

Educational Supervisors' Locus of Control

Necdet KONAN*

Suggested Citation:

Konan, N. (2013). Educational supervisors' locus of control. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 51, 45-64.

Abstract

Problem Statement: In social open systems, there are basically two determinants of organizational behavior: "organizational" and "personal." The former is mostly related to the aim of the organization, the necessities of the work, whereas the latter is concerned with the traits of the employee. Various studies have focused on the traits of the employee along with their different dimensions. One of these is the locus of control, which can be measured and evaluated as a dimension of personal trait. Although there are some studies that were carried out with students, teachers, and principals regarding locus of control, so far no research has been done with educational supervisors who are crucial actors in the current educational process.

Purpose of Study: The purpose of this study is to determine the locus of control of educational supervisors.

Methods: The research consisted of 340 educational supervisors working in 18 cities, which are located in the fourth and fifth educational service regions of Turkey. The data collection tool consists of two parts. The first is "General Information Form," which aims to collect personal information concerning educational supervisors. The second part is the 29-item Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E-LOC Scale), which aims to determine the locus of control of educational supervisors. In data analysis, techniques such as Kolmogorov Smirnov test, independent sample t-test, one way ANOVA, and Scheffe test were used.

Findings and Results: According to the results, there was no significant effect of variables such as field, faculty, education level, teaching tenure, and incentives ($p > .05$) on locus of control of the participants. However, supervisory tenure did have a significant effect on locus of control ($p < .05$).

Conclusions and Recommendations: It was determined that educational supervisors had a tendency to internal locus of control ($M=9.09$). Having

* Dr., Inonu University, Education Faculty, Department of Educational Sciences, Malatya-Turkey necdet.konan@inonu.edu.tr

an internal locus of control for an educational supervisor may contribute to the task performance, which is determined by legal regulations and ethical principles of the profession. In addition, it can create an environment that reinforces the tendency of having internal locus of control for the target population. To enable supervisors to have more internal locus of control, mainly two things can be suggested. First, applicants for supervisory positions should be chosen among already internal locus of control teachers and/or administrators. To realize this, some practices must be abolished. These practices are about the perceptions of unjust processes in which proficiency is not a criterion to be selected and appointed, and which can be manipulated and predictable. Second, another perception of supervisors may be changed. It is the perception that they play a role that is heavily dependent on external supervision during their task performances, in terms of authority they have. This perception can be positively changed during pre-service or in-service periods.

Keywords: Locus of control, internal external LOC, I-E-LOC, educational supervisor

Man, born with limited qualifications, has to acquire new knowledge, skills, and attitudes at the least to exist in the world. School is the place where this is the most systematically achieved. School is an open system that gets the majority or all of inputs from the environment, and gives the majority or all of output to the environment. It is also a social system since a human being determines the quality of the output.

In systems where both main input and output are human, he/she is the crucial element of the socially open system. It is the behaviors of employees towards the aim that determines the quality of output and there are different determinants of these behaviors. In fact, in almost all organizations, there are two determinants of observed organizational behaviors. One is related to the aim of the organization and the necessities of the task, while the other is concerned with personality traits of an employee. The former is described as "organizational dimension", while the latter is "personal dimension" (Aydın, 2010).

Organizational dimension means expected behaviors of the employee in the position that she/he holds. Employees are expected to behave and make contributions according to their positions in the workplace, and the aim of their institution. Organizations are careful when employing those who are willing to make contributions to the organizational aim. They get them to work wherever needed. Every position requires behaviors for the position itself. Any attempt to show the needed behaviors is considered as a determinant of organizational behavior. It is more or less under the control of the organization and can be directed through changes or improvements by organizational powers.

However, the “personal” side of organizational behavior is not as open to the effect and control of the organization as the “organizational” side of it is. The personal side is more like a trait that is made up of necessities and expectations of the person. Personality traits are one of the main factors explaining the different organizational behaviors of employees who are in similar positions and have similar role expectations. For this reason, it may be misleading to assess the organizational contribution of the employee by not taking the trait into account.

Personality traits with various dimensions have been the subject of several studies (Day, Schleicher, Unckless & Hiller, 2002; Hogan, Curphy & Hogan, 1994; Judge, Bono, Ilies & Gerhardt, 2002; Judge, Piccolo & Kosalka, 2009; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986; Nahrgang, Morgeson & Ilies, 2009; Peterson, Smith, Martorana & Owens, 2003; Silverthorne, 2001; Stewart, 2001; Snyder & Monson, 1975; Zaccaro, Foti & Kenny, 1991; Zaccaro, Gilbert, Thor & Mumford, 1991; Zanna, Olson & Fazio, 1980). One of these is locus of control, which was proved to be a personality trait that can be measured and used in many cases, as a result of a great deal of empirical research designed to determine the relationship with various variables, for different individuals, and in different research areas from health to education, from principal to student, from stress to problem solving (Arlotto, 2002; Armstrong, 2001; Bağlum, 2000; Dibekoğlu, 2006; Dilekmen, Alver, Ada, & Akçay, 2009; Jooa, Lima & Kimb, 2013; Hodges & Winstanley, 2012; Konan, 2013; Lindströma & Rosvalla, 2012; Özdemir, 2009; Yeşilyaprak, 2004). Locus of control, examined as a personal trait in researches, is considered as a tendency of taking the life-affecting events, good or bad, as a result of his/her skills, qualities and behaviors or as a result of luck, fate, and other powers. It is indicated that the ones who believes that life-affecting events are within their control area have internal locus of control, whereas the ones who believe that they are the results of other powers rather than himself/herself have external locus of control (Rotter, 1966).

The first researches on measuring locus of control were done by Phares and James. Following these attempts, several scales were developed to measure the locus of control. The locus of control scale developed by Rotter is definitely the most well-known. His scale, “internal-external locus of control” (I-E-LOC Scale) is the most commonly used scale of all (Dağ, 1991).

