

Academic Dishonesty Tendencies and Values of Teacher Candidates

Öğretmen Adaylarının Akademik Sahtekârlık Eğilimleri ve Değerleri

Ayşegül KADI, Osman Ferda BEYTEKİN, Hasan ARSLAN

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the values and academic dishonesty tendencies of teacher candidates. The population of this study included teacher candidates who received pedagogic formation education during 2013-2014 academic semester at the Faculty of Education at Ege University. The study was conducted with 244 teacher candidates, who were chosen through convenient sampling method. Academic Dishonesty Tendency Scale and Portrait Values Questionnaire were used to collect data. It was a correlational study due to the investigation of the relationship between values and academic dishonesty tendencies of teacher candidates. It was also a survey study since the academic dishonesty tendencies and values of teacher candidates were examined in relation to demographic variables. The results suggested that there was a significant difference between the values and academic dishonesty tendencies of teacher candidates for gender variable. The values and academic dishonesty tendencies of teacher candidates did not differ for different fields of study. There was not a significant relationship between the academic dishonesty tendencies and values of teacher candidates.

Keywords: Values, Teacher candidates, Academic dishonesty

ÖZ

Bu araştırmanın amacı, öğretmen adaylarının akademik sahtekârlık eğilimleri ve değerlerini incelemektir. Araştırma evrenini, Ege Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi'nde 2013-2014 eğitim-öğretim yılında formasyon eğitimi alan öğretmen adayları oluşturmaktadır. Örneklemi ise, uygun örnekleme yöntemiyle seçilen 244 öğretmen adayı oluşturmaktadır. Veriler, Akademik Sahtekârlık Eğilimi Ölçeği ve Portre Değerler Anketi ile toplanmıştır. Araştırma, öğretmen adaylarının değerleri ile akademik sahtekârlık eğilimleri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemesinden dolayı korelasyonel ve öğretmen adaylarının akademik sahtekârlık eğilimleri ve değerlerini demografik değişkenlere göre incelemesinden dolayı tarama modelindedir. Sonuç olarak; cinsiyet değişkenine göre öğretmen adaylarının akademik sahtekârlık eğilimleri ve değerleri arasında anlamlı fark vardır. Bölüm değişkenine göre öğretmen adaylarının değer ve akademik sahtekârlık eğilimleri farklılaşmamaktadır. Öğretmen adaylarının değerleri ile akademik sahtekârlık eğilimleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki yoktur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Değerler, Öğretmen adayları, Akademik sahtekârlık

Ayşegül KADI (✉)

Ege University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, İzmir, Turkey
Ege Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, İzmir, Türkiye
aysegulkadi.33@gmail.com

Osman Ferda BEYTEKİN

Ege University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, İzmir, Turkey
Ege Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, İzmir, Türkiye

Hasan ARSLAN

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Çanakkale, Turkey
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Çanakkale, Türkiye

Received/Geliş Tarihi : 18.04.2016

Accepted/Kabul Tarihi : 26.05.2016

INTRODUCTION

The adoption of rote learning approach in education systems has the potential risk of encouraging learners to cheat. Cheating can have several types including looking at a friend's paper or other sources secretly in exams, using information from the internet and other sources as they are without giving any references for projects, performance assignments and research (Alkan, 2008).

According to Kibler, Nuss, Paterson and Pavela (1988), academic dishonesty means getting help from sources while studying without getting any permission or pretending to be the owner of a study that does not belong to oneself. Gehring, Nuss and Pavela (1986) lists the reasons of academic dishonesty as follows: the lack of knowledge about in which conditions and in what extents they can cooperate; the lack of knowledge about academic dishonesty; the general belief that what they learn will not have any practical value; societal values, passion for success and increasing rivalry among students due to the challenges of university entrance.

For Kibler (1993), on the other hand, it is very difficult to explain why students resort to academic dishonesty (Aluede, Omoregie & Osa-Edoh, 2006). The research studies conducted in Turkey suggest that such factors as the adoption of rote learning approach in education, the construction of education system based on an abstract understanding and teacher behaviors trigger academic dishonesty (Selçuk, 1995; Yeşilyaprak & Öztürk, 1997; Seven & Engin, 2008; Tayfun & Yazıcıoğlu, 2008).

Academic dishonesty is also closely related to the ethics of research and broadcasting. The truth value of a research study and its foundations tend to be a concern not only for scientific community but also for the whole society. The reason is that an unreliable research study can lead to a waste of research funds, mislead the scientific community and society and prevent the development of science.

