ADMINISTRATORS' AND TEACHERS' VIEWS OF INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES IN TURKISH PRIMARY SCHOOLS

KÜRŞAD YILMAZ

ALI BALCI

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the views of primary school administrators and teachers on individual and organizational values in primary schools in Turkey. Survey data were gathered using the "Value Scale" wherein primary school administrators and teachers were asked to rank order individual and organizational values. Findings suggested similarities between the views of primary school administrators and teachers both on individual and organizational values. Both the primary school administrators and teachers ranked highest "fairness" as an individual value and "respect for people" as an organizational value. For administrators, money was the lowest ranked individual item and "religious devotion" was the lowest organizational value, whereas "religious devotion" both as an individual and organizational value was ranked the lowest in the list by teachers.

INTRODUCTION

In the early 1960s, Greenfield (1961) noted concern with the status of values in educational administration. Yet, the majority of theories in educational administration and leadership have ignored the importance of values in schools. More recently, studies have increasingly pointed out the importance of values in school administration (Bates, 2001) and the particularly crucial role values play in educational organizations (Strike, 1993).

Although previous studies emphasized administrators' instrumental activity and technical satisfaction with activities, researchers have suggested that values motivate school administrators and such cultural foundations were vital (Bates, 2001). These critiques question the basic assumptions of a positivist paradigm in the social sciences and educational administration (English, 1992, 1997, 2003; Foster, 1986). A common concern of critics is that studies in educational administration increasingly emphasize that organizations are inseparable from social culture. Such emphasis is prevalent in the studies on organizational culture (Bates, 1992; Chikudate, 1991; Hofstede, 1991, 1993, 1998; Schein, 1991, 1993, 1996) and such studies argue that organizations are not independent of values.

Values are perceived as instrumental in creating humane workplaces. There is a relationship between effective management, culture, and values (Bryying & Trollestad, 2000). As Hofstede (1980) stated, without understanding the culture of followers, communicating leadership and administrative skills would not be effective.

VALUES AND THEIR IMPORTANCE

Several studies have developed a greater understanding of values and their role in social dynamics. Sharp (1928) conducted one of the earliest recorded studies on values (Aydın, 2003). Sharp (1928, as cited in Aydin, 2003) considered values artifacts of emotion and attitudes that might socially be observed everywhere. Rokeach (1968, 1973, 1979), an American social psychologist, was the first author to consider values in a social dimension and relate them to attitudes and behavior in that framework. Rokeach (1968, 1973, 1979) illustrated that every value was based on a single belief and every attitude on a group of beliefs. Allport also conducted research on values (Allport 1968; Allport & Vernon, 1931; Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1960). According to Allport (1968), values are the meanings perceived in relation to ego. Schwartz (1994) conducted studies to determine the content of values and suggested value categories (internal and external values) that since have been used in experimental studies.

In this sense, values constitute an indispensable part of human life as social preferences of individuals relate to value systems that are acquired over time (Goodman, 1967). Values influence attitudes, principles and the value of things grown out of personality. People integrate their values with individual points of view to determine their priorities (Hostetter, 2003). Values help individuals in creating thoughts, professional opinions, and support for their attitudes and dispositions (Everard, 1995).

Thus, being aware of people's value systems not only gives information about them, but also provides some information on their social culture (national culture) and cultural differences.

Values exist not only at an individual level but also at an organizational level, and they are a crucial part of organizational existence. Individual values influence individual and organizational behavior. Several researchers have pointed out to this causal relationship (Kotey & Meredith, 1997; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998; Posner & Munson, 1979; Sikula, 1971). In these studies, individual values as an independent variable influenced individual and organizational behavior.

Values are crucial in understanding individual and organizational behavior. Value differences are largely the cause of many conflicts (Lamberton & Minor, 1995). They are also functional in that they bind components of social systems (Katz & Kahn, 1966).