By means of this scale, locus of control of human resources in educational settings has been a research subject for several studies. While some studies about locus of control focused on students (Aqeel, Masood, Muhammad & Nabiha, 2010; Arslan, Dilmaç & Hamarta, 2009; Daniel, 1993; Dilmaç, 2008; Gan & Shang, 2007; Ruibyte, 2007; Williams & Andrade, 2008; Wu & Elliott, 2008; Yaşar, 2008), teachers (Akça & Yaman, 2010; Arogundade & Itua, 2010; Canbay, 2007; Kapıkıran, 2007; Munir & Sajid, 2010; Rose & Meadway, 1981) and principals (Dibekoğlu, 2006; Dilekmen, Alver, Ada & Akçay, 2009; Klein & Wasserstein-Warnet, 2000) in different countries at different teaching levels, no research has yet been found that focused on educational supervisors who are crucial in the educational process.

Educational supervisors are those who do the supervision in which the aim is to improve the teaching-learning process. Although it is being practiced in different ways in different institutions in different countries, the supervision is universal regardless of its aim and institution, and a necessity for any institution (Başaran, 2006). For educational institutions it is irreplaceable (Aydın, 2000; Aydın, 2005; Başar, 2000; Taymaz, 2005). Supervision in educational settings focuses on determining the accomplishment of organizational aim, and reasons for failure to accomplish the aim, and above all, it focuses on being efficient and productive as an entire unit.

In the Turkish education system, according to article 42 of the constitution of the Turkish Republic, teaching and learning are performed under the control and supervision of the state. The National Ministry of Education (MoNE) is responsible for this control and supervision of the whole process on behalf of the state (MoNE, 1973). The Ministry carries out this responsibility with a supervisory board at elementary and high school education levels. In every province, as responsible to the National Ministry Directorate, there is an Elementary School Supervisory Department consisting of a president, a vice president, educational supervisors, assistant supervisors, and a supervisory bureau (MoNE, 1999). Educational supervisors and assistant supervisors working at the Elementary School Supervisory Department carry out tasks such as guidance, on-the-job training, supervision, assessment, examination, investigation, and inquiries for any formal and informal educational institutions at various levels in addition to National Ministry Directorates for the province and its counties (MoNE, 2011).

Educational supervisors, while performing the supervision, may be in a position in which they may teach, inspire, question, judge, and dispense justice by playing various roles such as a teacher, principal, or sometimes a leader. One of the critical determinants while performing these responsibilities efficiently is legal regularities of the job itself, the other is his/her personality traits. Thus, research is needed on locus of control, a factor of educational supervisors' personality traits, being one of the effective constituents during supervision processes.

On the basis of this rationale, the aim of the present research is to examine the locus of control of educational supervisors in terms of some variables.

To this end, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. Do educational supervisors' locus of control scores significantly differ in terms of field?
2. Do educational supervisors' locus of control scores significantly differ in terms of faculty?
3. Do educational supervisors' locus of control scores significantly differ in terms of education level?
4. Do educational supervisors' locus of control scores significantly differ in terms of teaching tenure?
5. Do educational supervisors' locus of control scores significantly differ in terms of supervisory tenure?
6. Do educational supervisors' locus of control scores significantly differ in terms of incentives for the last three years in a supervisory position?

Method

Research Design

The study is a descriptive research since it aims to determine the present status of locus of control for educational supervisors with regard to some independent variables such as field, faculty, educational level, teaching tenure, supervisory tenure, and incentives within the last three years of supervisory service.

Research Group

The research group of the study is comprised of 340 educational supervisors working in 30 provinces that are in eastern and southeastern Anatolia, which are classified as 4th and 5th service regions of Turkey in which there are socioeconomically less developed cities, in 2010-2011 academic year. Eighteen provinces were randomly chosen, 9 from the 4th and 9 from the 5th service regions of Turkey. These educational supervisors, who filled out the data collection tools voluntarily and according to the instructions, are working in 18 provinces (Adiyaman, Ağrı, Batman, Diyarbakır, Elazığ, Erzincan, Erzurum, Gümüşhane, Hakkari, Iğdır, Kahramanmaraş, Kastamonu, Muş, Mardin, Siirt, Sivas, Şanlıurfa and Van).

Research Instruments

General information form. The form, developed by the researcher, consists of 6 items aiming to determine the participants' personal characteristics (field, faculty, educational level, teaching tenure, supervisory tenure, and incentives within last three years as a supervisor).

Internal-external locus of control scale. To determine the level of internal-external locus of control for educational supervisors, 29-item Internal-External Locus of Control (I-E-LOC) was used. It was developed by Rotter (1966) and then Dağ (1991) adapted it into Turkish and performed validity and reliability tests. The scale's Spearman-Brown and KR reliability coefficients range from .65 and .79, with split half techniques using the data obtained from four different samples with the size of 2,100 subjects; also from various samples test-retest reliability coefficients that range from .49 to .83 (Rotter, 1966).

In the scale, each item has two alternatives, identified as "a" and "b". The respondent is asked to choose the most suitable sentence for himself/herself and then to choose it. During scoring, 6 items out of 29 (1, 8, 14, 19, 24, 27) were excluded since they are just filling items so as to conceal the aim of the scale. Out of the remaining questions, for numbers 2, 6, 7, 9, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, and 29 the alternative "a" gets 1 point, while for the rest, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 22, 26, and 28 the alternative "b" gets 1 point. Thus, the respondent can acquire points from 0 to 23. The higher the point is, the more the person's external locus of control.

In Turkey, Dağ (1991) tested the validity and reliability. Test-retest reliability coefficient of I-E-LOC Scale was found as .83. Reliability coefficient of scale, using KR-20 technique is .68; Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is .70. For convergent validity

of the scale, Pearson correlation value was reported as .69 between the mean score of LOC - interview and I-E-LOC Scale. Just like the original one, the Turkish version of the I-E-LOC scale has also adequate reliability coefficient value and acceptable validity indicators (Dağ, 1991), thereby it is used in a considerable number of studies in Turkey.

