

## The Values of Principals in Elementary Schools-A qualitative approach

Dr. Pelagia A. Stravakou\*, Evangelia Ch. Lozga

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Prof, Democritus University of Thrace, Nea Chili, Alexandroupolis 681 00, Greece

<sup>2</sup>Phd Candidate, Democritus University of Thrace, Irodotou 23 Street, Alexandroupolis 681 00, Greece

**\*Corresponding author**  
Dr. Pelagia A. Stravakou

### Article History

Received: 07.08.2018

Accepted: 18.08.2018

Published: 30.08.2018



**Abstract:** This study explores (a) what Greek school principals value as important both for themselves as principals (desired values) and for other principals in school administration (desirable values), directly and indirectly; and the Greek school principals opinions (b) about the factors affecting their personal and professional values and (c) about the importance of values in educational administration. Twelve principals were invited to decide upon vignettes (hypothetical scenarios) for their values indirectly to be unraveled, whereas semi-structured interviews were applied for the participants' values directly to be investigated and the other two research questions to be answered. The data were analyzed with the qualitative content analysis. A consistent finding emerged between the principals' desired and desirable values, explored both directly and indirectly, was the prevalence of the values of consequences for immediate clients (students, educators and parents) and collaboration. Regarding the factors impacting on principals' personal values, family, friends, and the Christian religion were mentioned as highly influential, while the principals' professional values were shaped mostly through their professional experience and their career path in Greek educational administration. However, interestingly, the principals' immediate supervisors seemed to affect mainly negatively the participants' professional values. These findings were found to reinforce and extend the research indicating the significance of values in educational administration, and they are discussed in terms of their implications for value-led principalship and principals' professional development.

**Keywords:** principals, values, educational administration, school leadership, vignette technique, qualitative content analysis.

## INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the academic focus has always been on values as a component of organizational culture, while individuals' personal and professional value orientations in organizations have not captured the analogous concern from scholars [1].

This delay is attributed to the prevalence of logical positivism and its principal assumption, according to which, a statement has meaning only if it is verifiable in an objective way that was assumed not being the case for values. Simon inserted this assumption in the field of administration and its effect particularly on educational administration was depicted on the "Theory Movement" scholars' work [2]. However, Greenfield, in 1974, vigorously challenged that assumption and later, other significant scholars in the field under study, such as Hodgkinson and Willower, highlighted explicitly the impact of values on educational administrative practice, while they contributed to the inquiry of values [3, 4]. Still, there are other influential scholars, such as Begley [1, 3, 5], with a sustainable concern for the topic over the years.

Until now, there has been a small [6] but growing body of research, indicating that indeed administrative values affect the way leaders in education reach decisions [7], the manner they handle problematic issues and dilemmas [3, 8-12], and generally, how they act and behave [13]. Although Leithwood [14], another giant scholar of educational administration, doubted the practical usefulness of much of the current research using a value approach with a target for the exercise of educational administration to be more ethical; at least the study of values can help school leaders to understand themselves and their colleagues, as well as to recognize and find remedy to value conflicts, having been a commonality in school leaders' professional lives [3, 15].

This principals' self-awareness is also required for the exercise of "values-led principalship" [6, p. iii], which is demanded in our contemporary era being full of continual changes and ambiguities. In fact, Day, Harris, and Hadfield [16, p. 52] found specifically the type of "values-led contingency leadership" to be a prerequisite for school leaders' effectiveness. The

values-led headship assumes that specific values impact in a positive way on school leaders' practices, after these values having been selected in a conscious, intentional, and eclectic way by principals [6]. But the principals' self-understanding, gained by the study of their values, has also practical implications for school leaders to apply in a conscious way their own value orientations while their starting of the formation of school culture or their initiating of its change towards a desired one [17, 18].

Therefore, it is significant to explore if school leaders are self-aware of their embraced values [6], which can be detected by a parallel direct and indirect exploration of their values. This parallel investigation is also important because the values actually being embraced by individuals may be different from those explicitly mentioned by them [19]. However, until now, educational administrators' values have usually been explored either only indirectly or directly. Namely, in indirect exploration, during face-to-face interviews participants were engaged in "stimulate recall activities" [3, p. 242] or they were invited to respond to short case cases or vignettes, while researchers later detected and identified values in the transcribed material using value definitions, taxonomies, or frameworks. Conversely, in the direct exploration of values [20] respondents had to answer explicitly about their value orientations [21]. Another critical issue about previous research is that the bulk of it has been restricted to the Western context, which is the case of scholarship in educational administration generally [22]. Only quite recently scholars from non-western context [23, 24] have contributed to the emerging scholarship about values in educational administration. Still, another issue that has been left relatively unexplored is the formation of principals' values [6, 25].

Hence, the present study extends prior research on values and principalship, by providing primary findings from the highly centralized Greek educational system. Specifically, we seek to address the following questions: (a) What are Greek elementary school principals' values, gathered both indirectly and directly?; (b) What are the factors that Greek principals consider to influence their values?; and (c) How do principals understand the importance of values in educational administration?

## Literature

The clarification of *values* is not an easy endeavor, not only because the word itself and others relevant to it are not usually defined by those using them, but also because even at the time of writing there is still no accepted definition about values [4]. Moreover, scholars' opinions differ in whether values are objective or subjective and if they are indeed separated from facts [26]. Nevertheless, in this paper, we use Kluckhohn's definition proposing that "*values*

*are a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action*" [5, p. 235]. As Begley [5] stated, by this definition the effect of values on administrative practice and especially on processes, such as problem-solving or decision making, is evident, because people have to choose among alternatives.

Even though the above-mentioned definition is functional for the study of values, it is not quite understandable at first sight. Leithwood and Steinbach [11, p. 150] defined more simply values as "a broad and relatively enduring preference for some state of affairs". Furthermore, Hofstede [27, p. 6-7] proposed a discrimination between values he called "desired" and those of the "desirable", having different characteristics and ways of measurement. Specifically, desired values denote to "what people actually desire" personally which can be unraveled by questions of what is of significance or of preference for individual's oneself. On the other hand, Hofstede's [27, p. 6] desirable values stand for "what they [people] think they ought to desire", and these values answer 'the should or ought to' questions for people generally. The above-mentioned scholar [27, p. 6-7] also emphasized that these two different kinds of values should not be considered equal for a "positivistic fallacy" to be avoided.