Scientific misconduct is divided into two as "inelaborate research" or "unrigorous research". Even in the absence of bad intentions, wrong results are gained due to the violation of scientific methodologies in these types of misdirection. For those misleading research that are done on purpose, titles such as "scientific fraud", "scientific deception" and "scientific distortion" are used. The types of scientific misconduct are known as irresponsible authorship, plagiarism, fabrication, duplication, salamization, disrespect for human-animal ethics, subjective selection of sources and biased publication (conflict of interest) (Ruacan, 2003). According to Rokeach (1973), values are defined as standards that affect individuals' behaviours whereas they refer to the beliefs that impact individuals' behaviours for Brand (1999). For Feather (1975), they are defined as thoughts that affect the decisions made by individuals. Rokeach firstly examines the social dimension of values and indicates that they are associated with attitudes and behaviours. (Yılmaz, 2008). Schwartz (1992), on the other hand, looks at values at two levels, which are individual and cultural. The values at the individual level guide people's lives while cultural values are shared by the society and are

based on societal norms (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000; Yazıcı, 2006). Schwartz identifies 10 basic values and their subvalues. These are power, success, hedonism, stimulation, self-control, universality, benevolence, traditionalism, harmony and safety (Asan, Ekşi, Doğan & Ekşi, 2008).

Research studies on values and academic dishonesty are provided below:

Bjorklund and Wenestan (1999) found that cheating behavior did not differ depending on gender but it was caused by time pressure, laziness and desire to help a friend. According to Rettinger and Kramer (2007), the main reason for cheating behavior was peer pressure. Köse and Öztemur (2013) showed that cheating behavior did not vary according to gender but differ depending on grade level and academic standing. Semerci and Sağlam (2005) concluded that police candidates generally felt uneasy when they cheated. Küçüktepe and Küçüktepe (2012) aimed at investigating history teacher candidates' levels of academic dishonesty tendency. The findings of the study did not show a significant difference for the educational level of parents. A significant difference was found for gender, grade level and perceived level of achievement.

Akkaya's (2013) study indicated that students preferred the value of "peace of conscience" as their first choice. The values of the recognition of truth and a comfortable life were ranked as their last choices. The aim of Yılmaz's (2011) study was to reveal the views of teacher candidates regarding democratic values and student control ideologies and to determine the relationship between these two. The results suggested that student views did not vary depending on programs of study and there was not a significant relationship between democratic values and control ideologies. Yazar (2012) found that the primary values that shape teacher candidates' lives are moral values, which are followed by economic and religious values. The purpose of Oğuz's (2012) study was to uncover the views of teacher candidates about values and values education. The findings demonstrated that teacher candidates agreed mostly with universality, benevolence and safety values. Their views on values education could be categorized under the headings of program, modeling, utilization of experiences and provision of environments in which students can express their opinions. Cheating is an action, the impact of which is felt both academically and morally. There is a need for taking measures to minimize such actions in educational settings. To this end, students' tendencies for cheating and their values can be ascertained. In this study, it is postulated that there may be a relationship between teacher candidates' values and their academic dishonesty. When the existing literature was examined, the researchers did not locate any study that included these two variables. Therefore, an examination of teacher candidates' values and their academic dishonesty tendencies was expected to fill this gap and be beneficial for researchers and practitioners.

The following research questions are asked in this study:

1. Do the points of teacher candidates' academic dishonesty tendencies and their values vary depending on gender?

2. Do the points of teacher candidates' academic dishonesty tendencies and their values vary depending on fields of study?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the points of teacher candidates' academic dishonesty tendencies and their values?

METHOD

Research Model

It was a correlational study since the relationship between teacher candidates' values and their academic dishonesty tendencies were examined. Correlational studies aim at uncovering the relationship between variables by using correlation statistics (Balci, 2011). It was also a survey study as teacher candidates' academic dishonesty tendencies and values were studied to see if they differed depending on demographic variables. Survey research is a model that is used to determine types of knowledge such as people's attitudes, beliefs, values, habits and thoughts (Mcmillan & Schumacher, 2001).

Population and Sampling

The population of research consisted of teacher candidates who received formation education in 2013-2014 academic semester at Ege University Faculty of Education. The sample was composed by 244 teacher candidates who were chosen through convenience sampling method. Convenience sampling refers to choosing a sample from easily accessible units for carrying out procedures due to time, money and work force limitations (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel,

2011). Below are given the percentages and frequency values of participants' demographic variables.