To evaluate model-data relationship concerning one-factor scale structure, CFA was done. CFA analysis was done using Lisrel 8.71 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2004). In analysis maximum likelihood technique was used. The results of CFA are as follows: $\chi^2=382.32$, $SD=229$, $\chi^2/Sd=1.66$, GFI:.90, AGFI:0.88, RMSEA:0.046, RMR:.014 and SRMR: .061. In evaluation of goodness of fit, some accepted criteria within the literature were used. It is accepted as perfect goodness of fit to be 2 or lower " χ^2/Sd " ratio, ".95" or above GFI, AGFI results, and ".05" or lower RMSEA, RMR and SRMR results. However, it is taken as acceptable goodness of fit to be 2-5 " χ^2/Sd " ratio, ".90" or above GFI, AGFI results, and ".08" or lower RMSEA, RMR and SRMR results (Brown, 2006, Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2010; Şimşek, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As a result of these findings, it may be said that model-data fitness is within acceptable limits, and the scale is a valid and reliable one to measure educational supervisors' locus of control.

Procedure

The researcher himself or educational supervisors in Educational Administration and Supervision who hold a master's degree and were already informed about administrating the scale carried out the data collection procedure. A total of 340 educational supervisors who completed the information form and the scale according to the instructions were taken as the sample of the study, while 16 forms due to missing info or mistakes were not included in the analyzing process. Each educational supervisor personally answered the data collection tools and it took about 14 minutes to complete the forms.

Data Analyses

Normality test was performed for scores of locus of control using Kolmogorov Smirnov normal distribution formulas. In the study, independent sample t-test, One-Way-ANOVA and Scheffe test were used to compare groups. All calculations were done using SPSS 17.0. For all analysis, significance level was taken as .05 (Büyüköztürk, 2010).

Results

The study aimed to determine the relation between educational supervisors' internal-external locus of control and the independent variables such as field, faculty, educational level, teaching tenure, supervisory tenure, and incentives within the last three years of supervisory service. The findings are as follows:

The results of the t-test performed to determine whether there is any significance between locus of control mean scores of educational supervisors in terms of field variable are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

T-test Results, according to Field for Scores of LOC Scale for Educational Supervisors

<i>Field</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Classroom Teacher	212	9,29	3,907	338	1.212	.226
Field Teacher	128	8,76	3,904			

As can be seen in Table 1, it was found that mean score of locus of control scale for educational supervisors whose field is classroom teacher was 9.29, while it was 8.76 for educational supervisors who were field teachers. From the table, it can be said that field causes no significant difference [$t(338)=1.21, p>.05$] on the scores of locus of control scale for educational supervisors.

The results of the t-test performed to determine whether there is any significance between locus of control mean scores of educational supervisors in terms of faculty variable are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

T-test Results, according to Faculty, for Scores of LOC Scale for Educational Supervisors

<i>Institution</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Education Faculty	275	9.12	3.882	338	.300	.765
Other Faculties	65	8.95	4.048			

It was found that mean score of locus of control scale for educational supervisors who graduated from Education Faculty was 9.12, while it was 8.95 for educational supervisors who graduated other faculties. From the table, it can be said that faculty causes no significant difference [$t(338)=.30, p>.05$] on the scores of locus of control scale for educational supervisors.

The results of the t-test performed to determine whether there is any significance between locus of control mean scores of educational supervisors in terms of education level variable are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

T-test Results, according to Education Level, for Scores of LOC Scale for Educational Supervisors

<i>Education Level</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Undergraduate	267	9.13	3.860	338	.340	.734
Graduate	73	8.95	4.106			

In Table 3, it can be seen that mean score of locus of control scale for educational supervisors who graduated from a faculty was 9.13, while it was 8.95 for educational supervisors who completed graduate school. Also, according to education level, no significant difference [$t(338)=.34, p>.05$] was found on the scores of locus of control scale for educational supervisors.

The results of One-Way ANOVA performed to determine whether there is any significance between locus of control mean scores of educational supervisors in terms of teaching tenure variable are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

ANOVA Results, according to Teaching Tenure, for Scores of LOC Scale for Educational Supervisors

<i>Locus of Control ANOVA Results</i>	<i>Sum of squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	36.932	2	18.466	1.210	.299
Within Groups	5142.421	337	15.259		
Total	5179.353	339			

As can be seen from Table 4, the mean score of locus of control scale for educational supervisors whose teaching tenure is 10 years or less is 8.86, and it is 9.37 for educational supervisors whose teaching tenure is 11 to 15 years, and it is 8.58 for educational supervisors whose teaching tenure is 16 years or more. From ANOVA results it can be said that teaching tenure causes no significant difference [$F(2-337)=1.21, p>.05$] on the scores of locus of control scale for educational supervisors.

The results of One-Way ANOVA performed to determine whether there is any significance between locus of control mean scores of educational supervisors in terms of supervisory tenure variable are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

ANOVA Results, according to Supervisory Tenure, for Scores of LOC Scale for Educational Supervisors

<i>Locus of Control ANOVA Results</i>	<i>Sum of squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant differences</i>
Between Groups	131.912	2	65.956	4.404	.013*	1-2
Within Groups	5047.440	337	14.978			
Total	5179.353	339				

As can be seen from Table 5, the mean score of locus of control scale for educational supervisors whose supervisory tenure is 2-5 years is 9.66, more than that of educational supervisors' whose teaching tenure is 1 year or less, 8.23. Analysis results indicate that there is significant difference on the scores of locus of control scale for educational supervisors in terms of supervisory tenure [$F(2-337)=4.40$, $p<.05$]. In other words, locus of control of educational supervisors changes significantly with relation to supervisory tenure. According to Scheffe test results, done to determine the difference between groups, it was found that there was a significant difference between those whose supervisory tenure is 2-5 years and those whose supervisory tenure is 1 year or less.

The results of the t-test performed to determine whether there is any significance between locus of control mean scores of educational supervisors in terms of incentives variable are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

T-test Results, according to Incentives, for Scores of LOC Scale for Educational Supervisors

<i>Incentives</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Received	105	9.16	3.698	338	.239	.811
Not Received	235	9.06	4.007			

It was found that mean score of locus of control scale for educational supervisors who received an incentive was 9.16, while it was 9.06 for educational supervisors who did not receive any incentives. From Table 6, it can be said that incentive causes no significant difference [$t(338)=.23$, $p>.05$] on the scores of locus of control scale for educational supervisors.