In the same vein, Minkov [28, p. 40-55] stressed the need for the above value differentiation to be used, although he referred to desired values as 'personal values' and to desirable as 'norms' or 'ideologies'. He argued that in the research of personal values, the latter are anything individuals choose or portray in their words as significant or insignificant to their lives, which are commonly referred as abstract nouns [28]. Such values may be love, integrity, friendship, or anything else a person finds of paramount importance for him/herself. Minkov [28] also maintained that the statements people make about what is of significance for themselves (personal values) may not be in line with what they want for other people (desirable values/norms), and even, they can be completely dissimilar from each other. This value distinction influenced our conceptualization and operationalization of values in the research conducted.

For the nature of values and the reasons of their existence, Hodgkinson [15] offered a widely known framework. He, supporting that values exist because of individuals' motives, proposed four types of values. In Type III lies the values held simply because of an individual's self-preference and affect, and of his/her perceptions of what is good, and therefore these values are sub-rational. Type II contains the rational values which are further divided into the values of consequences and consensus. The former are embraced due to the evaluation of the consequences towards to

“some future resultant state of affairs” [15, p. 98], while the latter are founded on the opinion of an expert, due to the individual’s compliance with the most group members’ will, or because of the peer pressure. Finally, Type I is associated to ethics or principles and can be driven from an individual’s commitment, faith, or belief. The last three value types are based on the individual’s perception of rightness [1, 15]. Begley [1] based on this framework further proposed that it is because of these motivational bases in conjunction with the influence of an individual’s training, experience, and or reflection that the embracing of specific value exists. Moreover, he stressed that the adopted value will determine a person’s attitudes and may define the way he/she will act and what he/she will say.

The above-mentioned value taxonomy, although coupled with some limitations [4], has been adopted by many studies where the prevalence of Type II values was found, when educational administrators decided [3]. In contrast, it is argued that Type I values are shown up in urgent, vague, and not assured situations, or when headteachers face situations where either they cannot evaluate the consequences or the consensus cannot be reached [5]. It seems, therefore, that particular values are manifested under specific conditions. Furthermore, when Leithwood and Steinbach [11] explored the way Chief Education Officers (CEOs) found solutions to problems, using values as an aspect of this cognitive procedure, they categorized the problematical situations that participants had to solve into structured/clear or unstructured/less clear, and found that value statements in unstructured problems were slightly more than in structured ones. In light of this finding, this distinction of scenarios was also used in this research.

Hodgkinson’s typology discussed above is one of the taxonomies proposed and used for value identification in educational administration. Another one having been offered by Leithwood and Steinbach [11] includes the general moral, social and political, basic human, and the professional values, with a number of sub-values in each group. Nevertheless, other researchers [10] investigated administrative values without using any prior categorization for data analysis. In fact, the difficulties with the diverse existing value taxonomies, as Keast [7] underlined, are the different grouping of the same values and the dissimilar conceptual delimitation of the term.

Apart from the categorization of values and their definition, their origin, and the factors affecting their formation is also a controversial issue [1]. In the literature review carried out by Strauss [12] in her doctorate, biology, culture, life experiences, or a mixture of them, were referred among others as the sources of values generally, while socialization processes or language were stressed among the means for moral acculturation. In a similar vein, Hodgkinson

suggested that religion, broader culture, community, organization where the person belongs, and groups which include the friendly, professional, and family circle of an individual, are considered as the origin of an individual’s value orientations, as well as of value conflicts [3, 5]. In above factors, we can also add the occupation in which people are socialized during their studies [29]. From a sociological perspective, the espousal by particular values of an individual can be seen as a consequence of his/her belonging in a social group with values satisfying “a useful psycho-social function”, while according to a proposition the manifestations of emotions show the existence of values [30].

However, both formal socialization and personal lived experiences seem to be the common acknowledged influences on value formation, and in light of this can be explained why people hold similar or dissimilar values [31]. Particularly, it is a widely held view among scholars that administrators’ life experiences shape their values carried to work. Especially for educational leaders’ professional values, it has been assumed that they are embraced mainly through the socialization process which starts from leaders’ school life and continues throughout their professional path. During this path, educational administrators are socialized both with formal and with informal procedures, while their professional ways of conduct are also affected by their mentors or direct superiors [12].

Regarding the impact of values on educational administration, as it has been referred in previous section, research findings indicated that they impact upon administrators’ decisions and on their solving problems processes. In this context, values may be the desired, implementable leaders’ aims. Hence, values define the ends an administrator would try to achieve, while at the same time values could also function as restraints on leaders’ behaviors towards their objectives [32]. Similarly, others suggested that values explicitly dictate administrators’ behavior and impinge on how a person would perceive the information of the external environment [31]. Moreover, it was also proposed that a person’s embraced values influence his/her assessment of how other human beings act and of their value orientations [30].

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

A qualitative methodological design was employed in this study, because it enables the participants’ perceptions and meanings for the issue to emerge in more depth [33] and because the issue of values in educational administration is a contested one among the scholars [34]. Furthermore, this specific methodological paradigm has been proposed as the most suitable to the investigation of values by the pioneers in the field [3].

The study was carried out in the administrative district of Eastern Macedonia and Thrace, and twelve principals of seven-teacher until twelve-teacher elementary schools<sup>1</sup> were recruited. The sample was selected on the basis of the “homogeneous” purposeful sampling, because all participants should be principals in schools with many teachers [34, p. 246]. Prior to the participants’ recruitment, we obtained their immediate supervisor’s consent to contact them. Then, we had telephone conversations with the principals that met the survey criterion, until a sufficient number of participants was collected. The final sample was considered satisfactory, not only due to the short time being available for the research, but also because of the need for richer data to be collected [36]. Furthermore, given the fact that in qualitative research data are analyzed in parallel with data collection [37], it was evident in the ongoing analysis that the same categories were shown up among the interviews. Therefore, the sample met the criterion of redundancy [36].