VALUES IN SCHOOLS AND EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Values, as an element of culture, are at the core of situations concerning people at an individual level or in social and organizational life. Values are like motors that orient the lives of individuals. Values are at the core of the education as well (Everard, 1995). Values have prominence in school life, as in other organizational lives. At the same time, values have an important place in the educational process (Şişman & Turan, 2004). In this sense, educational institutions have been seen as the most effective tools to maintain or change the values system of individuals or the society. The values in a school are closely relevant to many subjects like decision-making, recruitment, reward and punishment, performance evaluation, personal relations, communication, cooperation, leadership, conflict etc. (Şişman & Turan, 2004). According to Sergiovanni (1992), schools are value-laden communities and moral leadership should perform the management of these communities.

Given the role schools play in shaping and translating the values of a given society, school managers must be good values managers as well (Çelik, 2004). As Evans (2000) stated, the leaders or managers who do not have strong values and motivation to inspire the school community engage in passive leadership. Yet, even in this context, cultural values undoubtedly are considered, due to their existence in all elements of school. Thus, educational administration is closely related to values. Values influence administrators' decisions and behaviors inside or outside of the organization (Çelik, 1999; Dawis, 1991). According to Begley (1996; 1999) and others (Akbaba-Altun, 2003; Çelik, 1999; Dawis, 1991; Frankel, Schechtman, & Koenigs, 2006; Richmon, 2004), research is needed on the nature and the function of values in education administration.

Although there is robust support in the literature on the primacy of values in social and organizational life, there has been little or no attempt to determine what those values are. Although the scope and content of studies on values in Turkey (Akbaba-Altun, 2004; Erçetin, 2000; Güngör, 1998; Karaman-Kepenekci, 2004; Kıncal & Işık, 2005; Kuçuradi, 1998) and in the world (Allport, 1968; Allport & Vernon, 1931; Allport et al., 1960; Rokeach, 1968, 1973; Trusted 1998) differ, there has been little research to determine views school administrators and teachers hold on individual and organizational values.

This study focused on views school administrators and teachers in Turkish primary schools hold on individual and organizational values. Measuring organizational values in schools and individual values of teachers are essential to understand daily managerial functioning. Whether there is a congruence or divergence on values between administrators and teachers will indicate the extent of common values as well as the strength of school culture (Pang, 1998).

THE AIM OF THE RESEARCH

The aim of this study is to determine views of administrators and teachers on individual values and organizational values in primary schools in Turkey. The following questions guided this study.
1. What are the school administrators' and teachers' views on individual values?
2. What are the school administrators' and teachers' views on organizational values in school?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Turkish Education System provides education to approximately 19.4 million students in over 56, 000 schools with 680,000 teachers and administrators. Of these, approximately 11 million students,

35, 000 schools and school administrators and 403, 000 teachers comprise the state primary school system (Ministry of National Education, [MoNE] 2007).

The study population includes public primary school administrators and teachers in city centers throughout Turkey. A "multi-stage sampling method" was used to create the study sample. Two main criteria were used to select the sample of the study. First, the geographical regions and provinces of schools were determined. There are seven geographical regions in Turkey. The provinces in those regions were categorized by level of development using Socio Economic Status (SES) data by the Turkish State Planning Organization (2004), as "underdeveloped", "developing" and "developed" provinces. The study provinces in each region and were then selected through random sampling to reflect a range of development across the country. The resultant sample included 712 teachers and 407 school administrators from 21 different provinces.

The researcher developed a "Value Scale". Values were defined in words or phrases. The instrument was first pilot tested in a group of 150 teachers. An exploratory factor analysis (principal components) was carried out in order to establish the construct validity of the instrument. Cronbach Alphas were calculated to test the reliability of the instrument. Based on the factor analyses, the scale had two dimensions. The first scale was on individual values and the second was on organizational values. Twenty-nine values for each dimension were tested. The results indicated that the 29 items loaded high on one factor and the factor loadings ranged from .30 to .71. Thirty four percent of the variance was explained by only one factor, the dimension of individual value. The Cronbach Alpha value for the 29 items comprising this dimension was .89.