Conclusions and Recommendations

One of the significant elements is the supervision subsystem that makes and maintains a system characteristic to education. There is a need to focus on an effective and productive supervision of education, which determines each and every contribution to the general aim, when found not adequate, and reveals the possible causes and finds solutions, and intends to develop the process as a whole. Educational supervisors are the critical agent to make supervision effective and productive. They are expected to behave according to legal regularities and in the light of professional ethical principles. It is not realistic to expect educational supervisors to behave without the influence of personal traits while doing what they are expected to do. In this respect, the fact that educational supervisors' personality trait may influence the supervision process should not be ignored. Attitudes and behaviors of educational supervisors during supervision may be affected by locus of control, which is a dimension of personality trait.

In this research, 340 educational supervisors' locus of control was examined in terms of several variables. This group was working in the 4th and 5th service regions in which there are 30 socioeconomically less developed provinces, mostly in eastern and southeastern Anatolia. Eighteen provinces were randomly chosen, 9 from the 4th and 9 from the 5th service regions of Turkey. According to the results, there was no significant effect of variables such as field, faculty, educational level, teaching tenure, and incentives ($p>.05$) on locus of control of the participants. However, supervisory tenure had a significant effect on locus of control of the participants ($p<.05$).

According to Scheffe test results, done to determine the difference between groups, it was found that there was significant difference between those whose supervisory tenure is 2-5 years and those whose supervisory tenure is 1 year or less. That is, locus of control for beginners in educational supervision is mostly internal. When compared with the first year of supervisory tenure, the second group (2-5 years) of supervisory tenure has a tendency towards external locus of control.

The reason for this is that educational supervisors may be affected by previous positions, such as teacher and principal, rather than a newly appointed position, especially in the first year. In researches done in Turkey, mean scores of locus of control for teachers range from 6.34 to 8.70 (Canbay, 2007; Çetin, Çağlayan & Erkmen, 2008; Çolak, 2006; Demirtaş, 2006; Erdoğan & Ergün, 2011; Erkmen & Çetin, 2007; Küçükarağöz, 1998; Tümkaya, 2000; Sarıkaya, 2007), and mean scores of locus of control for school principals range from 6.94 to 10.72 (Akça & Yaman, 2009; Dibekoğlu, 2006; Dilekmen, et al., 2009; Özdemir, 2009; Türkoğlu, 2007).

Those who have higher internal locus of control scores have an upward tendency (Solmuş, 2004; Yeşilyaprak, 2004) while at the same time, to accomplish this goal, they have upper level academic success compared with the ones who have higher external locus of control (Dilmaç, 2008; Yeşilyaprak, 2004). This leads to an expectation that scores of locus of control for teachers and principals who intend to become educational supervisors should come near internal locus of control. In view of this expectation, teachers and principals who intend to be educational supervisors

or to realize it are expected to have internal locus of control. This can be an explanation for the score of those whose supervisory tenure is 1 year or less having significantly lower (internal LOC) than those whose tenure is 2-5 years.

The finding that mean score of locus of control for educational supervisors is 9.09 can be compared with the findings of the researches in which participants are Turkish teachers (Canbay, 2007; Çetin, et al., 2008; Çolak, 2006; Demirtaş, 2006; Erdoğan & Ergün, 2011) and principals (Akça & Yaman, 2009; Dibekoğlu, 2006; Dilekmen, et al., 2009; Özdemir, 2009; Türkoğlu, 2007), in view of the fact that scores of locus of control may differ in various cultures. According to the findings of these researches, mean score of locus of control for teachers was 8.08, while it was 8.43 for principals. In the researches done in Turkey, mean score for teachers is 8.08 and mean score for principals is 8.43, whereas mean score of locus of control for educational supervisors is 9.09. These findings suggest that educational supervisors have more external locus of control scores than teachers and principals. Considering the fact that the ones who have higher internal locus of control scores have an upward tendency (Solmuş, 2004; Yeşilyaprak, 2004) while at the same time, to accomplish this goal, they have an upper level of academic success compared with the ones who have higher external locus of control (Dilmaç, 2008; Yeşilyaprak, 2004), it can be expected that teachers and principal with internal locus of control should become educational supervisors, thereby educational supervisors would have less locus of control scores. Yet, this finding of the research is not supported by the findings of the literature. The reason for this may be two-sided. First, due to perceptions of unjust processes in which proficiency is not a criterion to be selected and appointed, teachers and principals with internal locus of control do not think of becoming an educational supervisor. The perception of a process that can be manipulated and predictable makes it appropriate for those with external locus of control instead of those with internal locus of control. Second, it may be the result of the perception of educational supervisors towards their own profession. They may think that they play a role that forces them to use external control while they exercise their authority. This perception towards their position may be a cause of higher score of locus of control for educational supervisors than that of teachers and principals. Both possible reasons do not justify that educational supervisors should have higher scores (external) than teachers and principals.

If it is appropriate for people who have internal locus of control to perform supervisory jobs (Spector, 1982), educational supervisors are expected to have more internal locus of control than teachers and principals do. Considering personality traits of people having a tendency of internal locus of control, it can be realized how vital it is for educational supervisors to have these characteristics. Researches (Cüceloğlu, 1993; Dağ, 1991; Dönmez, 1983, 1984, 1986; Yeşilyaprak, 2004) suggest that there are some common personality qualities for internal locus of control when compared with external locus of control. According to these researches, people with internal locus of control are more at peace with themselves and society, inclined to make changes in their environment, to join social and political activities, and to help others, and are more comfortable and successful in personal activities. On the other