For the selection of principals, their differentiation on the basis of gender and years of experience in principalship was also considered. In phone conversations, the participants were informed about the purposes of the study and the estimate time they would need to spend, while their voluntary participation was also ensured. With the principals accepted to participate, the time of the interviews that took place at the participants’ professional settings was arranged. During the interviews one of us posed the questions while the other took notes. The participants were also aware of the fact that they could leave the study whenever it was judged desirable, but nobody chose to leave. Table-1 provides the sample characteristics.

---

<sup>1</sup> The elementary school size in Greece is determined by the teachers working in them, ranging from 1 to 12. Accordingly, the number of teachers is determined by their ratio to students. Hence, for schools with 1, 2, or 3 teachers, each teacher corresponds to 15 students, while for school units of 4 to 12 teachers, each teacher corresponds to 25 students [35].

**Table-1: Characteristics of the study sample**

No.	Gender	Size of the school (by the number of educators)	Years of experience as principal	Years of experience as educator
Principal 1	Male	12	12	30
Principal 2	Male	7	2	30
Principal 3	Male	12	4	25
Principal 4	Male	12	6	30
Principal 5	Female	12	7	29
Principal 6	Female	7	16	30
Principal 7	Male	10	12	35
Principal 8	Female	12	10	33
Principal 9	Female	10	22	26
Principal 10	Female	12	15	30
Principal 11	Male	8	1	29
Principal 12	Female	12	7	30

### Data Collection

The survey was conducted between January and February 2017, and its structure was influenced by Kasten and Ashbaugh's [20] study, since the collection of values was done both directly and indirectly. To that end, we would be able to explore whether elementary school principals were aware of their own values.

The interviews included two parts. In the first phase of the interviews, we explored indirectly principals' values by using vignettes (hypothetical scenarios) in conjunction with semi-structured interviews. Namely, without in this stage the principals being aware of the definition used for values, they were introduced individually to six written vignettes. Next, they had to read each vignette separately until to understand it, and then, to answer for each scenario three questions for their values to come to surface. The questions were: (a) What should a school principal in the Greek educational system do in that case, for participants desirable values; (b) From your point of view, what is the most significant here; and (c) What is preferable to happen for you and why? The last two questions were for the desired values. The questions were based to Hofstede [27] proposition for the distinction of values. There were also probing questions in this stage.

Specifically about the vignettes, three of them were about routine matters of the Greek school administrative reality where participants had to make decisions (structured scenarios), and the other three were about more difficult and less common issues (unstructured scenarios). In all the stories there was a collision of values. To that end, the scenarios would resemble more to the principals' administrative reality, because decisions in educational sector depending on their difficulty level can be either unplanned that are unexpected, or planned that are expected and not so difficult [38]. This type differentiation of the problematical situations was also influenced by Leithwood and Steinbach' [11] study.

For the construction of the vignettes, we drew upon the relevant literature and the information was also gathered in a preliminary research with two principals not participating in the main research. We have discussed our construction and implementation of vignettes elsewhere [39]. The vignette technique was chosen due to its ability to unravel data about difficult and complex issues, such as values, and because it elucidates the judgements of individuals and permits their actions in specific circumstances to be investigated [40]. On the other hand, semi-structured interview allows researcher to adjust to some degree the questions in each case [41], whereas interviewers' influences to interviewees' answers are decreased [34].

After participants' answers to the vignettes, in the second phase of the interviews, we announced to principals the Kluckhohn's definition of values mentioned previously. Then, using semi-structured interviews only, we asked the participants direct questions about their value orientations, the factors influencing their values, and the importance of values in educational administration. The questions about the factors impacting on principals' values were open-ended including the factors, people, situations, or events having impinged on the formation or the change of their personal and professional value orientations, according to their perspective. These questions were also inspired by Strauss's [12] dissertation.

The interviews lasted on average one hour and a half, and they were audio-recorded. Next, they transcribed verbatim, while the transcribed material was sent via e-mail to respondents to check them for authenticity and for potential identifiers, which were excluded for the respondents' anonymity (member-checking). Before the conduct of the main research, the vignettes and the questions included in the interview protocol were validated in a pilot study with two principals, not having been participated in the main study, and small changes were made. The vignettes were also tested for their suitability by two academics [39].



### Data Analysis

After the participants' consent for the transcribed interviews, the material was analyzed by the qualitative content analysis, according to Schreier [42]. This particular research method was chosen, because it enabled us to give a summary description of what our participants said during the interviews. The development of the categories and the subcategories was done both deductively and inductively and at different stages for each main category [42]. For the coding of values no typology was used in advance, but the types of values in various existing value classifications were used supplementary for the identification of values in our case.

To enhance the reliability of the findings, the two authors who were also the coders in the analysis worked separately at each stage, but they had several meetings to solve the differences that occurred until reaching consensus [42]. The findings follow below.

### FINDINGS

The qualitative content analysis identified four major categories in relation to the research questions: (a) the indirect principals' values gathered from vignettes, (b) the direct principals' values referred by them, (c) the factors affecting the principals' personal values, (d) the factors affecting the principals' professional values, and (e) the importance of values in educational administration.

#### The Indirect Principals' Values Gathered From Vignettes

Units of analysis for the principals' indirect values were the participants' answers in each interview when they took decisions upon the vignettes [42].

Units of coding for the desired or personal values were the text segments responding to the Kluckhohn's definition of values, but we were looking here for what principals desired personally. On the contrary, units of coding for the desirable values were those segments corresponding to the same definition [42], but they referred to the values that principals' "wished for others (principals in our case) to consider important" [28, p. 40].

The participated principals referred to a variety of value orientations they desired both for themselves and for other Greek school principals while they took decisions to solve the problematical situations described in the scenarios. Table-2 provides an overview of the

specific types of the desired and desirable values found and the absolute frequencies of them.

According to Table-2, the principals' total value statements for the personal or desired values were more than twice as much as the desirable values. Nevertheless, this is of little interest because there were two questions after each vignette provoking the expression of the desired and only one for the desirable values. Furthermore, Table-2 indicates that the participants' value statements in the structured problems, both for the desired and desirable values, were a little more than those in the unstructured problems.

