

# Examining the Relationship between Teacher Candidates' Individual Values and Leadership Orientations

Ramazan Cansoy<sup>1\*</sup> Sezen Tofur<sup>2</sup>

1.Karabuk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Educational Sciences, Karabuk, Turkey

2.Ministry of National Education, Fatih Secondary School, Science teacher, Gördes, Manisa, Turkey

## Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations. The participants of the study were a total of 452 teacher candidates studying in the pedagogical formation program of Karabük University in the 2016-2017 academic year. The Leadership Orientations Scale and Portrait Values Scale were employed to gather the research data. In data analysis, arithmetic mean, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, and Multilinear Regression Analysis were used. According to the results, the teacher candidates' preferences of values were universalism, security, conformity and benevolence, self-direction, stimulation, traditionalism, hedonism, achievement and power in order of importance, respectively. The highest level of leadership orientation that the teacher candidates had was in the human resources frame, which was followed by structural, symbolic and political frames. Positive and significant relationships were revealed between all dimensions of individual values and those of leadership orientations. The individual values of power and achievement were found to be predictors of structural, symbolic and political frames. Two of the remaining individual values, self-direction and benevolence, were found to be significant and common predictors of all frames of leadership orientations. The findings revealed from the present study were discussed with reference to the literature, and various inferences were made.

**Keywords:** Individual values, Leadership orientations, Leadership framework, Value-Leadership relationship, Teacher candidates.

## 1. Introduction

Values are significant sources of motivation in individuals' behaviours, and enable them to make sense of their behaviours (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998; Homer & Kahle, 1988; Papagiannakis & Lioukas, 2012; Ehrhart & Klein, 2001). When values are internalised, they start to direct individuals' actions and behaviours, either consciously or unconsciously (Bruno & Lay, 2008). There are important causal relationships between individual values and the behaviours performed (Homer & Kahle, 1988), and human behaviours are explained based on these values (Güngör, 1993). One of the variables that is argued to be related to the connection between behaviours and values is the area of leadership. In this sense, individual values are regarded as important in the literature on leadership (Burns, 1978; Michie & Gooty, 2005; Sosik, 2005; Grojean, Resick, Dickson & Smith, 2004). Studies that focus on leadership show that one of the vital characteristics in effective leadership is individual values, and leaders have strong individual values, principles and ethics (Graber & Killpatrick, 2008). Besides, individual values are also key to leaders' choices, decisions, actions, and evaluation of events and people (Byrne & Bradley, 2007). Therefore, examining the relationships between individual values and leadership orientations are seen to have significance.

Schools are social organisations that are based on values (Bursaloğlu, 1997). Values determine leaders' positions (Kouzes & Posner, 2003), and play a guiding role (Mashlah, 2015). There are empirical studies showing that values are influential in performing behaviours (Egri & Herman, 2000; McNeely & Meglino, 1994). Values are strong motivational tools for leaders and their followers (Shamir, 1990). For this reason, effective leaders need to have certain core individual values (O'Toole, 1996; Greenleaf, 1995; Bennis, 2009). If leadership is seen as a process of creating impact, it can be argued that this could be achieved through values (Baloğlu, 2012). In this regard, value orientations affect administrators' perspective to different cases, solutions to problems, interpersonal relationships, individual and organisational success, references about what moral behaviours are, conformity to organisational purposes, and managerial success (England & Lee, 1974). At the same time, while leaders carry out activities based on certain values, they ensure that individuals and groups are in accord (Lord & Brown, 2001). It can be argued that revealing the relationship between different leadership orientation and individual values is of significance in managing organisation effectively, and determining and understanding problems.

## 2. Individual Values

Values are norms or principles that are used to explain human behaviours (Güngör, 1993), have varying degrees of importance and direct life (Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess & Harris, 2001), affect individuals' preferences and guide them (Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1975), and are accepted by individuals in social life (Kılıç, 2011). Values are regarded as social norms in sociology, as elements that reveal personal attitudes and explain

behaviours in psychology, and as the essence that constitute culture by anthropologists (Sağnak, 2004). They are seen as concepts that guide individuals and make them parts of the society (Aktay & Ekşi, 2009). Different individual values form individuals' reasons of motivation for their priorities (Cartwright, 2007). When individuals are aware of their values, how they would react to different situation can be predicted (Gibb, 2010). Values are higher-order structures that direct individuals' attitudes and behaviours without depending on certain situations or conditions (Schwartz, 1996). According to these perspectives, values have a special place in social life as well as in individuals' life. It can then be argued that individual values have important functions for the continuity and peace of the existing social structure.

Individual values have a set of functions. These are evaluating social behaviours, concentrating on what is beneficial, being regarded as a means of solidarity, and experiencing social roles more easily (Fichter, 1990). In addition, values that have been learned within the social structure and can be perceived consciously have a critical role in ensuring social harmony (Kılıç, 2011). In overall, having individual values can be thought to have a functional importance in the context of living the life more meaningfully.

Values have been exposed to different classifications theoretically. In Spranger's (1928) classification, basic values and their groups are as follows: (i) Theoretical (Scientific). value that features revealing the truth, knowledge and thinking. (ii) Economical value that emphasises what is beneficial. (iii) Aesthetic value that attaches importance to conformity and form, and highlights art. (iv) Social values that focus on human relationships, loving others, and helping them. (v) Political value that deals with power and status. (vi) Religious values that comprehends the universe, and features religious values. According to Rokeach (1973), values are classified as ends values and means values. Ends values include the values desired at the end such as achievement, freedom and equality. Means values, on the other hand, include attitudes and behaviours that are means to reach ends values such as courage, passion and responsibility.

Schwartz (1992) divides values into two groups: individual and cultural. Schwartz (1996) groups values based on three needs, which are universal needs as a biological organism, universal needs towards ensuring harmony in social interactions, and those towards meeting the needs for the adaptation of groups and the society. Schwartz (1996) proposes types of individual values based on these three needs. In the context of the present study, individual values were examined. Individual values are regarded as concepts that guide people's lives and have certain degrees of importance. The groups of individual values are listed as follows (Schwartz, 1996; Kağıtçıbaşı & Kuşdil, 2000; Yazıcı, 2006; Demirutku & Sümer, 2010); *Power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, traditionalism, conformity and security*. These values are evaluated based on their importance in guiding individuals' lives and orienting them. Among these values, *power* is about social status, trying to be influential on people and resources, having the supervisory power over them, being socially powerful, and maintaining one's perception and image in the society. *Achievement* is the desire of individual achievement based on the standard accepted by the society, and being competent and ambitious. *Hedonism* is about bodily pleasure, enjoying life, and being content. *Stimulation* is novelty and enthusiasm, having excitement, and being brave. *Self-direction* refers to individuals' thinking and acting freely, being curious, and setting their goals independently. *Universalism* is about wishing for the well-being and peace of all humanity, being tolerant and understanding, and being in harmony with the nature and environment. *Benevolence* is hoping that one's acquaintances would be well and in peace, trying to be a real friend, and looking out for friends. *Traditionalism* refers to being respectful and tied to the culture, religious customs, and views. *Conformity* is staying away from actions that may hurt others, limiting those actions that would disrupt the social order, monitoring one's own behaviours, and being a kind person. *Security* is about ensuring the maintenance and stability of social tranquillity, and one's peace and continuity.