The results of the second factor indicated that 29 items load high on one factor and the factor loadings ranges from .30 to .82. Forty eight percent of the variance was explained by only one factor, the dimension of organizational value. The Cronbach Alpha value for the 29 items comprising this dimension was .94.

The participants were asked to rank the values in the instrument from "1 to 5" based on the priority they assign to that value. They were invited to consider the importance of those values in terms of their principles and how important the value is in shaping their own lives and life in schools. Respondents were asked to mark "1" for the values they thought were "contrary to my principles" and "5" for the value statements that were "very important for me." Finally, they were expected to rank order all values in a given dimension.

Educational Studies Support Program of the Research and Development Office of the Ministry of National Education (EARGED) assisted with the data collection. EARGED provided services like copying the instrument, forwarding the instruments to schools and collecting the completed instruments from schools nationwide. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means and standard deviations were used to analyze the data.

RESULTS

The views of school administrators and teachers presented in the study on individual values are listed in table 1.

Table 1.

School Administrator and Teacher Views on Individual Values

Individual Values	Administrators				Teachers			
	n	$\overline{X}$	ss	Rank order	n	$\overline{X}$	ss	Rank order
1. Openness	405	4.79	.53	7	710	4.78	.50	10
2. Fairness	406	4.91	.36	*1*	712	4.94	.31	*1*
3. Independency	405	4.72	.60	13	710	4.71	.59	13
4. Commitment	402	3.88	1.29	*27*	700	3.99	1.25	*26*
5. Achievement	402	4.75	.52	10	710	4.75	.51	11
6. Rationality	407	4.77	.51	9	708	4.74	.54	12
7. Diligence	407	4.86	.40	*4*	711	4.82	.44	7
8. Democracy	405	4.73	.71	11	708	4.83	.49	6
9. Religious Devotion	401	3.39	1.41	*28*	705	3.34	1.40	*29*
10. Honesty	406	4.90	.40	*2*	711	4.93	.32	*2*
11. Equality	407	4.85	.42	6	708	4.86	.45	*4*
12. Self-sacrifice	407	4.66	.62	17	705	4.61	.64	22
13. Respect for people	407	4.89	.38	*3*	712	4.91	.33	*3*
14. Cooperation	406	4.72	.56	12	711	4.68	.56	17
15. Benevolence	407	4.70	.60	15	709	4.71	.57	15
16. Secularism	405	4.61	.86	19	707	4.69	.75	16
17. Having authority	405	4.06	1.02	*26*	708	3.98	1.08	*27*
18. Self-control	406	4.57	.68	23	707	4.64	.67	19
19. Self-respect	407	4.70	.62	16	708	4.79	.53	8
20. Money	407	3.29	1.16	*29*	709	3.49	1.10	*28*
21. Loyalty	402	4.58	.77	22	708	4.66	.70	18
22. Responsibility	406	4.85	.46	*5*	708	4.85	.40	*5*
23. Objectiveness	407	4.77	.49	8	708	4.78	.52	9
24. Frugality	401	4.31	.88	*25*	710	4.23	.88	*25*
25. Harmony	407	4.62	.63	18	708	4.63	.62	21
26. Creativity	406	4.60	.62	20	707	4.56	.67	24
27. Solidarity	406	4.71	.55	14	708	4.71	.55	14
28. Competence	405	4.59	.62	21	706	4.63	.60	20
29. Satisfaction	405	4.57	.69	24	703	4.58	.70	23

NOTE: Values listed in the first five rank orders by the participants are ***bold*** and ***in italics,*** whereas those in the last five rank order are presented *in italics*.

The highest five rankings of individual values given by the primary school administrators were respectively "fairness" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.91), "honesty" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.90), "respect for people" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.89), "diligence" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.86) and "responsibility" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.85). The lowest five rankings of individual values given by the

school administrators were "money" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.29), "religious devotion" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.39), "commitment" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.88), "having authority" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.06) and "frugality" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.31).