Regarding the specific types of values, it is apparent that the most highly manifested value orientations for the desired and desirable subcategories, with minor differences in frequencies between them, were the consequences for immediate clients and knowledge. These values were borrowed by the Leithwood and Steinbach's taxonomy [11] and in the case of clients were regarded educators, students, and parents. The text segments coded as "knowledge" were those which showed a principal's need to give information to people being involved in the problematical situation and to be more informed about the issue needed solving [12]. Most interviewees had as a priority when they decided in response to the scenarios the consequences that their decision would have mostly for students, and in a lesser extent for educators, and parents. The same wanted the participants for other principals in school administration to do. At the same time, the principals in our study before arriving at a conclusion wanted to gather more information to have a more holistic view about the issue. Examples of the coded text segments are given below:

"For the principal to solve this issue [a child's misconduct in the scenario], he should search why this student is naughty. The principal has to get information about the family to find out whether this child is from divorced parents". (Participant 2, knowledge as a desirable value)

"The most significant, for me, here [in the scenario about a principal's decision for children's safety which provoked teachers' contradiction] is the child's safety; a child must come to school and leave it, with safety and happiness". (Participant 6, consequences for immediate clients as a desired value)

**Table-2: Absolute frequencies of the types of the principals' desired and desirable values referred indirectly in the structured and unstructured hypothetical scenarios**

	Personal/desired values		To tal	Ran k	Desirable values for other principals		Tota l	Ran k
Types of value	Type of hypothetical scenario				Type of hypothetical scenario			
	Structure d	Unstructured			Structured	Unstructured		
Consequences for immediate clients	33	33	66	1	10	19	29	2
Knowledge	34	30	64	2	17	13	30	1
Collaboration	23	24	47	3	19	8	27	3
Following the laws	8	18	26	4	5	6	11	4
Respect for others	16	10	26	4	2	8	10	5
Fairness/justice	19	0	19	5	8	0	8	6
Solving problems	11	7	18	6	5	1	6	8
Solidarity	12	3	15	7	0	3	3	10
Specific role responsibility	5	8	13	8	1	6	7	7
Consequences for the school	8	1	9	9	0	0	0	0
Nurturing	4	4	8	10	5	1	6	8
Prevention	3	5	8	10	4	0	4	9
Carefulness	0	7	7	11	0	2	2	11
Holding somebody responsible	1	3	4	12	0	4	4	9
Helping others	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	12
School- community connection	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	12
Persistence	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	12
Advantages for older educators	2	0	2	13	2	0	2	11
Persuasiveness	1	0	1	14	0	2	2	11
Consequences for the system	1	0	1	14	0	0	0	0
Creativity	0	1	1	14	0	0	0	0
Kindness	0	1	1	14	0	0	0	0
Total	181	155	336		80	74	154	

Collaboration, having in total been referred forty-seven times (47) as a desired and twenty-seven (27) times as a desirable value, came third in the preference of the principals. Here, collaboration meant the principals' cooperation with other people to accomplish a mutual aim [10], and such statements were the following:

*"I should call a social worker to investigate more the issue [that students may have been victims of domestic*

*violence] together. If I see that students have injuries, I will definitely cooperate with a social worker to arrange what to do". (Participant 2, desired value)*

*"She [the principal in the scenario] should collaborate with them and try together to find a common tactic to follow, and the student will understand that it is a common line between school and family." (Participant 5, desirable value, in relation with the vignette about a child's misconduct)*

Data analysis showed that the principals valued collaboration with all the people related to school. Namely, they wanted personally and for other principals to collaborate with their superiors overseeing them, with the specialists from the local community, such as social services and school psychologists helping schools to solve their problems, with parents, educators, and with students, too. The value of collaboration served mainly as a mean for the principals to solve the different problems described in the vignettes, similar to the function of the value of knowledge, while the type of consequences for immediate clients was mostly expressed as a desired and desirable purpose to be achieved.

The principals' desired values were also consistent with the desirable for the next four most referred value orientations. These were the values of following the laws, respect for others, fairness/justice, and solving the problems. Interestingly, the participants wanted to consult the Greek educational legislation and try to find what laws prescribe to take a decision more frequently when they were confronted with the unstructured scenarios. A text segment coded as "respect for others" indicated the principals' care not to offend somebody and to take into consideration "the contributions...of other people" [12, p. 178], as the quote below illustrates:

*"I would discuss with my colleagues; I should listen to them, I would suggest alternatives and I would ask them to tell me their opinions". (Participant 10, desired value, in relation to the vignette about teachers' dissatisfaction with the schedule of supervision)*

Our participants referred to fairness/justice nineteen times as a desired and eight times as a desirable value, but only in the structured problems and mainly in association with the management of staff, while the value of solving the problem was mentioned little more frequently in the structured scenarios.

When the respondents expressed their preference to support their colleagues, we put the segment under the code solidarity, a value also adapted from the Leithwood and Steinbach's [11, p. 151] type of value "Loyalty, solidarity and commitment". Surprisingly, although some interviewees referred to this type of value as a desired behavior in the structured incidents, none of them mentioned it in the same type of problems as a desirable value orientation.

Among other desired and desirable values manifested fewer times in a declining course in the principals' accounts were: the specific role responsibility relating to the duties and obligations arising from the principal's position, the nurturing referring to the conscious attempts for the positive changes of someone's way of conduct [10], and the value of holding somebody responsible.

Moreover, the value of consequences for the school and its function was referred nine times only as a desired value, while the values of consequences for the whole educational system, kindness, and creativity were each mentioned by one participant as a preferred personal behavior and as a mean through which he/she decided in the unstructured scenarios. However, there were also some values, such as helping the others, the preference for principal to be persistent, and the school-community connection, which referred only as desirable values by one principal each time. Below we give two indicative examples of the coded segments:

*"The principal should show persistence in this case [in the scenario about educators' resistance to the principal's decision for students' safety]. The leader should have this characteristic." (Participant 7, persistence as a desirable value)*

*"The principal should explain the rules to the child and give sermons for the child's behavior to change". (Participant 5, nurturing as a desirable value, in relation to the scenario about a child's misconduct)*

Comparing now the occurrences of specific values between the desired and desirable sub-categories, it seems that the value of carefulness, meaning here the careful handling of an issue and the also careful design of the steps to solve it, was evident exclusively in the scenarios about difficult issues. In the latter, the value of holding somebody responsible was also expressed more times. Another similarity between the two sub-categories of values was the more references of solving the problem in the structured hypothetical stories. On the contrary, prevention did not occur as a desirable in the unstructured problems at all, unlike the sub-category of the desired values. In this study, the value of prevention meant taking of all the necessary safety measures before a problem will arise to minimize the possibilities for its occurrence.