Based on the definitions and arguments on individual values, it can be stated that these values are significant indicators in revealing what is right and wrong for individuals, acting on a set of options in daily life in the framework of a set principles, and having a happier life. Therefore, revealing individual values can contribute to individual and social conformity and ensure meeting in common grounds by exhibiting individuals' perspectives about themselves.

### 3. Leadership framework

Studies have focused on leadership from different aspects including the characteristics approach, behavioural approaches, situational approaches, and new approaches. The characteristics approach states that leaders have certain extraordinary characteristics, whereas behavioural theories evaluate whether leaders are effective or not by focusing on what they do and how. Situational theories state that contextual conditions are important in leadership, and it is the situational conditions what make a leader. On the other hand, in the new approaches, leadership is seen as a social interaction, a shared process, influence, and a relational process (Komives, Lucas & McMahon, 2007). However, leadership, in its broadest sense, is perceived as a social process that affects group members in ways such as motivation, power relations, and choice of purpose (Hoy & Miskel, 2010).

Leadership framework is among the new approaches. This framework brings making the clear and

incomprehensible problems that come out within the organisation, and their indications meaningful, and performing certain actions to ensure their solutions (Dereli, 2003). Among the new approaches to leadership, Bolman and Deal (2003) mentions the distinctive leadership approach and refers to four types of frames. The four-frame model is compared to a factory or machine for the structural frame, a family for human resources, a forest for the political frame, and a ceremony, temple or theatre play for the symbolic frame. The leadership image is specified as the social structure in the structural frame, empowering and authorising in human resources, advocacy and political understanding in the political frame, and inspiring in the symbolic frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013). One of the important characteristics of this model is that it brings multiple frames to organisations. The characteristic of multiple frames is formed with the synthesis of many theories, old and new. At the same time, the suitable frame for an existing situation can lead to an effective evaluation and being an effective leader (Tanrıöğen, 2013).

According to Bolman and Deal (2003), organisations have their unique natures, structures, multiple problems due to people, confusions and conflicts. In order to avoid confusions and conflicts, four different frame orientations have been developed based on the use of different organisational power resources that are structural, human resources, political and symbolic. These power resources include types such as positional power (authority), controlling rewards, coercive power, knowledge and expertise, reputation, individual power, alliances and networks, access and control over the agenda, and framing (Bolman & Deal, 2013). In this scope, leaders should approach to the solution of problems with multiple frames that consider all of these dimensions. Furthermore, effective leaders should be able to use more than one frame effectively to solve problems and understand the organisation. In this way, the failures of organisations can be precluded. Accordingly, the alignment of the situations encountered and the models formed in mind, and what can be done in an existing situation are introduced in the framework.

The leadership frames depending on the structures in organisations are listed as follows (Bolman & Deal, 2013):

(i) *Structural frame*: A structuralist leader thinks that problems are mostly related to the structure. The structuralist leader ensures focusing on organising, planning, executing, good relationships with the environment, and developing all these. He/she tries to act fairly. Structuralist leaders know their responsibilities, duties and contribution to the organisation.

(ii) *Human resources frame*: Human resource leaders support and strengthen individuals by focusing on their psychological and social needs. They are sensitive, rather than authoritative. They have confidence in their workers, and the workers can reach them whenever they want. They act honestly, and expect their followers to act freely.

(iii) *Political frame*: Political leaders get along well with groups outside the organisation, use their power extremely carefully, ensure the power balance, force their followers when necessary, and try to create environments based on reconciliation. They know what to do, and what they want.

(iv) *Symbolic frame*: Symbolic leaders emphasise the organisational culture based on doing the job more meaningfully, and feature values. Besides, they use stories and ceremonies, and inspire people. They can create new symbols, or change existing symbols, to put the group into action when necessary.

In educational institutions that are the primary organisations influenced by social change, leadership has become quite important (Can, 2014). With individual values being key to leadership behaviours, it can be argued that the importance of the relationship between leadership and individual values (Graber & Killpatrick, 2008; Ehrhart & Klein, 2001). In the literature, there are many studies that reveal the relationships between individual values in organisations, and servant leadership (Russell, 2001), transformative leadership (Burns, 1978; Grooves & LaRocca, 2012), destructive leadership (Illies & Reiter-Palmon, 2008), charismatic leadership (Sosik, 2005) and leadership orientations (Noorhani, 2015). In this respect, demonstrating the relationships between individual values and different approaches to leadership is thought to be beneficial in the solution of organisational programs. In order to understand and overcome the organisational problems that come out, Bolman and Deal (2003) proposes four different leadership frames. These are the structural frame, political frame, symbolic frame, and human resources frame. In this approach, it is indicated that leaders can use these four basic frames effectively either in the solution of problems or in making sense of the organisation. However, in the literature on leadership and management, studies that focus on individual and professional values are limited in number (Begley & Johansson, 2003). In the Turkish context, there are a number of studies that reveal teacher candidates' individual values, and the values that they want to see in organisations and students (Özdemir & Sezgin, 2011), their views on values (Altunay & Yalçınkaya, 2011; Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli & Çıkılı, 2008; Sarı, 2005) and the relationships between their individual values and attitudes towards the teaching profession (Bektaş & Nalçacı, 2012; Parlar & Cansoy, 2016). However, there seems to be a need for further studies that would reveal the relationships between teacher candidates' individual values, and their leadership orientations that are thought to be related to those values. Therefore, it is thought that such a study would contribute to the literature in the Turkish context. In addition, demonstrating to what extent individual values can explain leadership orientations

can contribute to the policies on emphasising the activities towards developing teacher candidates' individual values. Besides, putting forth different variables that explain leadership orientations can provide researchers various significant findings. Moreover, since teacher candidates of today are the educational administrators of tomorrow, examining the relationships between teacher candidates' leadership orientations and individual values can be seen as important. For this reason, in the scope of this study, the relationships between teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations, and the predictive level of individual values for leadership orientations were investigated.

Researchers have reported different pieces of proof which show that different types of leadership are related to individual values. In the literature, Stogdill (1974) found that leadership was not directly related to a certain value, and based on such reports, the number of studies on the importance of values increased in the field of administration (cited in Graber & Killpatrick, 2008). It was reported that the individual values of power, achievement and hedonism were related to destructive leadership (Illies & Reiter-Palmon, 2008), and the values of traditionalism, self-transcendence and self-enhancement had significant relationships with charismatic leadership (Sosik, 2005). It was also found that the values of openness to novelty, self-transcendence, and collective working were positively related to transformational leadership, but negatively related to self-enhancement (Groves & LaRocca, 2012), whereas the dimensions of power, achievement and benevolence were important variables in effective leadership (Agrawal & Krishnan, 2000). Accordingly, the following research questions were addressed in the present study:

1. What are the levels of teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations?
2. Are the relationships between teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations significant?
3. Do teacher candidates' individual values significantly predict their leadership orientations?