As table 1 indicates, the highest five individual values the primary school teachers rank ordered were respectively "fairness" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.94), "honesty" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.93), "respect for people" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.91), "equality" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.86) and "responsibility" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.85), whereas those ranked last were "religious devotion" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.34), "money" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.49), "having authority" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.98), "commitment" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.99) and "frugality" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.23).

Table 2 presents the views of the school administrators and the teachers on organizational values in primary schools.

Table 2.

School Administrator and Teacher Views on Organizational Values

Organizational Values	Administrators				Teachers			
	n	$\overline{X}$	ss	Rank order	n	$\overline{X}$	ss	Rank order
1. Openness	407	4.73	.57	12	709	4.67	.66	12
2. Fairness	406	4.82	.57	*3*	711	4.75	.61	*4*
3. Independency	403	4.47	.84	24	707	4.52	.79	22
4. Commitment	400	4.28	.96	*26*	698	4.15	1.11	*27*
5. Achievement	405	4.80	.49	8	706	4.73	.53	8
6. Rationality	406	4.78	.59	9	706	4.72	.62	9
7. Diligence	404	4.80	.48	7	707	4.75	.57	*5*
8. Democracy	406	4.73	.68	11	708	4.78	.57	*2*
9. Religious Devotion	398	3.06	1.42	*29*	699	2.98	1.41	*29*
10. Honesty	404	4.82	.49	*2*	706	4.77	.60	*3*
11. Equality	406	4.81	.49	*4*	709	4.73	.65	7
12. Self-sacrifice	406	4.63	.73	19	706	4.55	.76	19
13. Respect for people	406	4.88	.41	*1*	711	4.78	.56	*1*
14. Cooperation	405	4.76	.57	10	709	4.69	.64	10
15. Benevolence	406	4.60	.73	21	703	4.55	.74	20
16. Secularism	406	4.67	.74	17	707	4.67	.73	14
17. Having authority	405	4.25	.93	*27*	708	4.18	1.05	*26*
18. Self-control	406	4.61	.65	20	705	4.57	.75	18
19. Self-respect	403	4.68	.65	15	701	4.67	.63	13
20. Money	405	3.55	1.23	*28*	701	3.62	1.20	*28*
21. Loyalty	402	4.51	.82	23	701	4.50	.80	24
22. Responsibility	406	4.81	.52	6	705	4.74	.60	6
23. Objectiveness	406	4.81	.52	*5*	707	4.68	.72	11
24. Frugality	404	4.44	.90	*25*	704	4.32	.91	*25*
25. Harmony	406	4.73	.56	13	705	4.60	.74	17
26. Creativity	405	4.65	.62	18	707	4.54	.77	21
27. Solidarity	405	4.73	.56	14	704	4.65	.65	15
28. Competence	406	4.67	.60	16	704	4.62	.68	16
29. Satisfaction	405	4.59	.73	22	701	4.50	.80	23

NOTE: Values listed in the first five rank orders by the participants are presented in ***bold*** and ***in italics,*** whereas those in the last five rank order are presented *in italics*.

As shown in the table 2, the top five organizational values as ranked by the primary school administrators were "respect for people" ($\overline{X}$ = 4,88), "honesty" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.81), "fairness" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.82), "equality" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.81) and "objectiveness" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.81), respectively. As shown in table 2, the five organizational values the school administrators listed last were "religious devotion" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.06), "money"

($\overline{X}$ = 3.55), "having authority" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.25), "commitment" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.28) and "frugality" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.44).

As shown in table 2, the highest ranked organizational values as ranked by the primary school teachers were "respect for people" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.78), "democracy" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.78), "honesty" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.77), "fairness" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.81) and "diligence" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.75), respectively. As reported in table 2, organizational values the teachers ranked lowest were; "religious devotion" ($\overline{X}$ = 2.98), "money" ($\overline{X}$ = 3.62), "commitment" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.15), "authority" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.18) and "frugality" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.68).