### **The Direct Principals' Values Referred by Them**

After the analysis of the principals' answers to the direct questions about their values, two sub-categories were emerged: (a) the desired/personal values, and (b) the desirable values for other principals.

#### **The desired/personal values**

When the principals were explicitly asked about their values, the majority referred to the values of consequences for immediate clients and collaboration. Almost all of them stated that they always take into consideration the effects that their decisions will have particularly to students and staff, while they manage their school and decide. For many principals, a specific desired purpose was to create a positive school climate for educators to work and for children to learn and be nurtured.



On the contrary, the value of collaboration was a mean through which the principals will be helped to manage the school and also a purpose to be achieved, although in this collaboration they included only parents and educators, but not their superiors.

Some respondents advocated that their personally preferred behavior as principals were to “fulfill the responsibilities and obligations from their position” (specific role responsibilities), to connect the school with the local community, and try to “shape students’ attitudes” (nurturing), while others cited especially their love for children, integrity, and fairness.

Only few participants stated that they should help other educators, follow the laws, be punctual, innovative, democratic, and have a mission. The last value was emerged here for the first time and was referred to the specific goal, or image principals should strive to achieve for their school:

*“As a principal I should have a mission for my school. My mission is to accomplish the goal of the school which is the all-round development of students’ personality”.* (Participant 10, direct desired value)

#### **The desirable values for other principals**

The participants’ accounts for the way they wanted other principals to behave seemed congruent with their direct desired values, as the majority mentioned the consequences for immediate clients and collaboration again. However, this time many principals added the respect for others and democratic behavior. According to Participant 7: “A principal should be democratically governed”.

Furthermore, two principals cited the value of mission, while only few said the values of prevention, following the laws, and specific role responsibility.

#### **The Factors Affecting the Principals’ Personal Values**

The principals reported that the formation of their personal values has begun from their childhood and has evolved throughout their entire lives, with many people and circumstances having affected it. Each and every one of the participants advocated that when they were children their families, and especially their “parents”, were a critical factor transmitting to them, through nurturing, some core values they now embrace.

Despite their family in childhood, the family in adulthood was the second most recurring influential factor indicated by the informants. “Husband” and “wife” were equally mentioned by the female and male principals, respectively. To these respondents, marrying a different person and living together made them to set new priorities, to see the negative aspects of their character, and finally to adopt new desired behaviors. In a male principal’s words:

*“My wife, surely. Because you live together, there is an exchange. She takes some things from me, I take some things from her. Now I recognize things I hadn’t recognized before. I have accepted some positive characteristics”.* (Participant 2)

Two additional factors, equally recurring in the principals’ narratives, were their friends and the Christian religion. Few of those interviewed also indicated that their teachers in compulsory education had affected their values at a personal level. Other people less frequently mentioned were their colleagues and a godmother: “I have a wonderful ninety-year-old godmother, and I’m glad to hear her talking, she’s a wise woman who has enriched me lately a lot”. (Participant 11)

The quality of the above-mentioned people’s influence on principals’ personal values was also expressed, as it was for the better. Additionally, two of the principals spoke also about the prerequisites for a person’s values to be influenced by other individuals. Specifically, one of them stated that people have to be concerned about the effects of their actions on others while interacting, and to do constantly a personal introspection to change their values. The other respondent said that the critical moments in each person’s life when he/she wants to self-develop are responsible for him/her changing of values.

Finally, both all the choices having been taken by the informants during their entire lives and all their lived experiences contributed to their desired personal behavior, according to three participants.

#### **The Factors Affecting the Principals’ Professional Values**

##### **The factors influencing the development of the principals’ professional values**

According to principals’ accounts, various people and circumstances had also influenced the formation of their professional values.

The most cited influential people were their previous principals and vice-principals, and to a lesser extent other educators. But these previous principals hadn’t usually had a positive influence on them and only for three respondents they functioned as positive role models. As an interviewee put it:

*“The first principal I had had here at school when I first came, he was a pretty mild man... I liked the way he thought about the problems. When students came to his office for whatever reason, he never used to berate them. Instead, he tried to elicit from children their real problem. This principal influenced me a lot”.* (Participant 4)

In fact, for two of the above respondents these previous headteachers acted specifically as informal

mentors, because they had been advising the interviewees how the latter should behave towards children, parents, and educators, and how the participants should act in case they would take the principal's position.

However, almost half of the interviewees emphasized that previous principals acted as examples to be avoided. When the participants were educators, they negatively judged their previous immediate supervisors by observing how the latter oversaw the school function and handled people. The participants learned that it was undesired to be sneaky and authoritarian, as many problems would be arisen. The respondents also advocated their learning to behave as principals from how other educators in school criticized their supervisors during their conversations.

In response to the question "Do your supervisors (School Counselors, Chief Education Officers) influence your professional values?", a range of responses was elicited. Fewer than half claimed that their supervisors had no effect on their professional values, because the Greek State has not facilitated the collaboration and communication among Greek Educational Executives and has not delineated the upper educational administrative bodies' duties, too. Especially for the School Counselors, it was said that they were too few for schools to help principals with their duties, and therefore School Counselors cannot have an impact on the participants' behavior.