#### 4. Method

This study was designed in the correlational model to examine the relationships between teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations. The dependent variables of the study were the frames of the leadership orientations scale that are the structural frame, human resources frame, political frame and symbolic frame (Bolman & Deal, 1991). On the other hand, the independent variables were the dimensions of the portrait values scale including achievement, universalism, traditionalism, power, security, hedonism, conformity, self-direction, stimulation, and benevolence (Schwartz et al., 2001)

##### 4.1. Participants

The participants of the study were a total of 452 teacher candidates studying in the pedagogical formation program of Karabük University in the 2016-2017 academic year. The candidates' ages were 22.8 in average. Among them, 322 were female (71%), and 130 were male (29%). The distribution of the participants' majors is as follows: Archaeology 10 (2.2%), Physical Education 12 (2.7%), Geography 57 (12.6%), Child Development 63 (13.9%), Midwifery 26 (5.8%), Nursing 17 (3.8%), Theology 112 (24.8%), English 37 (8.2%), Mathematics 16 (3.5%), Music 9 (2%), Painting 10 (2.2%), Art History 21 (4.6%), Sports Administration 17 (3.8%), History 18 (4%), and Turkish Language and Literature 27 (6%).

##### 4.2. Data Gathering Tools

The information gathered with regard to the participants' demographic characteristics included gender, age, major and department. The *Leadership Orientations Scale* and *Portrait Values Scale* were employed to gather the research data.

###### 4.2.1. Leadership Orientations Scale (LOS)

This scale was developed by Bolman and Deal (1991) and adapted to Turkish by Dereli (2003). The scale aimed to determine school principals' leadership orientations. However, it was tested for validity and reliability with different groups of samples (Arslan & Uslu, 2014; Güngör, 1993). In the scale that consisted of 31 items and four frames, a five-point scale including ratings ranging from “(1) Never” to “(5) Always” was used. The frames were the structural frame, human resources frame, political frame and symbolic frame. Each frame contained eight items. The higher the scores in the frames are, the better the leadership characteristic is. All items contained positive statements. In Bolman (2010), the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were found to be .92 for the structural frame, .93 for the symbolic frame, .91 for the political frame, and .93 for the human resources frame. The structural frame highlights bureaucratic characteristics, hierarchy and responsibilities. The human resources frame features the needs and motivation. The political frame emphasises conflict resolution and mutual understanding. The symbolic frame points out organisational values and culture, and shared values (Dereli, 2003). In this study, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed to determine the validity of LOS. The fit indices were found not to be at the sufficient level, and thus, Items 7 and 8 from the Structural Frame, Items 10 and 12 from the Symbolic Frame, Item 22 from the Political Frame and Item 32 from the Human Resources

Frame were excluded as a result of the DFA. After the exclusion of these items, it was seen that the four-dimension structure showed acceptable fit to the data, ( $X^2 = 767.06$ ;  $p < .05$ ;  $sd = 286$ ;  $X^2/sd = 2.68$ ;  $RMSEA = .061$ ;  $CFI = .87$ ;  $GFI = .87$ ). Consequently, the structural and symbolic frames contained six items each, whereas the political frame had seven items and the human resources frame eight items. For this study, the factor loadings of the scale items ranged between .47 and .68. Reliability was re-examined for the study. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were calculated as .72 for the structural frame, .77 for the symbolic frame, .77 for the political frame, and .78 for the human resources frame. The reliability value for the whole scale was found to be .91. Evaluating the results of the analyses as a whole, it was concluded that the scale was a valid and reliable tool that can be used to gather data.

#### 4.2.2. Portrait Values Scale (PVS)

This scale was developed by Schwartz et al. (2001) and adapted to be used with university students by Demirutku and Sümer (2010). The scale reveals the relationships between individuals' values and behaviours. It has a structure that defines individuals' goals and desires, and measures different values indirectly. In the scale that consisted of 40 items and 10 dimensions, each item included two sentences. It examines the relationships between different values and the behaviours revealed by these values. Sample items are as follows: "Being rich is important for him. He wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.", "For him, it is important to step forward through achievement. He tries to be better than others". The scale was prepared by using a six-point scale with ratings from "(1) It doesn't describe me at all" to "(6) It describes me perfectly" with regard to the extent that the statements describe them. PVS includes the dimensions of power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, traditionalism, conformity, and security. In Demirutku and Sümer (2010), the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the reliability of the scale were reported to range between .58 and .84 in the first and second administrations at different times. In addition, it was stated that the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were at the acceptable level due to the low number of items (Demirutku & Sümer, 2010).

In order to test the validity of the structure of the scale used in the present study, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) were performed, and it was examined whether the fit indices were at the satisfactory level. Some of the items that had low factor loadings were excluded in accordance with the opinions of the experts. As a result of the CFA, Items, 11, 13, 15, 21, 24, 26, 27, 30, 35 and 40 were excluded from the analysis because their factor loadings and reliability coefficients were low. Consequently, the analysis included four items in the achievement and security dimensions each, six items in the universalism dimension, two items in the traditionalism, power, hedonism, conformity and stimulation dimensions each, and three items in the self-direction and benevolence dimensions. As a result, it was seen that the model consisting of 30 items and 10 dimensions showed acceptable fit to the data, ( $X^2 = 866.385$ ;  $p < .05$ ;  $sd = 360$ ;  $X^2/sd = 2.40$ ;  $RMSEA = .056$ ;  $CFI = .90$ ;  $GFI = .89$ ). For this study, the factor loadings of the items were found to range between .40 and .82. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficients calculated in the present study are as follows: .64 for achievement, .80 for universalism, .46 for traditionalism, .62 for power, .66 for security, .59 for hedonism, .59 for conformity, .63 for self-direction, and .50 for stimulation. The reliability coefficient of the whole scale was .92. Evaluating the results of the analyses as a whole, it was concluded that the scale was a valid and reliable tool that can be used to gather data.

#### 4.2.3. Data Analysis

The analysis of the data was conducted basically in two steps. In the first step, the data were examined for missing or incorrect values, outliers and multivariate. In the second step, the research questions were investigated. Missing values were assigned an average value. Besides, multicollinearity, variance inflation (VIF), and tolerance values were also examined. With respect to multicollinearity, near-zero tolerance and a VIF value above 3 were not encountered. Although there were four dimensions with a CI value higher than 30, it was concluded that there was no multicollinearity based on expert opinion and when all results were evaluated together. Tolerance value being lower than .20, VIF value being higher than 10, CI value being higher than 30, and the correlations between independent variables being .80 and above can be an indicator of multicollinearity (Büyüköztürk, 2010). In addition, it was seen that the correlations between the predictive variables ranged between .60 and .77, and there was no strong relationship between them. Multicollinearity can be the case if there are predictive variables with correlations ranging from .80 to .90 in-between (Field, 2005). Therefore, the results did not reveal multicollinearity here. Based on the Q-Q plot, it was assumed that the distribution of the data was normal.