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study indicated that individual values of primary school administrators and teachers were similar. They mostly focused on fairness, honesty, and respect for people, equality, and responsibility. The only difference between the two groups of respondents was that the primary school administrators put "diligence" in the 4th rank order, whereas teachers ranked "equality" 4th. The rank order of the other values did not differ for administrators and teachers. This order might indicate that school administrators and teachers attribute more importance to relation-oriented values (fairness, honesty, respect for people, equality, responsibility etc.).

Güngör (1998) claims that the highest ranking or the top value of a person in a value list may be considered as his/her *basic value*. Theoretically, if one is asked to rank order a list of values, the top ranking value is the most influential one in his or her life. Other values are a means of individual psychological and social happiness and peace. Therefore, the basic individual value for school administrators and the teachers was "fairness". This may suggest that such an attitude indicates that fairness and equality were dominant in their own lives. One may also suggest that both administrators and teachers attach much more importance to relation-oriented values.

Individual values of the teachers and the school administrators in the last rank of their value ranking are the same. These values were money, religious devotion, commitment, having authority and frugality. However, money was the lowest-ranking item for school administrators, whereas religious devotion was the lowest-ranking value for teachers. These findings support the findings of other studies that had similar results (Aydın, 2003; Bacanlı, 1999; Erçetin, 2000; Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000). Finding religious devotion as the lowest-ranking item might be a result of training and the professional socialization process in a secular educational system.

Although dedication is one of the most distinctive cultural features of the Turkish society (Özen, 1996), it was the final item on the individual value lists both for school administrators and teachers. Researchers have found that Turkish culture emphasizes *commitment to internal the group.* Turkish culture ensures social order mostly through hierarchical roles (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994; Smith, Dugan, & Trompenaars, 1996). The reason for the differences in findings regarding these values between previous studies and the current study might be social changes that have occurred in the past decade. Because of social changes and the influence of globalization and liberal economic policies, values like commitment, trust, and dedication might have given way to other individualistic values. The values like commitment to internal group and family, two of the most distinctive features of the Turkish society, might have been less emphasized. In societies where values such as commitment and family have been worn out, people often face problems like violence in family and schools, individuals might resort to violence and use of drugs.

Turkish society has traditionally been characterized by density, lack of competition, and lack of entrepreneurship, many Turks perceive work as an obligation and may lower work performance as a result (Tezcan, 1995). Diligence and responsibility were two of the values emphasized by both the school administrators and the teachers. As a result, one might surmise there have been recent changes in Turkish society and culture. The findings are not as surprising when one considers that individuals have to take responsibility and work harder than before in a society that is constantly changing. Values such as diligence and responsibility are desirable values for societies and organizations.

The basic organizational value in primary schools for the administrators and teachers was respect for

people, whereas religious devotion was the lowest ranking among the values. Thus, one may conclude that the school administrators and the teachers attribute the utmost importance to respect for individuals in organizations.

School administrators and teachers perceive respect for others as the basic value for school organizations and religious devotion as the lowest ranking. The results might suggest that individuals whose basic individual values were fairness might also perceive it as the basic organizational value. These individuals attribute more importance to relation-oriented values at both individual and organizational levels. Finding religious devotion as the lowest-ranking item is expected, given a secular educational system attaches little or no importance to religious values. While the finding concerning the religious devotion was expected, secularism was expected to be one of the top ranking values in the list; however, administrators ranked secularism as the 17th item and teachers ranked it as the 14th. The findings indicated that the views of participants on religious devotion and secularism have not changed much over time. In addition, teachers attributed relatively more importance to secularism in organizations than the administrators.

It is surprising to find commitment as one of the lowest-ranking values both by the administrators and by teachers, given organizations expect commitment from employees to the organization. While, again, changes might have taken place in society, previous studies found the Turkish culture among the cultures that emphasized *commitment to internal group* (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994; Smith et al., 1996).