75.4% of teacher candidates were female whereas 24% of them were male. 21.7% received undergraduate education at the department of Mathematics, 7.4% at the department of Physics, 10.7% at the department of Geography, 8.6% at the department of Chemistry, 11.1% at the department of Biology, 11.5% at the department of German language and literature, 4.5% at the department of English language and literature, 1.2% at the department of American language and literature, 13.1% at the department of Music, 7.8% at the department of Public Relations, 2.5% at the department of Art history.

Data Collection Instruments

Academic dishonesty tendency scale

Academic Dishonesty Tendency Scale was developed by Eminoğlu and Nartgün (2009). The analysis of data identified four factors for the scale. Five items for the first factor, seven items for second factor, four items for third factor and six items for fourth factor were found. The identified factors were named as "cheating tendency", "dishonesty tendency in studies such as assignments, projects, etc.-general", "dishonesty tendency during the processes of research and reporting" and "dishonesty tendency for references" respectively upon the analysis of the structures of the items they cover. Construct validity of the scale was tested through confirmatory factor analysis. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were 0.71, 0.821, 0.785, 0.776 and 0.90 respectively for every factor and the whole of the scale. Test- retest reliability coefficient was found to be

Table 1: Demographics of Teacher Candidates

Variable	Features	N	%
Gender	Female	184	75.4
	Male	60	24.6
	Total	244	100.0
Undergraduate education	Mathematics	53	21.7
	Physics	18	7.4
	Geography	26	10.7
	Chemistry	21	8.6
	Biology	27	11.1
	German language and literature	28	11.5
	English language and literature	11	4.5
	American language and literature	3	1.2
	Music	32	13.1
	Public relations	19	7.8
	Art history	6	2.5
	Total	244	100.0

0.88. A 5-point scale that included “Strongly Agree”, “Agree”, “Undecided”, “Disagree”, “Strongly Disagree” as response options were used.

Portrait values questionnaire

Portrait Values Questionnaire was adapted from Demirutku (2004). As a 6-point Likert scale, the questionnaire consisted of the following response options: 1-very much unlike me 2-unlike me 3-very little like me 4-somewhat like me 5-like me 6-very much like me. The scale was composed of 40 items and 10 subscales. The subscales were related to power, success, harmony, hedonism, traditionalism, self-control, safety, universality, stimulation and benevolence respectively. Demirutku (2004) obtained the test-retest reliability coefficients as power, .81; success, .81; hedonism, .77; stimulation, .70; self-control, .65; universality, .72; benevolence, .66; traditionalism, .82; harmony, .75 and safety, .80.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS 17.00 package program. For the interpretations of the results, 0.05 alpha level was chosen as the criterion. To determine whether teacher candidates' values and educational beliefs differed depending on gender, an Independent Sample t-test was used. To find out whether their values and educational beliefs differed depending on field of study, Kruskal Wallis Test was utilized whereas Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used for investigating the relationship between teacher candidates' values and their academic dishonesty tendencies.

FINDINGS

The data gathered from the instruments to measure teacher candidates' values and educational beliefs were analyzed as follows:

When the data in Table 2 were examined, a significant difference was found between the teacher candidates' points in academic dishonesty tendencies and their values depending on gender variable ($p \leq .05$). Female teacher candidates' values points were higher than those of male teacher candidates while male teacher candidates' points in academic dishonesty tendencies were higher than those of female teacher candidates.

The analysis of the above data in Table 3 showed that teacher candidates' points in academic dishonesty tendencies did not differ depending on their fields of study ($p > .05$).

When the data in Table 4 were examined, it was seen that teacher candidates' values points did not differ according to their fields of study ($p > .05$).

The analysis of data in Table 5 showed that there was not a significant relationship between teacher candidates' values and their academic dishonesty tendencies. ($p > .05$).

DISCUSSION

The research findings showed that there was a significant difference between the points of teacher candidates' academic dishonesty tendencies and their values depending on gender variable. The value points of female teacher candidates were higher than those of male teacher candidates. Akın and Özdemir (2009) demonstrated that female teacher candidates had higher democratic values. Keskin and Sağlam (2014) indicated that intellectual values, moral values and freedom variables differed depending on gender.