As for the fit indices used while conducting confirmatory factor analysis, GFI is accepted as good fit if the coefficient obtained from AGFI is .85 (Anderson & Gerbing, 1984 & Cole, 1987) or .90 (Kline, 2005; Schumacker & Lomax, 1996) and above. Values obtained from RMSEA that are .10 and below are regarded as sufficient for fitness. The ratio of  $\chi^2/df$  being between 2-5 refers to good fit, whereas it being lower than 2 refers to perfect fit (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2001).

In order to answer the research questions in the study, the arithmetic means of the scores in the

dimensions of Portrait Values Scale and those of Leadership Orientations Scale were calculated. The analyses were conducted based on these mean values. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) was used to determine the relationships between the variables. In order to identify the predictive power of individual values over leadership orientations, Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was performed. In the analyses, the leadership orientations of structural, symbolic, political and human resources frames were taken as the dependent variables. On the other hand, the portrait values of *universalism*, *security*, *conformity*, *benevolence*, *self-direction*, *stimulation*, *traditionalism*, *hedonism*, *achievement* and *power* were taken as the independent variables. In the interpretation of the regression analyses, standardised Beta ( $\beta$ ) coefficients, and t-test results for their significance were considered. The significance level was set at .05.

## 5. Findings

In this section, mean and standard deviation values for the teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations, and the results of the correlation and regression analyses are presented.

### 5.1. Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations Between Variables

Means, standard deviations and the correlations between the variables are given in Table 1

**Table 1.** Correlation matrix for individual values and leadership orientations

Variables	$\bar{X}$	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
<b>Leadership</b>																
1.Structural	3.8	.56	1	.64*	.68*	.64*	.35*	.40*	.26*	.27*	.33*	.30*	.38*	.41*	.31*	.41*
2.Symbolic	3.6	.64		1	.77*	.60*	.38*	.30*	.21*	.29*	.25*	.28*	.31*	.39*	.33*	.35*
3.Political	3.6	.60			1	.64*	.35*	.34*	.22*	.32*	.28*	.29*	.30*	.39*	.27*	.39*
4.Human resources	4.1	.53				1	.20*	.54*	.34*	.17*	.42*	.32*	.45*	.48*	.36*	.52*
<b>Ends values</b>																
5.Achievement	4.5	.87					1	.32*	.24*	.45*	.31*	.38*	.30*	.39*	.39*	.34*
6.Universalism	5.2	.69						1	.55*	.18*	.68*	.52*	.67*	.65*	.57*	.73*
7.Traditionalism	5.0	.94							1	.16*	.59*	.34*	.61*	.40*	.36*	.54*
8.Power	4.4	1.0								1	.20*	.30*	.15*	.26*	.30*	.19*
9.Security	5.2	.68									1	.43*	.60*	.58*	.48*	.63*
10.Hedonism	4.9	.93										1	.50*	.56*	.53*	.50*
11.Conformity	5.2	.90											1	.55*	.45*	.65*
12.Self-direction	5.1	.74												1	.50*	.60*
13.Stimulation	5.0	.85													1	.48*
14.Benevolence	5.1	.78														1

\*\*  $p < .05$

As is seen in Table 1, the mean scores of the teacher candidates regarding the individual values were  $\bar{X} = 4.54$  for achievement,  $\bar{X} = 5.24$  for universalism,  $\bar{X} = 5.03$  for traditionalism,  $\bar{X} = 4.40$  for power,  $\bar{X} = 5.22$  for security,  $\bar{X} = 4.96$  for hedonism,  $\bar{X} = 5.22$  for conformity,  $\bar{X} = 5.10$  for self-direction,  $\bar{X} = 5.07$  for stimulation, and  $\bar{X} = 5.19$  for benevolence. The highest mean score of the teacher candidates was in the universalism dimension, and the lowest in the power dimension.

As for leadership orientations, the teacher candidates' mean scores were  $\bar{X} = 3.88$  for the structural frame,  $\bar{X} = 3.68$  for the symbolic frame,  $\bar{X} = 3.62$  for the political frame, and  $\bar{X} = 4.11$  for the human resources frame. The highest mean score of the teacher candidates was in the human resources frame, and the lowest in the political frame.

As can be seen in Table 1, there were positive and significant relationships between the teacher candidates' scores in the structural frame, and those in the achievement dimension ( $r = .35, p < .05$ ), in the universalism dimension ( $r = .40, p < .05$ ), in the traditionalism dimension ( $r = .26, p < .05$ ), in the power dimension ( $r = .27, p < .05$ ), in the security dimension ( $r = .33, p < .05$ ), in the hedonism dimension ( $r = .30, p < .05$ ), in the conformity dimension ( $r = .38, p < .05$ ), in the self-direction dimension ( $r = .41, p < .05$ ), in the stimulation dimension ( $r = .31, p < .05$ ), and in the benevolence dimension ( $r = .41, p < .05$ ).

There were also positive and significant relationships between their scores in the symbolic frame, and those in the achievement dimension ( $r = .38, p < .05$ ), in the universalism dimension ( $r = .30, p < .05$ ), in the traditionalism dimension ( $r = .21, p < .05$ ), in the power dimension ( $r = .29, p < .05$ ), in the security dimension

( $r = .25, p < .05$ ), in the hedonism dimension ( $r = .28, p < .05$ ), in the conformity dimension ( $r = .31, p < .05$ ), in the self-direction dimension ( $r = .39, p < .05$ ), in the stimulation dimension ( $r = .33, p < .05$ ), and in the benevolence dimension ( $r = .35, p < .05$ ).

There were also positive and significant relationships between the their scores in the political frame, and those in the achievement dimension ( $r = .35, p < .05$ ), in the universalism dimension ( $r = .34, p < .05$ ), in the traditionalism dimension ( $r = .22, p < .05$ ), in the power dimension ( $r = .32, p < .05$ ), in the security dimension ( $r = .28, p < .05$ ), in the hedonism dimension ( $r = .29, p < .05$ ), in the conformity dimension ( $r = .30, p < .05$ ), in the self-direction dimension ( $r = .39, p < .05$ ), in the stimulation dimension ( $r = .27, p < .05$ ), and in the benevolence dimension ( $r = .39, p < .05$ ).

There were also positive and significant relationships between the their scores in the human resources frame, and those in the achievement dimension ( $r = .20, p < .05$ ), in the universalism dimension ( $r = .54, p < .05$ ), in the traditionalism dimension ( $r = .34, p < .05$ ), in the power dimension ( $r = .17, p < .05$ ), in the security dimension ( $r = .42, p < .05$ ), in the hedonism dimension ( $r = .32, p < .05$ ), in the conformity dimension ( $r = .45, p < .05$ ), in the self-direction dimension ( $r = .48, p < .05$ ), in the stimulation dimension ( $r = .36, p < .05$ ), and in the benevolence dimension ( $r = .52, p < .05$ ). It can be seen that the frames of leadership orientations were positively and significantly related to the dimensions regarding individual values at different levels.