One may also argue that school administrator and teacher commitment to schools has weakened. Recently, an increase in violence in primary schools, insufficient salaries and other workplace-related issues might have caused weaken feelings of commitment. Teachers with lower levels of commitment are less likely to be able to focus on students and their work, which might lower their performance, increase absenteeism, and increase teacher and administrator turnover. Teachers and administrators may quit the profession; high staff turnover might cause stress (İnce & Gül, 2005). Low commitment by teachers also leads to low academic achievement for students, teachers become less tolerant to students, they become intolerant in classrooms, and they may become more worried and burnout (Balay, 2000). This is also crucial for the future of the education system, because studies have consistently pointed out that those individuals with higher organizational commitment spend greater efforts to realize organizational goals and carry out tasks assigned. More importantly, employees who have a feeling of commitment to their organizations identify themselves with the organization and increase their performance. Alternatively, individuals with lower levels of commitment are less likely to concentrate on their work and devote themselves to the mission of organization (İnce & Gül, 2005).

When we evaluate the views of the school administrators and the teachers on individual and organizational values together, there are some similarities and differences between the views of the two groups. They both ranked fairness as the highest individual value and respect for people as the highest organizational value. These two values are relation-oriented. Furthermore, they emphasized diligence and responsibility among individual values, equality and objectiveness among organizational values.

There were some similarities as well as differences between individual and organizational values ranked the lowest in the list by the school administrators. They ranked money lowest as an individual value and religious devotion as an organizational value. The values provided in the lowest ranking order by the administrators were the same (money, religious devotion, commitment, having authority, frugality) although the order was different. Hence, the school administrators ranked the same values lowest as individual and organizational values. School administrators ranked individual and organizational values either as more important or less important similarly. Therefore, it may be safe to assume that organizations influence and are influenced by social culture and individual values.

There were some similarities as well as differences between the views of teachers on individual and organizational values. Teachers ranked fairness top in the list as an individual value and respect for people as an organizational value. Moreover, they emphasized equality and responsibility among individual values and democracy and diligence among organizational values, so one may conclude teachers attach more importance to democracy and diligence in organizations when compared to other values. This response may have been due to deficiencies their schools in terms of democracy and diligence.

Individual and organizational values ranked lowest by the teachers were the same as those ranked lowest by administrators, although there were differences in the order. They ranked religious devotion the lowest both as an individual and organizational value, followed by money, having authority, commitment, and frugality.

There were also similarities and differences between the rankings of organizational values in primary schools for school administrators and teachers. The organizational values shared by the administrators and teachers were respect for people, fairness and honesty. The values that differed were equality and objectiveness for administrators, democracy and diligence for the teachers.

Similar views of school administrators and teachers on organizational values are important. If leaders support their followers' values, supporters may become much more motivated and devoted to follow their leaders (Meng, Ashkanasy, & Hartel, 2003). In addition, value agreements may lead to a more meaningful organizational existence and increased job satisfaction of employees.

The lowest-ranked values for both school administrators and teachers in terms of organizational values of schools were also similar. The school administrators and the teachers ranked religious devotion, money, commitment, having authority, and frugality lowest among organizational values in primary schools.

CONCLUSION

The primary school administrators' and teachers' views about individual and organizational values were found to be similar in Turkey. Therefore, it can be said that there is a congruity between the values of primary school administrators and teachers. Individuals who share similar value systems suggest they perceive outside stimuli similarly and respond similarly. That enables them to anticipate the others' behaviors better and coordinate the actions more effectively. Moreover, individuals with similar value systems act the same for common aims. Similarities in the values of the members of an organization lead to friendship, cooperation, mutual support, help, and motivation in the group.

There were similarities between the administrators and teachers' views regarding individual and organizational values. Thus, both principals and teachers regard the values that are important for them in their daily lives as similarly important for their organizational lives, too. The consistency between the individual and organizational values increases the staff's devotion, work satisfaction, happiness, and long-term work in the organization. It can be interpreted from the results that the primary school staffs in Turkey work in harmony.