However, the principals also expressed their desire to be positively influenced by their superiors. They wanted from their supervisors to communicate with them frequently, to try to build positive relationships with schools, and to hold the values of collegiality and collaboration. Such supervisors' influence would have a remarkable difference in the principals' professional behavior, according to a male participant:

*"No, Chief Education Officers surely don't influence principals, despite being "assets" in education. Namely, if Chief Education Officers come close to schools, as some have done before, the picture when we need to apply things will be completely different. When I see a Chief Education Officer who is near me and cares about my school, even if I have a negative legislation to apply, I will see it very differently". (Participant 3)*

Other participants advocated that School Counselors' and Chief Education Officers' character and the values they hold personally determined the quality of the relationship they would have with the respondents. If this relationship was positive, principals' professional values would be affected by superiors, otherwise not. Finally, from the rest of the informants, two advocated having been influenced

positively by their supervisors, while three referred to a negative affection. Especially, one male principal stressed that the reasons why he changed how he should behave towards his superiors were the arrogance and the individualism showed by some School Counselors when the latter was to assess educators and schools, a few years ago. Finally, few respondents also mentioned their teachers from tertiary education as influential people on the formation of their professional values.

Turning now to the circumstances, two most cited critical factors were their professional experience and their career path in the Greek educational administration. Namely, the principals in our study embraced their professional values through their tenure as vice-principals or in other upper administrative positions, by their participation in trade unions in education, and through their interactions and conversations with other principals.

Several interviewees described that "the post-training and the reeducation as part of their lifelong learning" helped them get feedback and change some professional practices, while for some others the working experience in non-educational settings and the parental perspective of school affected their desired professional behavior. Furthermore, two informants added the negative experiences and personal events from their own school years, and the participation in fellowships of local community.

### **The critical incidents that changed the principals' professional values**

When the participants were asked whether there had been critical incidents that during their tenure changed the way they should behave in their work, most respondents, and especially males, had negative incidents to share. These incidents usually altered the principals' desired behavior towards other people, and therefore, the interviewees changed their priorities and their goals when they interact with other humans related to schools. For example, a male respondent said that the way that the previous principal of his school handled a child's misconduct made him more cautious with solving children's problems.

Some interviewees also referred to their mistreatment by their colleagues, the devious behavior of other educators, and to their co-workers' negative criticisms about some elements of their character. Many respondents added the principals' selection from the Teachers' Associations legislated by the Greek State, as a factor provoking changes in their professional values. This new policy for a female principal was associated especially with some of her colleagues' ingratitude:

*"I support my colleague, even risking my career. So...when the Teachers' Associations began to decide the selection of a principal, there were colleagues that, even though I had supported them putting myself in lots*

*of danger, they didn't vote for me. Although these educators had been absent for a long time from school for personal reasons, and I had covered them, because they hadn't been entitled to time off, they didn't vote for me as they said I hadn't been a good principal... they had the audacity to tell me... I understood that people are ungrateful and I should always be fully formally and legally vested, because I realized that if something went wrong, they would leave me alone... This bothered me; it hurt me". (Participant 8)*

Interestingly, during the interviews, in the principals' descriptions about the negative critical incidents negative feelings, such as sadness or frustration, were evident in their facial expressions. This was also obvious to some participants who, although admitted that they had experienced negative incidents, they did not want to share these issues. In addition, a female informant described a last painful situation where she did not find support from her superiors despite her expectations, when she was falsely accused of having stolen the school money by her colleague.

However, only two female informants stressed that the more gaining of experience and the maternity positively affected their professional values and made them more patient, especially with children.

### **The Importance of Values in Educational Administration**

All the principals in our study emphasized that indeed school administrators' value orientations have a pivotal role in the way they apply the administration in schools. The specific influenced domains that were mentioned by the majority of the respondents were the decision-making process, the solving-problems process, the school leader's behavior to staff, and the leader's communication with the people related to school units. Some interviewees added that their values influence the culture of their schools. On the other hand, especially for two principals, the exercising leadership style is the outcome of the application of a leader's values, which consequently affects the school function. To a male participant's words:

*"The importance of values in educational administration is evident in leadership style. That's why there is the authoritarian leadership or the democratic leadership. I have heard that in some schools there are daily conflicts due to their principals' behavior... An authoritarian leader provokes a negative reaction that impacts on school function" (Participant 2).*

### **DISCUSSION**

The present study examined the Greek elementary school principals' values expressed both indirectly, while they took decisions upon six hypothetical scenarios (vignettes), and directly, while they answered direct questions about their values. We

were interested in exploring not only how principals prefer personally to behave (desired/personal values), but also what they value for other principals in school administration (desirable/professional norms). Our aim was also to investigate the principals' opinions about the factors affecting principals' personal and professional values, and about the importance of values in educational administration. In relation to the research questions, five main categories were emerged: the indirect principals' values gathered from vignettes; the direct principals' values referred by them; the factors affecting the principals' personal values; the factors affecting the principals' professional values; and the importance of values in educational administration.

Overall, the application of vignette technique in conjunction with the working value definition indicated that the principals' values were manifested in their decisions in relation to the scenarios, similarly with other studies [7].

The most manifested values consistently found, both directly and indirectly, as desired and desirable values, were the consequences for immediate clients (students, staff, and parents) [11, p. 141] and collaboration. This means that the participated principals found as the most significant for themselves when they decided to consider the consequences that their decisions, actions, or behaviors would have mainly on students, and also on educators, and parents (value of consequences), and to collaborate with others to accomplish a mutual aim (value of collaboration). The above mentioned values were also considered by the principals as the most social desirable in school administration. The prevalence of consequences in educational administrators' values is well established by other researchers [3,8,9], and according to Begley [8], it is due to the obligations and accountability accompanying the principal's position that values of consequences are manifested more. Additionally, the value of collaboration was also found by Lazaridou [10] to be one of the most prevalent in effective principals' problem solving. However, for this specific value type an interesting finding was emerged in our study, as, while the principals indirectly manifested as desired the collaboration with all the people related to school including their superiors, their collaboration with superiors was not referred as desired by the principals at all in the direct exploration. But, given the fact that a convincing explanation cannot be given by the data because different motives could have provoked this value, and that this study is a first attempt for the description only of Greek school principals' values, future research needs to examine this topic in Greece, by using the Hodgkinson's model of motivational bases.