hand, they are less liable to conform to pressure of others, rely more on their judgment, give more positive reactions in the face of blocking, react harshly to limiting freedom, and prefer to be independent, less dependent to outer surroundings, and self-sufficient. At the same time, they are the people who spend more time on intellectual and academic pursuits, make efficient use of time, have high academic achievements, have outstanding success especially on competitive occasions, are success-oriented, risk-lovers, self-confident, have a creative sense of self, are resistant, organized, systematic, have auto-control, are trustworthy, more objective and consistent. They can concentrate more on what they do or problems they encounter, accept difficulties easily, and they are self-assertive when it comes to long-term planning, realizing and choosing different alternatives. They can perceive and evaluate easily hints and environmental stimulus in solving problems. Since they have more of a sense of responsibility, they see others from the point of their responsibility. Not only do they seek responsibility, but they do not avoid giving responsibility as well. They are the ones who perceive themselves as more influential, trustworthy, and self-directed, having a highly positive sense of self-esteem, are venturesome, undertakers, active, combative, healthy and balanced emotionally, use fewer defense mechanisms, are more comfortable in interpersonal relations, self-assured, peacemakers, have high motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, low alienation, and are more productive and creative. The fact that educational supervisors should be internal locus of control may contribute to what is necessary in their tasks, which are the results of legal regulations and professional ethical principles, and also may create an environment in which they make targeted people more internal locus of control. This may spark an output effect contributing to developing the educational system as a whole.

Although educational supervisors have higher mean scores of locus of control than teachers and principals, their score ($M=9.09$) may be interpreted from a different point of view. Rotter's internal-external locus of control scale scores range from 0 to 23 points and having a higher score means external locus of control. However, in some researches (Akça & Yaman, 2009; Çolak, 2006; Saracaloğlu, Serin & Bozkurt, 2005; Sulu, 2007; Tokat, Kara & Ülkün, 2007) scores between 0 and 11 indicated internal locus of control, while scores between 12 and 23 indicated external locus of control. Taking this point into account, it can be said that mean score ($M=9.09$) of educational supervisors shows that they have internal locus of control.

For educational supervisors who are a crucial element in the educational process, playing an effective role is parallel with being internal locus of control. That's why some measures should be taken for educational supervisors to have more internal locus of control. To achieve this goal, two suggestions can be offered. First, the process of selection of educational supervisors can be restructured in order to choose people with high internal locus of control. The practices that are based on the perceptions of unjust processes in which proficiency is not a criterion to be selected and appointed, and which can be manipulated and predictable must be carefully eliminated. As a result of this, teachers and principals who have internal locus of control may think of becoming an educational supervisor and can make it a reality. Second, another perception of educational supervisors must be changed. It is the

perception that they play a role that is heavily dependent on external supervision during their task performances, in terms of authority they have. Essentially, when it comes to authority and responsibility of educational supervisors, the source of which comes from legal regulations and professional ethical principles, it means having those people work, who do their duties without any external supervision. The paradigm shift in perception towards their job can be carried out during either pre-service or in-service training. As a result of such training, behavior of an educational supervisor that is objective, consistent, success-oriented, encourages new practices, is supportive and confidential rather than fault-seeking, argumentative, oppressive, and penalizing will improve, thereby creating an environment in which perception of internal locus of control for teachers and principals will develop.

References

- Akça, F. & Yaman, B. (2010). The Effects of internal-external locus of control variables on burnout levels of teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 3976-3980.
- Akça, F. & Yaman, B. (2009). Okul yöneticilerinin problem çözme davranışlarını etkileyen faktörleri incelemeye yönelik bir çalışma [A study on the examination of the factors affecting the problem-solving behaviors of school directors], *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 17(3), 767-780.
- Aqeel, A. K., Masood N., Muhammad S., & Nabiha A. (2010). Measuring the mediating role of locus of control on stress among the students of the Islamia University of Bahawalpur. *Journal of Educational Research* 13(2), 187-193.
- Arlotto, G. P. (2002). A structural equation modeling analysis of the direct and indirect effects of locus of control and empowerment on burnout in high school principals. The George Washington University. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305525776?accountid=16268>. (305525776).
- Armstrong, B. C. (2001). School size as a factor in the job satisfaction and locus of control of high school principals in Missouri. University of Kansas. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304698013?accountid=16268>. (304698013).
- Arslan, C., Dilmaç, B. & Hamarta, E. (2009). Coping with stress and trait anxiety in terms of locus of control: A study with Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality* 37(6), 791-800. Doi: 10.2224/sbp.2009.37.6.791.
- Arogundade, O. & Itua, O. (2010). Locus of control and self-esteem as predictors of teachers' frustration in Lagos state secondary schools. *IFE Psychologia* 18(2), 339-351.
- Aydın, İ. (2005). *Öğretimde denetim: Durum saptama, değerlendirme ve geliştirme* [Supervision in education: Determination, assessment, development], Ankara: Pegem A.

- Aydın, M. (2000). *Çağdaş eğitim denetimi* [Contemporary education supervision], Ankara: Hatiboğlu.
- Aydın, M. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi* [Educational administration], Ankara: Hatiboğlu.
- Bağlum, O. K. (2000). Eğitim yöneticilerinde sorun çözme ve denetim odağı ilişkisi [Relationship between problem solving and locus of control of educational administrators] Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Başar, H. (2000). *Eğitim denetçisi* [Educational supervisor], Ankara: Pegem A.
- Başaran, İ. E. (2006). *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi* [Turkish education system and school management], Ankara: Ekinoks Eğitim.
- Brown, T.A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi kitabı*. [Data analysis for social sciences], 11. Baskı, Ankara: Pegem A.
- Canbay, S. (2007). *İlköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin iş doyumunu ve denetim odağı ilişkisi* [The relationship between locus of control and job satisfaction for elementary school teachers]. Unpublished master's thesis, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Çetin, M.Ç., Çağlayan, H.S. & Erkmen, N. (2008). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin denetim odağı düzeyi ile stresle başa çıkma yolları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between locus of control and stress coping ways for physical education teachers]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi BES Bilim Dergisi*, 10(2), 31-39.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G. ve Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları*. [Multivariate Statistics for Social Sciences] Ankara: Pegem A Akademi.
- Çolak, E. (2006). Meslek lisesi makine bölümü öğretmenlerinin denetim odaklarının medeni durum, yaş, anne ve babanın eğitim düzeyi değişkenleri açısından incelenmesi [Examining of teachers' locus of control in machinery program of vocational school in terms of marital status, age, education level of parents]. *Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Edu7, 2(1), 1-14.
- Cüceloğlu, D., (1993). Dıştan denetimli kişi [External locus of control]. *Yaşadıkça Eğitim*, 30, 4-5.
- Dağ, İ. (1991). Rotter'in iç-dış kontrol odağı ölçeği (RİDKOÖ)nün üniversite öğrencileri için güvenilirliği ve geçerliği [The validity and reliability of Rotter's internal-external locus of control for university students]. *Psikoloji Dergisi*.7(26), 10-16.
- Daniel, L. G. (1993). Health locus of control and school achievement in middle school students. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