It is essential to determine the value profiles of the staff to ensure appropriate approaches to administration in schools. Such processes as group behavior, communication style, leadership and leadership behavior, and decision-making are all influenced by values as the organizational value system affects the organizational aims, policies and strategies. When there is a parallel between organizational values and organizational policies it is easier to reach the objectives. Thus, educational planners should take the values of the staff into account in the plans and programs they develop as these educational policies and plans influence individual and social life directly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

NOTE

This article is based on the dissertation study "Individual and Organizational Values of Teachers and School Administrators in Public Primary Schools: How Do the School Administrators Manage Their Schools According to These Values?"

REFERENCES

Akbaba-Altun, S. (2003). Educational administration and values. *Journal of Value Education, 1* (1), 7–18.

Akbaba-Altun, S. (2004). Work values of the primary school administrators. *The XIII. National Educational Sciences Congress*, July 6-9, 2004, Malatya, Turkey. İnönü University Press.

Allport, G. W. (1968). *A person in psychology.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Allport, G. W., & Vernon, P. E. (1931). *A study of values.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1960). *A study of values*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Aydın, M. (2003). Value perceptions of youth: the case of Konya. *Journal of Value Education, 1 (3),* 121–144.

Bacanlı, H. (1999). Value preferences of university students. *Educational Administration in Theory and Practice, 5*(20), 597–610.

Balay, R. (2000). *Organizational commitment.* Ankara: Nobel Press.

Bates R. J. (1992). The emerging culture of educational administration and what we can do about it. *National Conference of the Australian Council for Educational Administration*, July 5-8, 1992, Darwin, Northern Territory, Australia.

Bates, R. J. (2001). Technology, values and school management. *British Educational Management and Administration Society Annual Conference*, Newport Pagnall. Retrieved December 21, 2004, from http://www.deakin.edu.au/~rbates/paper1.doc.

Begley, P. T. (1996). Cognitive perspectives on values in administration: a quest for coherence and relevance. *Educational Administrational Quarterly, 32*, 403–426.

Begley, P. T. (1999). Value preferences, ethics, and conflicts in school administration. In P. T. Begley (Eds.), *Values and educational leadership* (pp. 237–254). NY: State University of New York Press.

Bryying, T., & Trollestad, C. (2000). Managerial thinking on value-based management. *International Journal of Value-Based Management, 13*(1), 55–77.

Çelik, V. (1999). *Educational leadership*. Ankara: Pegem Press.

Çelik, V. (2004). Leadership. In Y. Özden (Edt.), *Handbook of educational and school administration* (pp. 188–215). Ankara: Pegem A Press.

Chikudate, N. (1991). Cross-cultural analysis of cognitive systems in organizations: a comparison between Japanese and American organizations. *Management International Review, 31*, 219–231.

Dawis, R. V. (1991). Vocational interests, values, and preferences. In M. D. Dunette and L. M. Hough (Eds.). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 833–871), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Pres.

English, F. W. (1992). *Educational administration: The human science.* NY: HarperCollins.

English, F. W. (1997). The cupboard is bare: the postmodern critique of educational administration. *Journal of School Leadership, 7*(1), 4–26.

English, F. W. (2003). *The postmodern challenge to the theory and practice of educational administration*. Springfield, IL**:** Charles C Thomas Publisher.

Erçetin, Ş. (2000). What values are primary schools administered with?. *Journal of Anadolu University, Faculty of Education, 10*(1), 31–43.

Evans, R. (2000). The authentic leader. In M. Fullan (Edt.), *Educational leadership* (pp. 287–308). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Everard, B. (1995). Values as central to competent professional practice. In H. Busher & R. Saran (Eds.), *Managing teachers as professionals in schools* (pp. 131–151). London: Kogan Page.

Foster, W. P. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: new approaches to educational administration*. NY: Prometheus, Buffalo.

Frankel, M. T., Schechtman, J. L., & Koenigs, R. J. (2006). Too much of a good thing? Values in leadership for educational organizations. *International Journal of Educational Management, 20*, 520–528.