Nevertheless, the emerged indifference between the values mentioned by the majority of the participants as desired and those mentioned as desirable values or norms indicates that to a degree the

principals' personal values conform to what they think as ethically right in school administration. This may contribute to better understanding among principals and respectively, to their positive relationships. However, there were also some deviations between the desired and desirable values, gathered both directly and indirectly, and therefore this is an issue for future research.

Our findings also indicated that the most manifested desired values indirectly in vignettes were to a great extent consistent with those mostly expressed explicitly as desired by the principals. However, the value of knowledge, which was also one of the most referred both as a desired and desirable value indirectly, was not mentioned by the participants in the direct exploration at all. Therefore, although the above indifference between indirect and direct values may suggest that the participants were aware about their embraced values, or to put it differently, they tried consciously to use their desired values during their decisions in scenarios; this was not the case for other values. The latter may be because in the indirect investigation of values the principals had to decide in context-bound situations rather than answer generally about their values. This may also be explained by the potential bias in the interviews in conjunction with the discrepancy between the "espoused values" and "theories in use", which are the values that people say that they hold and the values they embrace in reality respectively [19].

In view of the latter, and given the fact that extreme caution must be paid in relating desired values to actual values-led behavior, a significant implication both for future studies and for practitioners is the incorporation of value analysis in daily administrative practice through action research [3]. The implementation of vignette technique combined in an action research design as developed by Angelides and Gibbs [43, p. 115], may contribute to this direction. More specifically, according to the above scholars' design, a principal can work with an inspector or academic who serves as "a critical friend", and together they can reflect and analyze a vignette designed by the latter, after his/her observing the actual administrative practice. Respectively, improvements can be designed. This personalized design for professional development coupled with a value analysis is recommended here for principals' value awareness and the subsequent conscious application of principals' values to school administration. The latter can be effective also because Baig [24] suggested that principals' personal values and their subsequent leadership are influenced by their personal background and the characteristics of community and school.

A last note here about values is that in contrast with CEOs in Leithwood and Steinbach' [11] study, our principals manifested more values in the

structured/easier scenarios than in the unstructured/more difficult scenarios of vignettes, as well as unlike the CEOs in the aforementioned study, our principals when they faced the unstructured scenarios seemed to be a little reluctant while taking a decision. Therefore, a possible explanation for the fewer occurrences of values in unstructured scenarios might be explained by the seriousness of the stories, which is enhanced by the fact that principals exclusively in the unstructured situations manifested the value of carefulness. Nevertheless, more research on values in different situations is suggested.

Turning now to the factors affecting principals' personal values, interestingly, many of the propositions found in the literature were emerged. According to our data, the value formation was considered an evolving process throughout the participants' lives, which began early in their childhood where some of their core values influenced mostly by their parents, through nurturing, and by their friends [27]. Their family and friends in their adulthood were also mostly referred as influential, whereas the Christian religion was mentioned by many principals, too. Relating these findings to the Hodgkinson's model about the sources of values set forth in the 'Literature Section', it becomes apparent that the principals' personal values were mostly influenced by collective groups, where family and friends are included, and from religion being Hodgkinson's transcendental ring [3]. In general lines, our findings corroborate previous results about people having affected the values of CEOs in Ontario [12], but what was novel here was the reference of a godmother by one principal.

Regarding principals' professional values, a common finding was that their professional character was mainly shaped by their professional experience, their career path in the Greek educational administration, and through their conversations and interactions with other principals. Additionally, the principals' professional values were influenced by their immediate supervisors (principals, vice principals) when they were educators, and in an indirect manner by the participants' observing and their subsequent judgements about their supervisors' administrative practice and behavior. However, our participants had not been influenced positively by their supervisors and only for a minority the latter had served as a positive role model or informal mentors. Interestingly, the respondents held similar assumptions for their upper administrators' (School Counselors, Chief Education Officers) influence on their professional values. Some principals stated that their superiors had either negative or no influence at all on their values, because the Greek State has not promoted the collaboration and communication between principals and their superiors, whereas others emphasized that their supervisors influenced the principals only in case of a positive relationship with them, which depended on their



superiors' characters and values. Indeed, MacTavish and Kolb [44] pointed out that the value orientations of those who are lower in organizational rank are influenced by their supervisors when they have a positive relationship.

The above findings clearly indicate the crucial importance of values in educational administration and have significant implications for policy makers. One implication is that a value analysis should be incorporated into educational leaders' selection process, as by that way collaboration and positive relationship among them may be ensured. A second important implication is that values and value analysis should be included in all educational administrators' formal training [9]. As for the latter our findings are optimistic, because the participants clearly stressed that they changed some professional values by their post-training and reeducation. The educational leaders' training in values may help them both understand the consequences of their values on their colleagues, and also to instill their values consciously to the culture of their organization. Besides, the importance of values in educational administration was also recognized by the principals themselves not only in this research, but also in another one that we have conducted [45].

As for the critical incidents which were mentioned as having changed the principals' professional desired way of conduct during their tenure, these were diverse, similarly with the study of Strauss [12] about CEOs in Ontario. Furthermore, these incidents were negative in majority and they referred mainly be men. Such incidents were the educators' devious behavior, the no superiors' support when a principal was accused of stealing the school money, or the change of the educational policy when principals were selected by the Teacher's Associations. On the other hand, only two women referred that the more experience and the maternity changed positively their professional values, which might be associated with the "tendency for female school leaders to embed their professional lives in their personal experiences" [21].

However, the findings in this study are subject to at least three limitations. First, our findings cannot be generalized to principals outside the Greek educational administrative system. These findings should also be interpreted with caution, because our sample was small and from one Greek district only. Therefore, future studies about Greek principals' values in different districts and with larger sample are recommended. Thirdly, it is important to bear in mind the possible bias in principals' responses, too.

Despite the limitations, our study meets the need for international research data in the field of educational administration [22]. Furthermore, our research provides both additional evidence with respect to the importance of values in the aforementioned

domain and primary findings to a neglected area about the sources of values. Finally, this research makes a strong recommendation for a value analysis to be included both in principals' selection and training.

### Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all the Principals that accepted to participate in this research, despite their workload. Without their help this work would have never been possible.