- Demirtaş, Ç. P. (2006). *İlköğretim sınıf öğretmenlerinin stresle başa çıkma yöntemleri, ruh sağlığı ve denetim odağının yönü* [In the primary education, the classroom teacher's procedure of coping with stress, the health of psyche and the direction of check point.]. Unpublished master's thesis, Niğde Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Dibekoğlu, Z. (2006). *Okul yöneticilerinin denetim odaklarına göre tükenmişlik düzeyleri (Sakarya ili örneği)* [The level of burnout of principals in terms of locus of control.]. Unpublished master's thesis, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Dilekmen, M., Alver, B., Ada, Ş., & Akçay, K. (2009). İlk ve ortaöğretim okul yöneticilerinin iç-dış kontrol odakları [Internal-external locus of control for elementary and secondary school principals]. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 9(1), 127-136.
- Dilmaç, O. (2008). Görsel sanatlar öğretmen adaylarının denetim odaklarına ilişkin algılarının çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi [Examining visual art student-teachers' perception of locus of control in terms of some variables]. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20, 1-14.
- Dönmez, A. (1983). Denetim odağını (locus of control) ve çevre büyüklüğü [Locus of control and environment size]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(1), 37-47.
- Dönmez, A. (1984). Belirli toplumsal durumların algılanmasında denetim odağının etkisi [The effect of locus of control in perceiving certain social situations]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(1), 143-158.
- Dönmez, A. (1986). Denetim odağı: Temel araştırma alanları [Locus of control: Main research areas]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(1), 259-280.
- Erdoğan, Ö. & Ergün, M. (2011). İki farklı meslek grubunda çalışan personelin denetim odağı ve risk eğilimi düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması [Comparing and contrasting the locus of control and risk tendency levels of the personnel working in two different state institutions]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education)*. 40, 176-185.
- Erkmen, N. & Çetin, M.Ç. (2007). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin denetim odağının bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi [Examining of physical education teachers's locus of control in terms of some variables]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17, 211-223.
- Gan, Y. & Shang, J. (2007). Coping flexibility and locus of control as predictors of burnout among Chinese college students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 35(8), 1087-1098. Retrieved October 3, 2011, from <http://www.psy.pku.edu.cn/Upload/pubs/2010090300005.pdf>

- Hodges, K. & Winstanley, S. (2012). Effects of Optimism, Social Support, Fighting Spirit, Cancer Worry and Internal Health Locus of Control on Positive Affect in Cancer Survivors: A Path Analysis. *Stress and Health Special Issue: Stress and Cancer*, 28 (5), 408-415.
- Jooa, Y.J., Lima, K.Y. & Jiyeon Kimb, J. (2013). Locus of control, self-efficacy, and task value as predictors of learning outcome in an online university context. *Computers & Education*, 62, 149-158.
- Jöreskog, K.G., & Sörbom, D. (2004). *LISREL 8.7 for Windows* [Computer Software]. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.
- Kapıkıran, N. A. (2007). İlköğretim birinci kademe öğretmenlerinde denetim odağının yordayıcısı olarak öğretmenlerin öz-yetkinliklerinin incelenmesi [Examining of self-competence of teachers as a predictor of locus of control for elementary school teachers]. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34(3), 50-56.
- Konan, N. (2013). Relationship between locus of control and problem-solving skills of high school administrators. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 3 (3), 786-794.
- Küçükkaragöz, H. S. (1998). İlkokul öğretmenlerinde kontrol odağı ve öğrencilerinin kontrol odağının oluşumuna etkileri [Elementary schools teachers locus of control and theirs locus of controls effects on their students]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Klein, K. & Wasserstein-Warnet, M. (2000). Predictive validity of the locus of control test in selection of school administrators. *Journal of Educational Administration*. Armidale. 38(1), 7-25.
- M. Lindströma, M. & Rosvalla, M. (2012). Marital status, social capital and health locus of control: A population-based study. *Public Health*, 126 (9), 790-795.
- MoNE [MEB]. (1973). *Milli eğitim temel kanunu* [The basic law of National Education]. 24.6.1973 tarih ve 14574 sayılı Resmî Gazete.
- MoNE [MEB]. (1999). *Millî eğitim bakanlığı ilköğretim müfettişleri başkanlıkları yönetmeliği* [Regulations of elementary school supervisory directorate of National Ministry of Education]. 13.8.1999 tarih ve 23785 sayılı Resmî Gazete.
- MoNE [MEB]. (2011). *Millî eğitim bakanlığının teşkilat ve görevleri hakkında kanun hükmünde kararname* [Decree law concerning the organization and duties of the Ministry of National Education]. 14.09.2011 tarih ve 28054 sayılı Resmî Gazete.
- Munir, S. & Sajid, M. (2010). Examining locus of control (LOC) as a determinant of organizational commitment among university professors in Pakistan. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 3(1), 78-93.