Goodman, M. E. (1967). *The individual and culture.* Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Greenfield, D. J. (1961). Values and educational administration. *Peabody Journal of Education, 39*(3), 157–161.

Güngör, E. (1998). *Research on value psychology*. İstanbul: Ötüken Press.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations*. London: Harper Collins Business.

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive,*

7(1), 81–94.

Hofstede, G. (1998). Attitudes, values and organizational culture: disentangling the concepts. *Organization Studies, 19*, 477–492.

Hostetter, S. J. (2003). Institutional culture in the Bible college and its relationship to organizational member's values. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.* Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. UMI No: 3087175.

İnce, M., & Gül, H. (2005). *A new paradigm in management: organizational commitment*. Konya: Çizgi Press.

Karaman-Kepenekci, Y. (2004). Tolerance according to classroom teachers. *Educational Administration in Theory and Practice, 10*(38), 250–265.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. NY: Wiley.

Kıncal, R. Y., & Işık, H. (2005). Elementary school principals' level of practicing democratic values. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 14*, 338–345.

Kotey, B., & Meredith, G. G. (1997). Relationship among owner/manager personal values and perceptions, business strategies, and enterprise performance. *Journal of Small Business Management, 35*(2), 37–64.

Kuçuradi, İ. (1998). *Human and values*. Ankara: Publications of Turkish Philosophy Association.

Kuşdil, M. E., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000). Value orientations of Turkish teachers and the Schwartz value theory. *Turkish Psychological Association, 15*(45), 59–76.

Lamberton, L. H., & Minor, L. (1995). *Human relations: strategies for success*. Chicago: Irwin Mirror Press.

Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management, 24*(3), 251–289.

Meng, Y. K., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Hartel, C.E.J. (2003). The effects of Australian tall poppy attitudes on American value based leadership theory. *International Journal of Value Based Management, 16*(1), 53–65.

Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. (2007). *National education statistics in 2006–2007.* Ankara: MoNE Publications.

Özen, Ş. (1996). *Bureaucratic culture: social basis of managerial values*. Ankara: TODAİE Publications.

Pang, S. N. (1998). Managerial practices in Hong Kong primary schools. *Journal of Basic Education, 8(1)*, 21–42.

Posner, B. Z., & Munson, J. M. (1979). The importance of values in understanding organizational behavior. *Human Resource Management, 18*(3), 9–14.

Richmon, M. J. (2004). Values in educational administration: them's fighting words. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 7*(4), 339–356.

Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes and values.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of the human values.* NY: The Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1979). From individual to institutional values: with special reference to the values of science. In M. Rokeach (Edt.), *Understanding human values* (pp. 47–70). NY: The Free Press.

Schein, E. H. (1991). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1993). Legitimating clinical research in the study of organizational culture. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 71*(6), 703–709.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Culture: the missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*(2), 229–241.

Schwartz, S. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and content of human values?. *Journal of Social Issues, 50*(4), 19–45.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Moral leadership: getting to the heart of school improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sikula, A. F. (1971). Values and value systems: importance and relationship to managerial and organizational behavior. *Journal of Psychology, 78*, 277–286.

Şişman, M., & Turan, S. (2004). Educational and school administration. In Y. Özden (Edt.), *Handbook of educational and school administration* (pp. 99–146). Ankara: Pegem A Press.

Smith, P. B., Dugan, S., & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and values of organizational employees: a dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27(2)*, 231–264.

Strike, K. A. (1993). Against values: reflections on oral language and moral education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 1*(13). Retrieved October 22, 2003 from http:// epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n37/.html.

Tezcan, M. (1995). *Introduction to sociology.* Ankara: Publications of Ankara University Faculty of Education.

Trusted, J. (1998). The origin of social values. In M.M. Carrow, R.P. Churchill & J.J. Cordes (Eds.), *Democracy, social values, and public policy* (pp. 11–26). London: Praeger Publishers.

Turkish State Planning Organization (2004). *Economic and social indicators.* Retrieved December 21, 2005 from http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/ekonomi/gosterge/tr/esg.asp.