### REFERENCES

1. Begley, P. T. (2001). In pursuit of authentic school leadership practices. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(4), 353-365.
2. Ribbins, P. (1999). Foreword. In P. T. Begley & P. E. Leonard (Eds.), *The values of educational administration* (pp. ix-xvii). London: Falmer Press.
3. Begley, P. T. (2000). Values and leadership: Theory development, new research, and an agenda for the future. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XLVI( 3), 233-249.
4. Richmon, M. J. (2004). Values in educational administration: Them's fighting words!. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 7(4), 339-356.
5. Begley, P. (2001). *Values in educational leadership: Do they really matter?*. Retrieved from [http://research.acer.edu.au/apc\\_monographs/1/](http://research.acer.edu.au/apc_monographs/1/)
6. Branson, C. M. (2004). *An exploration of the concept of values-led principalship* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Australian Catholic University. Retrieved from <http://researchbank.acu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1095&context=theses>
7. Keast, D. A. (1996). Values in the decision making of CEOs in public colleges. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 26(1), 1-34.
8. Begley, P. T. (1988). The Influence of Values on Principals' Problem-Solving Processes: An Empirical Study.
9. Law, L. Y. S., Walker, A., & Dimmock, C. (2003). The influence of principals' values on their perception and management of school problems. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(5), 498-523.
10. Lazaridou, A. (2007). Values in principals' thinking when solving problems. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(4), 339-356.
11. Leithwood, K., & Steinbach, R. (1991). Components of Chief Education Officers' problem solving processes. In K. Leithwood & D. Musella (Eds.), *Understanding School System Administration: Studies of the Contemporary Chief Education Officer* (pp. 136-162). London: The Falmer Press. Retrieved from ERIC database.
12. Strauss, T. (1998). *The nature and role of Chief Education Officers' values* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from [tspace.library.utoronto.ca](http://tspace.library.utoronto.ca).



13. Moorhead, R., & Nediger, W. (1991). The impact of values on a principal's daily activities. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 29(2), 5-24.
14. Leithwood, K. (1999). An organizational perspective on values for leaders of future schools. *Values and educational leadership*, 25-50.
15. Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational leadership: The moral art*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
16. Day, C., Harris, A., & Hadfield, M. (2001). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(1), 39-56.
17. Bush, T., & Middlewood, D. (2005). *Leading and managing people in education*. London: Sage.
18. Hargreaves, D. (2004). Helping practitioners explore their school's culture. In M. Preedy, R. Glatter, & C. Wise (Eds.), *Strategic Leadership and Educational Improvement* (pp. 109-122). London: The Open University in association with Paul Chapman publishing.
19. Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
20. Kasten, K. L., & Ashbaugh, C. R. (1991). The place of values in superintendents' work. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 29(3), 54-66.
21. Campbell, C., Gold, A., & Lunt, I. (2003). Articulating leadership values in action: Conversations with school leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 6(3), 203-221.
22. Walker, A. D. (2003). Developing cross-cultural perspectives on education and community. In P. T. Begley & O. Johansson (Eds.), *The Ethical Dimensions of School Leadership* (pp. 145-160). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
23. Altun, S. A. (2003). Eğitim yönetimi ve değerler. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(1), 7-17.
24. Baig, S. (2011). The personal values of school leaders in Pakistan: A contextual model of regulation and influence. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, 4(2), 26-38.
25. Notman, G. R. (2005). *The principal as a person: A study of values in secondary school leadership* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from mro.massey.ac.nz.
26. Mueller, R. A. (2013). *Models of organizational values in the administration of university student services* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://ecommons.usask.ca/bitstream/handle/10388/ETD-2013-10-1095/MUELLER-DISSERTATION.pdf?sequence=3>
27. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
28. Minkov, M. (2013). *Cross-cultural analysis: The science and art of comparing the world's modern societies and their cultures*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
29. Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
30. Bednarek-Gilland, A. (2015). *Researching values with qualitative methods: Empathy, moral boundaries and the politics of research*. England & USA: Ashgate.
31. Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 351-389.
32. Haydon, G. (2007). *Values for educational leadership*. London: Sage.
33. Ritchie, J. (2003). The applications of qualitative methods to social research. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers* (pp. 24-46). London: Sage publications.
34. Creswell, J. W. (2011). *I erevna stin ekpaidefsi: Schediasmos, diexagogi kai axiologisi tis posotikis kai poiitikis 'erevnas* (Ii elliniki ekdosi) (Research in education: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research) (Ch. Tsormpatzoudis, Epim.; N. Kouvarakou, Metaf.). Athina: ion/ Ekdoseis Ellin.
35. Koini Ypourgiki Apofasi ar.F.3/897/97652/G1/25-9-2006, F.E.K. 1507/2006,t.V', "Arithmos mathiton ana Taxi i Tmima Taxis sto Dimotiko Scholeio (Number of students per class or class department in elementary school)".
36. Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
37. Suter, W. N. (2011). *Introduction to educational research: A critical thinking approach*. SAGE publications.
38. Pasiardis, P. (2004). *Ekpaideftiki igesia: Apo tin periodo tis evmenous adiaforias sti synchroni epochi* (Educational leadership: From the period of the benign indifference in modern times). Athina: Metaichmio.
39. Stravakou, P. A., & Lozgka, E. C. (2018). Vignettes in qualitative educational research: Investigating Greek school principals' values. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(5), 1188-1207.
40. Barter, C. A., & Renold, E. (1999). The use of vignettes in qualitative research. *Social Research Update*, 25.
41. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Methodologia ekpaideftikis erevnas* [Educational research methodology] (S. Kyranakis, M. Mavraki, Ch. Mitsopoulou, P. Bithara, & M. Filopoulou, Metaf.). Athina: Metaichmio.
42. Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
43. Angelides, P., & Gibbs, P. (2006). Supporting the continued professional development of teachers through the use of vignettes. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33(4), 111-121.

44. MacTavish, M. D., & Kolb, J. A. (2008). An Examination of the Dynamics of Organizational Culture and Values-Based Leader Identities and Behaviors: One Company's Experience. *Online Submission*.
45. Stravakou, P. A., Lozgka, E. C., & Melissopoulos, S. (2018). The influence of values on educational administration: The school principals' perspective. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 6(4), 147-160.