### 5.2. Prediction of Leadership Orientations

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis for the prediction of leadership orientations by individual values are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Regression analysis for the prediction of leadership orientations

Variables (Portrait values)	Structural frame <sup>a</sup>			Symbolic frame <sup>b</sup>			Political frame <sup>c</sup>			Human resources frame <sup>d</sup>		
	$\beta$	t	p	$\beta$	t	p	$\beta$	t	p	$\beta$	t	p
Constant		7,64	0,00		5,63	0,00		5,78	0,00		8,79	0,00
Achievement	0,16	3,14	0,00	0,20	3,98	0,00	0,14	2,84	0,00	-0,06	-1,37	0,17
Universalism	0,10	1,32	0,19	-0,06	-0,80	0,42	0,04	0,59	0,56	0,24	3,39	0,00
Traditionalism	-0,05	-0,84	0,40	-0,01	-0,26	0,79	-0,02	-0,42	0,68	-0,02	-0,38	0,70
Power	0,12	2,55	0,01	0,12	2,53	0,01	0,19	4,01	0,00	0,07	1,54	0,12
Security	-0,01	-0,23	0,82	-0,09	-1,48	0,14	-0,04	-0,68	0,50	0,00	-0,02	0,99
Hedonism	-0,04	-0,72	0,47	-0,04	-0,80	0,43	-0,02	-0,32	0,75	-0,06	-1,10	0,27
Conformity	0,13	2,00	0,04	0,10	1,59	0,11	0,02	0,34	0,73	0,08	1,27	0,20
Self-direction	0,15	2,52	0,01	0,21	3,41	0,00	0,18	2,94	0,00	0,18	3,18	0,00
Stimulation	-0,01	-0,09	0,93	0,10	1,79	0,07	-0,03	-0,53	0,59	0,04	0,80	0,42
Benevolence	0,15	2,28	0,02	0,15	2,30	0,02	0,21	3,26	0,00	0,22	3,54	0,00
	<sup>a</sup> $R = .52, R^2 = .27,$ $F = 16.48, p < .05$			<sup>b</sup> $R = .50, R^2 = .25,$ $F = 15.12, p < .05$			<sup>c</sup> $R = .51, R^2 = .26,$ $F = 15.50, p < .05$			<sup>d</sup> $R = .59, R^2 = .35,$ $F = 24.09, p < .05$		

As is seen in Table 2, the teacher candidates' individual values together showed a significant relationship with the leadership orientation of structural frame, ( $R = .52, p < .05$ ) These predictive variables explained 27% of the variance in the structural frame. The individual values of achievement, power, conformity, self-direction and benevolence were significant predictors of this leadership orientation. According to the results of standardised regression, the relative order of importance for individual values over the structural frame was achievement ( $\beta=.16, p < .05$ ), self-direction ( $\beta=.15, p < .05$ ), benevolence ( $\beta=.15, p < .05$ ), conformity ( $\beta=.13, p < .05$ ), and power ( $\beta=.12, p < .05$ ).

As is also seen in Table 2, the teacher candidates' individual values together showed a significant relationship with the leadership orientation of symbolic frame, ( $R = .50, p < .05$ ). These predictive variables explained 25% of the variance in the symbolic frame. The individual values of achievement, power, self-direction and benevolence were significant predictors of this frame. According to the results of standardised regression, the relative order of importance for individual values over the symbolic frame was self-direction ( $\beta=.21, p < .05$ ), achievement ( $\beta=.20, p < .05$ ), benevolence ( $\beta=.15, p < .05$ ), conformity ( $\beta=.13, p < .05$ ), and power ( $\beta=.12, p < .05$ ).

As is also seen in Table 2, the teacher candidates' individual values together showed a significant relationship with the leadership orientation of political frame, ( $R = .51, p < .05$ ). These predictive variables explained 26% of the variance in the political frame. The individual values of achievement, power, self-direction and benevolence were significant predictors of the political frame. The results of standardised regression revealed that the relative order of importance for individual values over the political frame was benevolence ( $\beta=.21, p < .05$ ), power ( $\beta=.19, p < .05$ ), self-direction ( $\beta=.18, p < .05$ ), and achievement ( $\beta=.14, p < .05$ ).

The teacher candidates' individual values together showed a significant relationship with the leadership orientation of human resources, ( $R = .59, p < .05$ ). These predictive variables explained 35% of the variance in the human resources frame. The individual values of universalism, self-direction and benevolence were significant predictors of the human resources frame. The results of standardised regression showed that the relative order of importance for individual values over the human resources frame was universalism ( $\beta=.24, p < .05$ ), self-direction ( $\beta=.24, p < .05$ ), and benevolence ( $\beta=.24, p < .05$ ).

05), benevolence ( $\beta=.22, p < .05$ ), and self-direction ( $\beta=.18, p < .05$ ).

## 6. Discussion and Conclusion

In the present study, the relationships between teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations were examined. According to the results, there were significant relationships between the teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations, and individual values were a significant predictor of leadership orientations. In other words, individual values were proven to be an important variable explaining leadership orientations.

In this study, the teacher candidates' individual values were examined. Their preferences of values were universalism, security, conformity and benevolence, self-direction, stimulation, traditionalism, hedonism, achievement and power in order of importance, respectively. At the same time, it was observed that the teacher candidates' values of universalism, security, conformity and benevolence and self-direction were at similar levels. In the literature, there are studies that report findings that overlap with those of the present study (Uyguç, 2003; Dündar, 2013). Similar findings exist with respect to the importance attached to universalism (Altunay & Yalçınkaya, 2011; Uyguç, 2003; Alimcan & Şam, 2016) and power (Alimcan & Şam, 2016; Dündar, 2013). According to Schwartz (1992), the values of universalism, security, conformity and benevolence, self-direction, stimulation, traditionalism, hedonism, achievement and power are comparable to each other based on similar or the same motivational needs. Conformity-security, self-direction-universalism, and benevolence-conformity are among the comparable groups of values. In this study, the teacher candidates' getting scores close to each other with respect to the groups of universalism, security, conformity and benevolence, self-direction can be regarded as a positive result. This is because the teacher candidates' perceptions of these values being at a high level may show that they care about the welfare of humanity, efforts for justice and conformity in all areas. Besides, their perceptions of achievement and power at a low level may show that they care more about working for the benefit of people, rather than for superiority over them. Teaching is a profession that can only be practised with the love of this profession, in which the feeling of serving people is experienced intensely, and that is towards providing material and spiritual well-being to individuals. Furthermore, there were also factors affecting the teacher candidates' preferences of values. Values develop in cultural environments, are formed based on what is cared about, and what is not, in that culture, and are learned as of childhood (Şişman, 1994). Values emerge culturally and reveal a preference (Gudmundsdottir, 1991), and constitute the basic characteristics of culture (Hofstede, 1980). In a study, on South Africans, Indians and Europeans, Furnham (1984), found that the importance attached to values changed based on historical, political and socio-cultural differences. Europeans highlighted friendship and love, whereas South Africans featured equality and peace. Accordingly, it can be argued that due to their preferences of the values of universalism, conformity and benevolence at a high level, they would have a positive influence on the working environments at schools when they start the profession, and would also support the activities towards cooperation and interaction with colleagues, taking care of students, taking part in collaborative practices at school and increasing the quality of education.