- Özdemir, E. (2009). *Okul yöneticilerinin denetim odaklarına göre tükenmişlik düzeyleri* [Burnout levels of school administrators in relation to locus of control]. Unpublished master's thesis, Maltepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Rose, J. S. & Meadway, F. J. (1981). Teacher locus of control, teacher behavior and student behavior as determinants of student achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 74(6), 375-381.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80(Whole No. 609), 1-28.
- Ruibytė, L. (2007). Relationship between individual attributional style, self-esteem, locus of control and academic achievement of Vytautas Magnus University students. *Education. Physical Training. Sport*. 4(67), 71-78.
- Saracaloğlu, A. S., Serin, O. & Bozkurt, N. (2005). Eğitim bilimleri enstitüsü lisansüstü öğrencilerinin problem çözme ve denetim odağı düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Examining the level of problem solving and locus of control in terms of some variables, of postgraduate students in educational sciences institute]. *Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17, 237-242.
- Sarıkaya, P. (2007). Tükenmişlik sendromunun kişilik özelliklerinden denetim odağı ile ilişkisi ve bir uygulama [A research about the relationship between burnout syndrome and one of the personality traits locus of control]. Unpublished master's thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Solmuş, T. (2004). İş yaşamı, denetim odağı ve beş faktörlük kişilik modeli [Occupational life, locus of control, 5-factor personality model]. *Türk Psikoloji Bülteni*, 10(34-35), 196-205.
- Spector, P.E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91(3), 482-497.
- Sulu, H. (2007). *Resmi ve özel ilköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin iş tatminleri ile denetim odağı arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [The investigation of the relation between the job satisfaction of the teachers who work in private and state primary schools and the control focus.]. Unpublished master's thesis, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Şimşek Ö. F. (2007). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesine giriş: Temel ilkeler ve LISREL uygulamaları*. [Introduction to Structural Equation Modelling: The Basics and Lisrel Applications] Ankara: Ekinoks Yayınları.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th edition). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Taymaz, H. (2005). *Eğitim sisteminde teftiş: Kavramlar, ilkeler, yöntemler* [Supervision in education system: Concepts, principles, methods]. Ankara: Pegem A.

- Tokat, B., Kara, H. & Ülkün, N. (2007). Yöneticilerin sorun çözme yetenekleri ve kontrol odağının belirlenmesi: DPÜ örneği [Problem solving proficiency of managers and determining the locus of control: DPU Case study]. *Akademik Bakış Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi*, 11, 1-11.
- Tümkiye, S. (2000). İlkokul öğretmenlerindeki denetim odağı ve tükenmişlikle ilişkisi [The relationship between locus of control and burnout for elementary school teachers]. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8, 61-68.
- Türkoğlu, E. (2007). Türk Alman okul yöneticilerinin denetim odağı boyutunda farklı değişkenler açısından karşılaştırılması [A comparative study of the Turkish and German school administrators on locus of control]. Unpublished master's thesis, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tokat.
- Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Anayasası* [Constitution of Turkish Republic] (1982).
- Williams, K. E. & Andrade, M. R. (2008). Foreign language learning anxiety in Japanese EFL university classes: Causes, coping, and locus of control. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5(2), 181-191. Retrieved October 3, 2011, from <http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v5n22008/williams.htm>
- Wu, S. C. & Elliott, R. T. (2008). A study of reward preference in Taiwanese gifted and nongifted students with differential locus of control. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 32(4), 230-244. Retrieved October 3, 2011, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ826292.pdf>.
- Yaşar, V. (2008). Farklı liselerde öğrenim görmekte olan 16-18 yaş grubundaki öğrencilerin denetim odağı düzeyleri ile bazı kişilik özelliklerinin karşılaştırılması [Comparison some personality traits with the level of locus of control for 16-18 year-old students in various high schools]. *Milli Eğitim*, 178, 121-138.
- Yeşilyaprak, B. (2004). Denetim odağı [Locus of control] in Y. Kuzgun & D. Deryakulu (Eds.). *Eğitimde Bireysel Farklılıklar* [Individual differences in education] (pp. 239-258). Ankara: Nobel.

Eğitim Denetmenlerinin Denetim Odağı

Atıf:

- Konan, N. (2013). Educational supervisors' locus of control. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 51, 45-64.

(Özet)

Problem Durumu

Toplumsal açık sistemlerde sistemin çıktısının niteliğini belirleyen temel etmen, çalışanların amaca yönelik davranışlarıdır. Bu davranışların farklı belirleyicileri bulunmaktadır. Ancak, hemen her örgütte, çalışanın örgütte, örgüte ilişkin olarak, gözlenen davranışının temelde "kurum" ve "birey" olmak üzere iki belirleyicisi

vardır. Bunlardan ilki, daha çok, örgütün amacı, yapılacak işlerin niteliği ile ikincisi ise, daha çok, çalışanın kişilik özellikleriyle ilişkilidir. Kurum boyutu, örgütün az ya da çok kontrolündedir ve örgütsel güçler tarafından değiştirilerek, geliştirilerek yönlendirilebilir. Oysa örgütsel davranışın "birey" boyutu, örgütün etkisine, kontrolüne, "kurum" boyutu kadar açık değildir. "Birey" boyutu, daha çok, bireyin gereksinimleri ve beklentilerinden oluşan bir kişilik özelliği niteliğindedir. Kişilik özellikleri, aynı konumda bulunan ve aynı rolü yerine getirmesi beklenen çalışanların birbirlerinden farklı örgütsel davranışını açıklayan temel etmenlerden biridir. Bu nedenle, çalışanın örgüte yaptığı katkının kişilik özelliklerinden yalıtılmış olarak değerlendirilmesi yanıltıcı olacaktır. Kişilik özellikleri, farklı boyutlarıyla, birçok araştırmanın konusu olmuştur. Bunlardan biri de, bir kişilik boyutu olarak ölçülüp değerlendirilebilen, denetim odağıdır. Denetim odağı araştırmaları farklı ülkelerde ve farklı öğrenim düzeylerinde öğrencileri, öğretmenleri ve yöneticileri konu edinmişken, kritik bir öge olan eğitim denetmenlerini konu edinen hiçbir araştırmaya rastlanmamıştır. Eğitim Denetmenlerinin işgörülerini etkili biçimde yerine getirebilmede belirleyici olan öğelerden biri görev alanının yasal dayanakları ise diğeri de kişilik özellikleridir. Bu nedenle, denetim uygulamalarında etkin olan önemli öğelerden birinin de eğitim denetmenlerinin kişilik özelliklerinin bir boyutunu oluşturan denetim odağı olması araştırma konusu edilmesini gerektirmiştir.

