaviors that reflect universal values. However, period of service affects school administrators' views on inspectors' behaviors that reflect universal values. Newly assigned school administrators think inspectors follow universal values in the inspection of administrators.

No studies exist in the literature on inspector behaviors that reflect universal values in the inspection of administrators. However, Shwartz (2004) identified universal values as "at peace", "wisdom", "social justice", "world of beauty", "inner harmony", "conserving the environment", "unity with nature", "equality" and "broad-minded". Some other studies also found that some values positively affect organizational commitment and individual performance (Abbot et. al., 2005; Finnegan 2000; Posner and Schmidt, 1993). Kinnier et. al. (2007) presented moral values in four dimensions "Commitment to something greater than oneself", "Self-respect but with humility, self-discipline and acceptance of personal responsibility", "Respect and caring for others" and "Caring for other living things and the environment".

In today's world, local values are observed to be rapidly replaced by universal ones due to globalization and advances in communication and transportation technologies. Universal values not only affect social life but also organizational life. Universal values are becoming common at school organizations as well. Therefore it can be suggested that inspectors should be more diligent in displaying universally-based behaviors in the inspection of administrators and therefore ensure the use of universal values in school management.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Aydın, *Çağdaş eğitim denetimi* (Ankara: Pegem Yayınları, 1993).
- [2] C. Cengiz, *Milli eğitim bakanlığı bakanlık müfettişlerinin yetiştirilmesi* (Ankara: Pegem Yayınları, 1998).
- [3] A. Başaran, E. Bozkurt, İ. Karabıyık, *Türk milli eğitim teftiş örgütünün avrupa birliğine uyum açısından değerlendirilmesi*, (Ed.), A. Başaran, E. Bozkurt) Türk milli eğitim teftiş sisteminde yapılanma sorunu, Ankara: MİNPA Matbaacılık, 2003).
- [4] Z. Bursalıoğlu, *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*, (Ankara: Pegem Yayınları, 1994).
- [5] Seçkin, N. (1991). Eğitimin niteliğinin geliştirilmesinde müfettişin rolü ve teftişte yeni arayışlar. *Eğitimde Nitelik Geliştirme-Eğitimde Arayışlar 1. Sempozyum*, İstanbul 13-14 Nisan.
- [6] Gökçe, F. (2004). Avrupa birliğine giriş sürecinde milli eğitim teftiş sisteminin değerlendirmesi paneli. 15 Mayıs 2004. Ankara: Minpa Matbaacılık.
- [7] R. Ç. Dağlı, *Teftiş sistemi*, A. Başaran, E. Bozkurt (Ed.), *Türk milli eğitim teftiş sisteminde yapılanma sorunu*, (Ankara: MİNPA Matbaacılık, 2003).
- [8] A.H. Taymaz, *Eğitim sisteminde teftiş*. (Ankara: TAKAV Matbaası, 1997).
- [9] İ. E. Başaran, *Eğitim yönetimi*. (Yargıcı Matbaası, Ankara: 1996).
- [10] B. Aslan, *Denetim ve değerlendirme* (Ed.), E. Toprakçı. *Yönetici Adayları Eğitim Programı*, (Malatya: İnönü Üniversitesi Yayını, 1999).
- [11] Ş. Erçetin, Milli eğitim bakanlığında teftiş hizmetlerinin yeniden düzenlenmesi, *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 1(104), 1997.
- [12] H. Başar, *Eğitim denetçisi*, (Ankara: Pegem Yayınları, 1995).
- [13] M. Aydın, *Eğitim yönetimi*, (Ankara: Hatiboğlu Yayınevi, 1994).
- [14] Z. Sabuncuoğlu, *İnsan kaynakları yönetimi*. (Bursa: Ezgi Kitabevi Yayınları, 2000).
- [15] Ş. Gözübüyük, *Yönetim hukuku*, (Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi, 1998).
- [16] F. Turgut, *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme metotları*, (Ankara: Yargıcı Matbaası, 1995).
- [17] A.H. Taymaz, *Hizmet içi eğitim*, (Ankara: Pegem Yayınları, 1992).
- [18] A. Açıkalın, *Eğitimde insan kaynağının yönetimi*, Y. Özden (Ed.), *Eğitim ve Okul Yöneticiliği*, (Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık, 2004) 41-58.
- [19] İ. Erdoğan, *Okul yönetimi ve öğretim liderliği*, (İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık, 2000).
- [20] M. Şişman, S. Turan, *Eğitim ve okul yöneticiliği*, Y. Özden (Ed.), *Eğitim ve Okul Yöneticiliği*. (Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık, 2004) 99-146.
- [21] A. C. Çetinkanat, *Örgütlerde güdülenme ve iş doyumunu*, (Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık, 2000).
- [22] B. Dönmez, *Sosyal sistem olarak sınıf ve sınıf iklimi*, M. Şişman, S. Turan (ed), *Sınıf Yönetim*, (Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık, 2004) 44-62.
- [23] V. Çelik, *Eğitimsel liderlik*, (Ankara: Pegem A Yayınları, 2003).
- [24] İ. Aydın, *Yönetimsel, mesleki ve örgütsel etik*, (Ankara: Pegem Akademi, 2010).
- [25] N. Bilgin, *Sosyal psikolojide yöntem ve pratik çalışmalar*, (İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık, 1995).
- [26] S. Kızılcılık, Y. Erjem, *Açıklamalı sosyoloji terimler sözlüğü*, (Ankara: Atilla Kitabevi, 1994).
- [27] P.S. Robbins, A.J. Timothy, *Organizational behavior*, I. Edem (Trns.), (Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık, 2012).
- [28] M.J. Rokeach, *The nature of human values*. (New York: The Free Press, 1973).
- [29] M. Sağır, Development of universal values in School management Scale (UVISMS). *Educational Research and Reviews*, 9(3), 2014, 83-91.
- [30] N. Karasar, *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*, (Ankara: 3A Araştırma Eğitim Danışmanlık Ltd. 1994).
- [31] S. Kaptan, *Bilimsel araştırma ve istatistik teknikleri*, (Ankara: Tekişik Web Ofset Tesisleri, 1995).
- [32] S. Buyukozturk, *Data analysis book for social sciences*, (Ankara: PegemA Publication, 2007).
- [33] G. Hutcheson, N. Sofroniou, *The multivariate social scientist. Introductory Statistics Using Generalized Linear Models*. (Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA ,1999).
- [34] S. H. Schwartz, Are there universal aspects in the structure and content of human values, *J. Social Issues*. (50), 1994, 19-45.
- [35] G.N. Abbott, F.A. White, M.A. Charles, Linking values and organizational commitment: a correlational and experimental investigation in two organizations, *J. Occupational Organ. Psychol*, (78), 2005, 531-551.
- [36] J.E. Finegan, The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment. *J. Occupational Organizational Psychol*, (73), 2000, 149-169.
- [37] B. Z. Posner, W.H. Schmidt, Values congruence AND differences between The interplay of personal AND organizational value systems. *J. Bus. Ethics*, (12), 1993, 341-347.
- [38] R.T. Kinnier, I.J. Kernes, T.M. Dautheribes, A short list of universal moral values, *Counseling and values*, 45(1), 2000, 3-78.