In this study, the teacher candidates' individual values were also examined. The highest level of leadership orientation that the teacher candidates had was in the human resources frame, which was followed by structural, symbolic and political frames. With regard to this finding, there are studies that report findings which are similar (Arslan & Uslu, 2014), and support it indirectly (Özkan, Akın & Durna, 2012; Dereli, 2003; Poniatowski, 2006; Tanrıöğen, Baştürk & Başer, 2014). The findings also showed that the teacher candidates internalised the human resources frame, which emphasise characteristics that are supportive and participative, more compared to other frames. This can be regarded as a positive finding because teachers who prefer the human resources frame are expected to support students, give close attention to them, establish trust, be sensitive to the problems at school, be helpful, show respect to others' views and appreciate students. It can be stated that the quality of education would increase thanks to teachers who have these characteristics. Arslan and Uslu (2014) attribute a similar finding to the human relationships being intensive, and not many problems being experienced among people in the teacher candidates' learning environments. Another finding was that the political frame was experienced by the teacher candidates at a low level. This frame refers to power and skills. Teacher candidates are expected to have higher perceptions of characteristics such as effective use of resources, conflict resolution, and getting others' support. Therefore, it can be argued that there is a need for practices towards enhancing the level of political frame in teacher candidates to desired levels. In addition, the structural and symbolic frames were found to be at levels close to each other. The structural frame refers to being analytical and organising, whereas the symbolic frame emphasises inspiring and charismatic features. It can be argued that analytical thinking, certain technical skills, making right decisions and reasoning should be developed in teacher candidates. This is because teaching is a profession in which well-planning and quick decision making are frequently used. At the same time, teachers are expected to have a vision and use their personal charisma. In this respect, practices can be implemented to move the structural and symbolic frames to higher levels in teachers. Considering all these results as a whole, Bolman and Deal (2013) state that leaders should have the four frames



in defining and solving the problems encountered at schools. In this way, failures can be prevented. In order to train teachers who can be leaders in their schools and classrooms, it can be stated that enhancing teacher candidates' leadership orientations would contribute to increasing their effectiveness.

In the study, the relationships between teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations were investigated. Positive and significant relationships were revealed between all dimensions of individual values and those of leadership orientations. There were positive and significant relationships between the individual values of achievement, universalism, traditionalism, power, security, hedonism, conformity, self-direction, stimulation and benevolence, and the leadership orientations of structural, symbolic, political and human resources frames. In other words, an increase in one of the variables led to an increase in the other variable, or the vice versa, a decrease in a variable led to a decrease in the other variable. In this regard, teacher candidates' individual values seem to be an important variable in enhancing their leadership orientations. In the literature, there are similar results showing that individual values are related to leadership. Illies and Reiter-Palmon (2008) reported that power, achievement and hedonism were effective in leadership, whereas Sosik (2005) found that traditionalism, cooperative working, self-transcendence and self-enhancement were positively related to charismatic leadership. Groves and LaRocca (2012) revealed that the values of self-enhancement, openness to novelty, self-transcendence and collective working were positively related to transformational leadership. Agrawal and Krishnan (2000) stated that the values of power, achievement and benevolence were significant variables in effective leadership. Individual values are regarded as important in the literature on leadership (Burns, 1978; Michie & Gooty, 2005; Sosik, 2005; Grojean, Resick, Dickson & Smith, 2007). These values are deemed as vital in the selection of leaders and evaluating differences (Byrne & Bradley, 2007). Besides, they are important motivational tools for leadership (Shamir, 1990). Consequently, individual values can be said to be significant variables in leadership orientations, and thus in making sense of the problems encountered within the organisation and ensuring the solutions. Considering that schools face different problems today, it can be inferred that leadership orientations, and thus individual values as a related variable, are influential in the solution of these problems.

In the study, the prediction level of the teacher candidates' individual values for their leadership orientations were investigated. Two of the remaining individual values, *self-direction* and *benevolence*, were found to be significant and common predictors of all frames of leadership orientations. In addition, the individual values of *power* and *achievement* were found to be predictors of structural, symbolic and political frames. According to these findings, the teacher candidates whose perceptions towards self-direction and benevolence were at a sufficient level can be expected to show more competent leadership orientations. Besides, it can be stated that the teacher candidates' use of structural, symbolic and political frames would increase in accordance with their perceptions of power and achievement. Values being a determinant in individuals' leadership orientations is an expected result. Similarly, there are results reported in the literature showing that individual values lead to different leadership styles (Byrne & Bradley, 2007; Groves & LaRocca, 2012; Agrawal & Krishnan, 2000; Sosik, 2005; Burns, 1978). Self-direction emphasises individuals' independent thinking and acting, and freely choosing their goals. On the other hand, benevolence highlights individuals' wishing for the welfare of those in their environment, and close friendship. It can be stated that activities for developing teacher candidates' leadership orientations and their values of self-direction and benevolence would positively affect their leadership orientations. Power emphasises social status, guidance, people and resources, whereas achievement features individual success, competence and being ambitious. Moreover, the values of power and achievement are expected to have a positive influence on leadership orientations. Power is seen as among the characteristics that have positive or destructive effect on leadership (Illies & Reiter-Palmon, 2008). With regard to the relationship between power and leadership, it is indicated that the leader is recognised and liked, or could punish his/her followers, through power (Northouse, 2007). Therefore, it can be argued that using power for good intentions can yield positive results in leadership orientations. Individual values' prediction of leadership orientations can be regarded as significant because making use of values is important in leadership. In leadership, creating effect can be possible through values (Baloğlu, 2012). Individual values determining where leaders stand (Kouzes & Posner, 2003) can be said to be influential on leadership orientations. The finding that individual values predict leadership orientations in this study can confirm the idea that certain core values should be possessed in leadership (O'Toole, 1996; Greenleaf, 1995; Bennis, 2009). As a result, it can be concluded that the teacher candidates' individual values being at a sufficient level can contribute to their recognition and solution of organisational problems in leadership by providing them multiple frames.