Araştırmanın Amacı

Bu araştırmanın temel amacı Eğitim Denetmenlerinin içten- dıştan denetim odağı ile branşı, en son tamamladığı öğrenim kurumu, öğrenim düzeyi, öğretmenlik mesleğindeki toplam hizmet süresi, eğitim denetmenliğindeki toplam hizmet süresi ve eğitim denetmenliğindeki son üç yılda herhangi bir ödül alması arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemektir.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi

Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, Türkiye'nin coğrafi olarak daha çok doğu ve güney doğu; sosyo-ekonomik olarak da daha az gelişmiş illerinin bulunduğu dördüncü ve beşinci hizmet bölgesinde yer alan 18 ilde (Adıyaman, Ağrı, Batman, Diyarbakır, Elazığ, Erzincan, Erzurum, Gümüşhane, Hakkâri, Iğdır, Kahramanmaraş, Kastamonu, Muş, Mardin, Siirt, Sivas, Şanlıurfa ve Van) görev yapan 340 eğitim denetmeni oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada eğitim denetmenlerine ilişkin kişisel bilgileri toplamak amacı ile araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan "Genel Bilgi Formu" ve eğitim denetmenlerinin iç dış denetim odaklarının düzeylerini belirlemeyi amaçlayan, toplam 29 maddelik Rotter'ın İç Dış Denetim Odağı Ölçeği (I-E LOC Scale) kullanılmıştır. Veriler, Kolmogorov Smirnov Normal Dağılıma Uygunluk testi, İlişkisiz Örneklem T- Testi (Independent Sample T-Testi), İlişkisiz Örneklem İçin Tek Faktörlü Varyans Analizi (One-Way ANOVA) ve Scheffe Testi ile değerlendirilmiştir.

Araştırmanın Bulguları

Yapılan analizler sonucunda; branşın, öğrenim kurumunun, öğrenim düzeyinin, öğretmenlikteki kıdemin ve ödül alma değişkenlerinin eğitim denetmenlerinin denetim odakları üzerinde anlamlı bir farklılığa neden olmadığı saptanmıştır ($p>.05$).

Denetmenlikteki kıdemin ise eğitim denetmenlerinin denetim odakları üzerinde anlamlı düzeyde bir farklılığa neden olduğu belirlenmiştir ($p<.05$).

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri

İçsel denetim odağı inancı yüksek olan kişilerin yükselme eğilimlerinin daha üst düzeyde oldukları, bu amaçlarını gerçekleştirebilmek açısından da, dışsal denetim odağı inancı yüksek olanlara kıyasla daha üst düzeyde bir akademik başarıya sahip oldukları dikkate alınacak olunursa, daha çok iç denetim odağı yönelimli öğretmen ve okul yöneticilerinin eğitim denetmeni olmaları, dolayısıyla eğitim denetmenlerinin öğretmen ve okul yöneticilerinden daha az denetim odağı ortalamasına sahip olmaları beklenirdi. Oysa araştırma sonucu ulaşılan bu bulgu alanyazındaki bulgularla desteklenmemektedir. Türkiye’de yapılan araştırmalarda, öğretmenlerin denetim odağı ortalama puanı $M=8.08$, okul müdürlerinin denetim odağı ortalama puanı ise $M=8.43$ olarak belirlenmişken, eğitim denetmenlerinin denetim odağı ortalama puanı $M=9.09$ olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu durum eğitim denetmenlerinin öğretmen ve okul müdürlerinden daha dış denetim odağı inancına sahip olduklarını göstermektedir.

Eğitim denetmeninin iç denetim odağı eğilimli olması, hem yasal düzenlemeler ve mesleğin gerektirdiği etik ilkelerden kaynaklanan görevinin gereklerini yerine getirmesine katkı sağlayacak, hem de hedef kitesindeki kişilerin iç denetim odağı eğilimli olmasına ortam yaratabilecektir. Eğitim denetmeninin iç denetim odağı eğilimli olmasını sağlamak amacıyla temelde iki yol önerilebilir. Bunlardan ilki, eğitim denetmenliğine yeni atanacakların seçimine yönelik olarak yapılacak düzenlemelerle gerçekleştirilebilir. Eğitim denetmenliğine seçilme ve atanmada yeterliği esas alan bir sürecin olmadığı, sonucu önceden kestirilebilen ve dış denetmenlerin kontrolünde bir süreç olduğu algısına dayanak oluşturan uygulamaların özenle ortadan kaldırılması gerekir. Bunun sonucunda iç denetim odağı yönelimli öğretmen ve okul yöneticilerinin eğitim denetmeni olmayı düşünmeleri ve bunu gerçekleştirmeleri mümkün olabilir. İkincisi ise, eğitim denetmenlerinin yasal düzenlemelerle kendilerine verilen yetkilerini kullanırken, görevlerinin gereği olarak daha çok dıştan denetimi gerçekleştiren bir rolü yerine getirdikleri algısının değiştirilmesi ile gerçekleştirilebilir. Eğitim denetmenlerinin, yasal düzenleme ve mesleki etik ilkelerden kaynaklanan görev ve sorumluluklarının özünde, hedef kitlelerindeki herkesin kendi görev ve sorumluluğunu dıştan bir denetime gerek duymadan yerine getirebilecek bilinç düzeyine çıkarmak yer almaktadır. Eğitim denetmenlerinin görevlerine ilişkin bu algı değişikliği, gerek hizmet öncesi eğitim, gerekse hizmetiçi eğitim yoluyla gerçekleştirilebilir. Bunun sonucunda açık arayan, eleştireci, baskıcı ve cezacı bir denetim uygulaması yerine objektif, tutarlı, başarı yönelimli, yeni uygulamaları özendiren, destekleyici ve güven veren eğitim denetmeni davranışlarının artacağı, bunun da özellikle öğretmen ve okul yöneticilerinin içten denetim algısının gelişmesi üzerinde etkili olabileceği beklenebilir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Denetim odağı, iç dış denetim odağı, kontrol odağı, eğitim denetmeni,