Another finding of the study was that male teacher candidates had higher points in academic dishonesty tendency than female teacher candidates. According to Köse and Öztumur's (2013) study, cheating behavior did not differ in relation to gender. Özyurt and Eren (2014), on the other hand, argued that female teacher candidates perceived cheating as a more negative behavior than male teacher candidates. Küçüktepe and Küçüktepe (2012) found that history teacher candidates' levels of academic dishonesty tendencies showed difference depending on gender. Gümüştül et al. (2013) suggested that there were significant differences in the levels of academic dishonesty tendencies of college students as varying with gender.

In this study, teacher candidates' points in values and academic dishonesty tendencies did not differ depending on the field of study. Akın and Özdemir (2009) revealed that teacher candidates' democratic values did not differ significantly based on their fields of study. Gümüştül et al. (2013) found differences in academic dishonesty tendencies of college students according to their fields of study. Akdağ and Güneş (2002) showed that cheating behaviors of students did not differ depending on their fields of study.

Finally, no significant difference was found between teacher candidates' values and their academic dishonesty tendencies. Dündar (2013) formerly indicated statistically significant differences between teacher candidates' values and their democratic attitudes. Özyurt and Eren (2014) found a relatively weak but significant and negative relationship between teacher candidates' attitudes towards cheating and teaching profession.

CONCLUSION

No significant difference was found between teacher candidates' academic dishonesty tendencies and their values. In further studies, other variables that can be related to these variables can be investigated. The findings of the study suggested that teacher candidates' values and academic dishonesty tendencies varied depending on gender but did not differ depending on fields of study. The reasons for these significant and non-significant differences can be further examined. The number of courses on values in education and ethics in scientific research can be increased.

Table 2: Results of Independent t-test for Teacher Candidates' Points from Academic Dishonesty Tendency Scale and Portrait Values Survey in Relation to Their Gender

	Gender	N	M	S.s.	t	p
Academic dishonesty	Female	184	61.99	5.94	-1.98	.05
	Male	60	63.83	7.19		
Values	Female	184	186.58	19.38	2.36	.02
	Male	60	180.77	15.57		

Table 3: Results of Kruskal Wallis Test for Teacher Candidates' Points from Academic Dishonesty Tendency Scale in Relation to their Fields of Study

	Department	N	Mean rank	χ^2	p
Academic dishonesty	Mathematics	53	128.52	10.84	.37
	Physics	18	105.86		
	Geography	26	124.98		
	Chemistry	21	102.24		
	Biology	27	112.06		
	German language and literature	28	123.16		
	English language and literature	11	110.00		
	American language and literature	3	64.50		
	Music	32	140.78		
	Public relations	19	125.53		
	Art history	6	168.17		

Table 4: Results of Kruskal Wallis Test for Teacher Candidates' Points from Portrait Values Scale in Relation to their Fields of Study

	Department	N	Mean rank	χ^2	p
Values	Mathematics	53	124.81	9.45	.49
	Physics	18	132.06		
	Geography	26	112.38		
	Chemistry	21	111.00		
	Biology	27	152.24		
	German language and literature	28	117.20		
	English language and literature	11	87.73		
	American language and literature	3	142.00		
	Music	32	122.23		
	Public relations	19	119.00		
	Art history	6	114.92		

Table 5: Product-Moment Correlation Analysis for Teacher Candidates' Points in Academic Dishonesty Tendencies and Portrait Values Scales

		Values
Academic Dishonesty	Pearson's correlation	-.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.384