The results of the study can be summarised as follows: (i) The teacher candidates' preferences of values were universalism, security, conformity and benevolence, self-direction, stimulation, traditionalism, hedonism, achievement and power in order of importance, respectively. (ii) In leadership orientations, the teacher candidates had the highest level of perception in the human resources frame, which was followed by the structural, symbolic and political frames, respectively. (iii) Positive and significant relationships were revealed between all dimensions of individual values and those of leadership orientations. (iv) The individual values of

self-direction and benevolence were found to be significant and common predictors of all frames of leadership orientations. Moreover, individual values together significantly predicted different frames of leadership orientations. Based on the results of the study, classes related to values education can be provided to teacher candidates to improve the individual values they perceive at a low level, and in parallel to values education, instructional programs can be implemented. Therefore, instruction through \*, explaining values, values analysis and moral reasoning approaches, which are commonly mentioned in the literature, can be used together or individually (Yazıcı, 2006). Diagnostic instruments can be used for teacher candidates' awareness of individual values, and individual guidance services can be provided based on needs. At the same time, structured programs can be prepared towards developing individual values. On the other hand, a set of planning can be made to improve teacher candidates' leadership orientations that are at a low or sufficient level to higher levels. Leadership courses towards developing leadership orientations can be taught in teacher training programs, and practices in parallel to courses on developing leadership can be implemented. Such practices can be towards social responsibility projects in which teacher candidates participate, and improving their problem solving skills and interpersonal relations. In this way, the development of teacher candidates' different leadership orientations can be ensured. Experiential learning can be actively used in developing leadership orientations. Short- and long-term leadership training programs can be organised. Since the results showed that individual values was an important variable in explaining leadership orientations, policies can be developed to select teachers who are suitable to the profession in terms of individual values, and improve the values of those who currently practice the profession. In this respect, values, attitudes and behavioural characteristics should be considered in the selection of teacher candidates in addition to their cognitive skills. Supporting the results revealed in this study with qualitative methods such as interview, observation and action research can be useful. In this way, in-depth data can be gathered in relation to the research topic. In further studies, the causal relationships between variables affecting leadership orientations can be examined through structural equation. Additionally, when focusing on leadership orientations in the context of administrators, the relationships of leadership orientation with different variables can be investigated. Besides, the relationships between teachers' individual values and different leadership styles can be studied in a school context.

## References

- Agrawal, T., & Krishnan, V. R. (2000). Relationship between leadership styles and value systems. *Management and Labour Studies*, 25(2), 136-143. doi:10.1177/0258042X0002500208
- Aktay, A. & Ekşi, H. (2009). Yönetici ve öğretmenlerin değer tercihleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki [*The relationship between administrators' and teachers' preferences of values and organisational citizenship behaviours*]. *İş Ahlakı Dergisi [Turkish Journal of Business Ethics]*, 2 (1), 19-65.
- Altunay, E., & Yalçınkaya, M. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının bilgi toplumunda değerlere ilişkin görüşlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [*Examining teacher candidates' views on values in the information society in terms of certain variables*]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration: Theory and Practice]*, 17(1), 5-28.
- Alimcan, D., & Şam, E.A. (2016). Eğitim fakültesi 1. ve 4. sınıfta öğrenim gören öğretmen adaylarının portre değerler anketine göre değerlere ilişkin yönelimleri (Amasya ili örneği) [*First and fourth year university students' orientations of values based on the portrait values scale: Case of Amasya Province*], In the proceedings of International Symposium on Social Studies Education (pp.196-207). Pamukkale University.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. (1984). The effect of sampling error on convergence, improper solutions, and goodness-of-fit indices for maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 49, 155-173. 10.1007/BF02294170
- Arslan, H., & Uslu, B. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının liderlik yönelimlerinin incelenmesi [*Examining teacher candidates' leadership orientations*]. *e-International Journal of Educational Research*, 5(1), 42-60. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.19160/e-ijer.69648
- Baloğlu, N. (2012). Değerler temelli liderlik ile dağıtımçı liderlik arasındaki ilişkiler: Okul müdürünün davranışını değerlendirmeye dönük nedensel bir araştırma, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri [Theory and Practice in Educational Sciences]*, 12(2), 1367-1378.
- Begley, P. T., & Johansson, O. (2003). The ethical dimensions of school leadership. In , P. T., Begley & O. Johansson (Eds.), *New expectations for democratic school leadership in a global community* (pp.XV-XX). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bektaş, F. & Nalçacı, A.(2012). Bireysel değerler ve öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutum arasındaki ilişki [*The relationship between individual values and attitudes towards the teaching profession*]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri [Theory and Practice in Educational Sciences]*, 12(2), 1244-1248.
- Bennis, W. (2009). *On becoming a leader*. NY: Perseus books group.

- Bolman, L. G. (2010). *Research using leadership orientations survey instrument*. [Online]: <http://www.leebolman.com/orientations.htm> (Access date: 22.10.2016).
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013). *Organizasyonları yeniden yapılandırmak [Re-structuring organisations]* (4<sup>th</sup> Edition). (Translated by Ahmet Aypay & Abdurrahman Tanrıoğen). Ankara: Seçkin.
- Bolman, L. G., ve Deal, T. G. (1991). *Reframing organizations. Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bruno, L. F., & Lay, E. G. (2008). Personal values and leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(6), 678-683.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1997). *Eğitim Yönetiminde Teori ve Uygulama [Theory and Practice in Educational Administration]*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı [Handbook of data analysis for social sciences]*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Byrne, G. J., & Bradley, F. (2007). Culture's influence on leadership efficiency: How personal and national cultures affect leadership style. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(2), 168-175. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.10.015
- Can, N. (2014). *Öğretmen liderliği [Teacher leadership]* (4<sup>th</sup> Edition). Ankara: Pegem Yayınları
- Cartwright, T. (2007). *Setting Priorities: Personal Values, Organizational Results*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Cole, D. A. (1987). Utility of confirmatory factor analysis in test validation research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 1019-1031. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.55.4.584
- Demirutku, K. & Sümer, N. (2010). Temel değerlerin ölçümü: Portre değerler anketinin Türkçe Uyarlaması [Measurement of ends values: Turkish adaptation of the Portrait Values Scale]. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 13(25), 17-25.
- Dereli, M. (2003). *A survey research of leadership styles of elementary school principles*. Unpublished MA thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Dilmaç, B., Bozgeyikli, H., & Çıkılı, Y. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının değer algılarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Examining teacher candidates' perceptions of values in terms of different variables]. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi [Journal of Values Education]*, 6 (16), 69-91.
- Dündar, H. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının sahip olduğu değerler ile demokratik tutumları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between teacher candidates' values and democratic attitudes]. *International Journal of Social Science*, 6(2), 367-381.
- Egri, C. P., & Herman, S. (2000). Leadership in the North American environmental sector: Values, leadership styles, and contexts of environmental leaders and their organizations. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 571-604. doi:10.2307/1556356
- Ehrhart, M. G., & Klein, K. J. (2001). Predicting followers' preferences for charismatic leadership: The influence of follower values and personality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12(2), 153-179. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00074-1
- England, G. W., & Lee, R. (1974). The relationship between managerial values and managerial success in the United States, Japan, India, and Australia. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(4), 411-419.
- Feather, N. T. (1975). *Values in education and society*, New York: Free Pres.
- Fichter, J. (1990). *Sosyoloji Nedir? [What is sociology?]* (Translated by N. Çelebi). Konya: Selçuk University, Faculty of Science and Literature.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (2nd ed.)*. London: Sage.
- Furnham, A. (1984). Value systems and anomie in three cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*, 19(1-4), 565-579. doi:10.1080/00207598408247546
- Gibb, K. (2010). Personal values. *Relational Child and Youth Care Practice*, 23(3), 40.
- Graber, D. R., & Kilpatrick, A. O. (2008). Establishing values-based leadership and value systems in healthcare organizations. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, 31(2), 179-197.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1995). Servant leadership. In Wren, J. T. (Ed.), *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (1st ed., pp. 18-23). New York: The Free Press.
- Grojean, M. W., Resick, C. J., Dickson, M. W., & Smith, D. B. (2004). Leaders, values, and organizational climate: Examining leadership strategies for establishing an organizational climate regarding ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 55(3), 223-241. doi:10.1007/s10551-004-1275-5
- Groves, K. S., & LaRocca, M. A. (2012). Does transformational leadership facilitate follower beliefs in corporate social responsibility? A field study of leader personal values and follower outcomes. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 19(2), 215-229.
- Gudmundsdottir, S. (1991). Values in pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41 (3), 44-

- 52.
- Güngör, E. (1993). *Değerler psikolojisi [Values psychology]*. Amsterdam: Foundation of Turkish Academics Union in the Netherlands.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultural consequences: International differences in work related values*. London: Sage.
- Homer, P. M., & Kahle, L. R. (1988). A structural equation test of the value-attitude behavior hierarchy. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 54, 638-646.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration]*. (Translated by S. Turan). Ankara: Nobel
- Illies, J. J., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2008). Responding destructively in leadership situations: The role of personal values and problem construction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(1), 251-272. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9574-2
- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (2001). *LISREL 8.51*. Mooresville: Scientific Software.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principle and practice of structural equation modelling*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. & Kuşdil, M. E. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerinin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz değer kuramı [*Turkish teachers' value orientations and Schwartz's values theory*]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi [Turkish Journal of Psychology]*, 15(45), 59-76.
- Kılıç, M. (2011). Değerler filozofisi ve hukuksal değerler [*Values philosophy and legal values*]. *Eğitime Bakış [A Glance to Education]*, 7(19), 51-54.
- Komives, S. Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. (2007). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference* (2nd. Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J., Posner, B. (2003). *Credibility*. California: Jossey - Bass.
- Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2001). Leadership, values, and subordinate self-concepts. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12(2), 133-152. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00072-8
- Mashlah, S. (2015). *The role of people's personal values in the mechanism of leadership*. Conference Paper. Lancaster Leadership centre; the Personal values and Leadership challenges Symposium.
- McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 836-844.
- Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*, 24, 351-389.
- Michie, S., & Gooty, J. (2005). Values, Emotions, and Authenticity: Will the Real Leader Please Stand Up?, *Leadership Quarterly* 16, 441-457.
- Noorhani, İ. (2015). *Personal Values And Leadership Style Orientation Among Owners And Managers Of Smes In Kedah And Penang*. Unpublished MA thesis, Universiti Utara Malaysia
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice* (4th ed.). London: Sage Publication.
- O'Toole, J. (1996). *Leading change: the argument for values-based leadership*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Özdemir, S., & Sezgin, F. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının bireysel ve örgütsel değerler ile öğrencilerde görmek istedikleri değerlere ilişkin önem sırası algıları [*Prospective Teachers' Perceptions of Importance Rankings on Personal, Organizational and Student Preferred Values*]. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi [Usak University Journal of Social Sciences]*, 4 (2), 1-21.
- Özkan, N. Ö., Akın, S. & Durna, Z. (2012). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin liderlik yönelimleri ve motivasyon düzeylerinin incelenmesi [*Nursing students' leadership orientations and motivational levels*]. *Hemşirelikte Eğitim ve Araştırma Dergisi [Journal of Nursing Education and Research]*, 12(1), 51-61.
- Papagiannakis, G., & Lioukas, S. (2012). Values, attitudes and perceptions of managers as predictors of corporate environmental responsiveness. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 100, 41-51. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.01.023
- Parlar H., & Cansoy R. (2016). Aday öğretmenlerin kişisel değerleri ve öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [*Examining the relationship between teacher candidates' individual values and their attitudes towards the teaching profession*]. 25. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi [25<sup>th</sup> National Congress on Educational Sciences], 1(1), 212-214.
- Poniatowski, D. (2006). *The relationship of student achievement to principals' self-reported use of the four frame theory* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Central Florida, College of Education, Florida.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: The Free Press.
- Russell, R. F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(2), 76-84. doi:10.1108/01437730110382631
- Sağnak, M. (2004). Kişi-örgüt değer uyumunu ölçme çalışmaları ve kullanılan yöntemlerin karşılaştırılması [*Studies of measuring the person-organisation value congruence and a comparison of methods used*]. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi [Journal of Values Education]*, 2(5), 101-124.

- Sarı, E. (2005). Öğretmen Adaylarının Değer Tercihleri: Giresun Eğitim Fakültesi Örneği [*Teacher Candidates' Preferences of Values: Case of Giresun Faculty of Education*]. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 3 (10), 73-88.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values; theoretical advances and tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experiment Social Psychology*, 25, (1), 65.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1996). Value priorities and behaviour: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson & M. P. Zanna, (Eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario symposium*, Vol. 8 (1-24). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S. A. M., & Harris, M. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 32, 519- 542.
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (1996). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modelling*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shamir, B. (1990). Calculations, values and identities: The sources of collectivistic work motivation. *Human Relations*, 43, 313–333.
- Sosik, J. J. (2005). The role of personal values in the charismatic leadership of corporate managers: A model and preliminary field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(2), 221-244. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.01.002
- Spranger, E. (1928). *Types of men*. New York: Stechert-Hafner.
- Şişman, M. (1994). *Örgüt kültürü [Organisational culture]*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Tanrıöğen, Z. M., Baştürk, R., & Başer, M. U. (2014). Bolman ve Deal'ın dört çerçeve kuramı: Müdürlerin liderlik tarzları ve örgüt kültürü [*Bolman and Deal's four-frame theory: Administrators' leadership styles and organisational culture*]. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi [Pamukkale University Journal of Education Faculty]*, 36 (2), 191-202.
- Tanrıöğen, Z. M. (2013). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin liderlik tarzlarının örgüt kültürü ile ilişkisi. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Pamukkale University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Denizli.
- Uyguç, N. (2003). Cinsiyet, bireysel değerler ve meslek seçimi [*Gender, individual values and choice of profession*]. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi [Dokuz Eylul University Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences]*. 18 (1), 93-103.
- Yazıcı, K. (2006). Değerler eğitimi'ne genel bir bakış [*A general outlook to values education*]. *Tübar [Journal of Turkology Studies]*, 12, 500-521.