REFERENCES

- Akdağ, M. & Güneş, H. (2002). Kopya çekme davranışları ve kopya çekmeye ilişkin tutumlar. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 31, 330-343.
- Akın, U. & Özdemir, M. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının demokratik değerlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Eğitim bilimleri fakültesi örneği. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42(2), 183-198.
- Akkaya, N. (2013). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer tercihleri. *TSA Dergisi*, 17(2), 69-82.
- Alkan, Ş. (2008). *İlköğretim ikinci kademe ile ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin ve öğretmenlerinin kopya çekmeye ilişkin görüşleri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.
- Aluede, O., Omoregie, E. O & Osa-Edoh, G. I.(2006). Academic dishonesty as a contemporary problem in higher education: How academic advisors can help. *Reading Improvement*, 43(2), 97-106.
- Asan, H. T., Ekşi, F., Doğan, A. & Ekşi, H. (2008). Bireysel değerler envanteri'nin dilsel eşdeğerlik, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, (27),15-38.
- Balcı, A. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. (9. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Bjorklund, M., & Goran, W. (1999). *Academic cheating: frequency, methods and causes*. European Conference on Educational Research. Lahti, Finland.
- Brand, L. D. (1999). *Educating for character in the United States Army: A study to determine the components for an effective curriculum for values education in basic training units*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of South Carolina, South Carolina, US.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş, Kılıç, E., Akgün, Ö., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2011). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Demirutku, K. (2004). Turkish adaptation of the portrait values questionnaire. *Unpublished manuscript*. Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey
- Dündar, H. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının sahip olduğu değerler ile demokratik tutumları arasındaki ilişki. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 6(2), 367-381.
- Eminoğlu, E. & Nartgün, Z. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin akademik sahtekarlık eğilimlerinin ölçülmesine yönelik bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1), 215-240.
- Feather, N. T. (1975). Human values and their relation to justice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 50(4), 129-151.
- Gehring, D., Nuss, E., & Pavela, G. (1986). *Issues and perspectives on academic integrity*. Columbus, OH: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Gümüşgöl, O., Üstün Ü. D., Işık U., & Demirel D. H. (2013). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin akademik sahtekarlık eğilim düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(2), 131-138. Retrieved from <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/17/1939/20324.pdf>
- Keskin, U., & Sağlam, H. (2014). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının insani değerlere sahip olma düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 4(1), 81-101.
- Kibler, W.C., Nuss, E.M., Paterson, B.G., & Pavela, G. (1988). *Academic integrity and student development: Legal issues, policy perspectives*. Asheville, NC, USA: College Administrators Publications
- Kibler, W.C. (1993). Academic dishonesty: A student developmental dilemma. *NAPSA Journal*, 30, 252-267.
- Köse, A., & Öztumur, B. (2013). Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin kopya çekme davranışı ile ilgili tutumlarının incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 2(3), 133- 142.
- Kuşdil, M. E., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz değer teorisi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(45), 59-76.
- Küçüktepe, S. & Küçüktepe, C. (2012). Tarih öğretmeni adaylarının kopya çekme eğilimlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(1),115-125.
- McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education. A conceptual introduction (5th ed.)*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Oğuz, E. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının değerler ve değerler eğitimine ilişkin görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 12(2), 1309-1325.
- Özyurt, Y., & Eren, A. (2014). Fen bilgisi öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine ve kopya çekmeye yönelik tutumlarının görünümü. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(1),78-101.
- Rettinger, D., & Kramer, Y. (2009). Situational and personal causes of student cheating, *Research in Higher Education*, 50(3), 293-313.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. Newyork: The Free.
- Ruacan, Ş. (2003). *Bilimsel araştırma ve yayınlarda etik ilkeler*. In Yılmaz O. (Ed.). *Sağlık Bilimlerinde Süreli Yayıncılık* (pp 47-53). Ankara: TÜBİTAK.
- Selçuk, Z. (1995). Bir eğitim ve rehberlik sorunu: Okullarda kopya çekme. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 1(3), 397-418.
- Semerci, Ç., & Sağlam, Z. (2005). Polis adaylarının sınavlarda kopya çekmeye ilişkin tutum ve görüşleri(Elazığ ili örneği). *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15(2), 163-177.
- Seven, M. & Engin, A. (2008). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin kopya çekmeye duydukları ihtiyaç ve kopya çekme sebepleri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1, 121-136.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). *Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries*. Zanna M. (Ed.). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp 1-65). New York: Academic Press.
- Tayfun, A. & Yazıcıoğlu, İ. (2008). Öğrencilerin kopya hakkındaki görüşleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3, 375-393.
- Yazar, T. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının değerler hakkındaki görüşleri. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 2(1), 61-68.
- Yazıcı, K. (2006). Değerler eğitimine genel bir bakış. *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları*, 19, 499-522.
- Yeşilyaprak, B., & Öztürk B. (1997). Üniversite öğrencilerinin kopya çekmeye yönelik tutumları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 1(2), 227-240.
- Yılmaz, K. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının demokratik değerler ile öğrenci kontrol ideolojilerine ilişkin görüşleri arasındaki ilişki. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24(2), 297-315.
- Yılmaz, K. (2008). *Eğitim yönetiminde değerler*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.