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Abstract
The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations. The participants of the study were a total of 452 teacher candidates studying in the pedagogical formation program of Karabük University in the 2016-2017 academic year. The Leadership Orientations Scale and Portrait Values Scale were employed to gather the research data. In data analysis, arithmetic mean, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, and Multilinear Regression Analysis were used. According to the results, the teacher candidates' preferences of values were universalism, security, conformity and benevolence, self-direction, stimulation, traditionalism, hedonism, achievement and power in order of importance, respectively. The highest level of leadership orientation that the teacher candidates had was in the human resources frame, which was followed by structural, symbolic and political frames. Positive and significant relationships were revealed between all dimensions of individual values and those of leadership orientations. The individual values of power and achievement were found to be predictors of structural, symbolic and political frames. Two of the remaining individual values, self-direction and benevolence, were found to be significant and common predictors of all frames of leadership orientations. The findings revealed from the present study were discussed with reference to the literature, and various inferences were made.
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1. Introduction
Values are significant sources of motivation in individuals' behaviours, and enable them to make sense of their behaviours (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998; Homer & Kahle, 1988; Papagiannakis & Lioukas, 2012; Ehrhart & Klein, 2001). When values are internalised, they start to direct individuals' actions and behaviours, either consciously or unconsciously (Bruno & Lay, 2008). There are important causal relationships between individual values and the behaviours performed (Homer & Kahle, 1988), and human behaviours are explained based on these values (Güngör, 1993). One of the variables that is argued to be related to the connection between behaviours and values is the area of leadership. In this sense, individual values are regarded as important in the literature on leadership (Burns, 1978; Michie & Gooty, 2005; Sosik, 2005; Grojean, Resick, Dickson & Smith, 2004). Studies that focus on leadership show that one of the vital characteristics in effective leadership is individual values, and leaders have strong individual values, principles and ethics (Graber & Killpatrick, 2008). Besides, individual values are also key to leaders' choices, decisions, actions, and evaluation of events and people (Byrne & Bradley, 2007). Therefore, examining the relationships between individual values and leadership orientations are seen to have significance.

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

2. Individual Values
Values are norms or principles that are used to explain human behaviours (Güngör, 1993), have varying degrees of importance and direct life (Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess & Harris, 2001), affect individuals' preferences and guide them (Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1975), and are accepted by individuals in social life (Kılıç, 2011). Values are regarded as social norms in sociology, as elements that reveal personal attitudes and explain
behaviours in psychology, and as the essence that constitute culture by anthropologists (Sağnak, 2004). They are seen as concepts that guide individuals and make them parts of the society (Aktay & Ekşi, 2009). Different individual values form individuals’ reasons of motivation for their priorities (Cartwright, 2007). When individuals are aware of their values, how they would react to different situation can be predicted (Gibb, 2010).

Values are higher-order structures that direct individuals’ attitudes and behaviours without depending on certain situations or conditions (Schwartz, 1996). According to these perspectives, values have a special place in social life as well as in individuals' life. It can then be argued that individual values have important functions for the continuity and peace of the existing social structure.

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

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

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

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

3. Leadership framework

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2.1. Leadership Orientations Scale (LOS)
This scale was developed by Bolman and Deal (1991) and adapted to Turkish by Dereli (2003). The scale aimed to determine school principals' leadership orientations. However, it was tested for validity and reliability with different groups of samples (Arslan & Usu, 2014; Güngör, 1993 ). In the scale that consisted of 31 items and four frames, a five-point scale including ratings ranging from “(1) Never” to “(5)Always” was used. The frames were the structural frame, human resources frame, political frame and symbolic frame. Each frame contained eight items. The higher the scores in the frames are, the better the leadership characteristic is. All items contained positive statements. In Bolman (2010), the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were found to be .92 for the structural frame,.93 for the symbolic frame,.91 for the political frame, and .93 for the human resources frame. The structural frame highlights bureaucratic characteristics, hierarchy and responsibilities. The human resources frame features the needs and motivation. The political frame emphasises conflict resolution and mutual understanding. The symbolic frame points out organisational values and culture, and shared values (Dereli, 2003). In this study, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed to determine the validity of LOS. The fit indices were found not to be at the sufficient level, and thus, Items 7 and 8 from the Structural Frame, Items 10 and 12 from the Symbolic Frame, Item 22 from the Political Frame and Item 32 from the Human Resources
Frame were excluded as a result of the DFA. After the exclusion of these items, it was seen that the four-dimension structure showed acceptable fit to the data, \( \chi^2=767.06; p < .05; \text{sd} = 286; \chi^2/\text{sd} = 2.68; \text{RMSEA} = .061; \text{CFI} = .87; \text{GFI} = .87 \). Consequently, the structural and symbolic frames contained six items each, whereas the political frame had seven items and the human resources frame eight items. For this study, the factor loadings of the scale items ranged between .47 and .68. Reliability was re-examined for the study. The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients were calculated as .72 for the structural frame, .77 for the symbolic frame, .77 for the political frame, and .78 for the human resources frame. The reliability value for the whole scale was found to be .91. Evaluating the results of the analyses as a whole, it was concluded that the scale was a valid and reliable tool that can be used to gather data.

4.2.2. Portrait Values Scale (PVS)

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

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

4.2.3. Data Analysis

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

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

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

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

5.1. Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations Between Variables
Means, standard deviations and the correlations between the variables are given in Table 1

Table 1. Correlation matrix for individual values and leadership orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.Structural</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Symbolic</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Political</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Human resources</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ends values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Achievement</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Universalism</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Traditionalism</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.Power</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Security</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Hedonism</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.Conformity</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.Self-direction</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.Stimulation</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.Benevolence</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

There were also positive and significant relationships between the their scores in the symbolic frame, and those in the achievement dimension ($r = .38$, $p < .05$), in the universalism dimension ($r = .30$, $p < .05$), in the traditionalism dimension ($r = .21$, $p < .05$), in the power dimension ($r = .29$, $p < .05$), in the security dimension...
(r = .25, p < .05), in the hedonism dimension (r = .28, p < .05), in the conformity dimension (r = .31, p < .05), in the self-direction dimension (r = .39, p < .05), in the stimulation dimension (r = .33, p < .05), and in the benevolence dimension (r = .35, p < .05).

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

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

5.2. Prediction of Leadership Orientations

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

Table 2. Regression analysis for the prediction of leadership orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables (Portrait values)</th>
<th>Structural frame</th>
<th>Symbolic frame</th>
<th>Political frame</th>
<th>Human resources frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

The teacher candidates' individual values together showed a significant relationship with the leadership orientation of human resources, (R = .59, p < .05). These predictive variables explained 35% of the variance in the human resources frame. The individual values of universalism, self-direction and benevolence were significant predictors of the human resources frame. The results of standardised regression showed that the relative order of importance for individual values over the human resources frame was universalism (β = .24, p < .05).
positive influence on the working environments at schools when they start the profession, and would also show that they care about the welfare of humanity, efforts for justice and conformity in all areas. Besides, their perceptions of achievement and power at a low level may show that they care more about working for the benefit of people, rather than for superiority over them. Teaching is a profession that can only be practised with the love of this profession, in which the feeling of serving people is experienced intensely, and that is towards providing material and spiritual well-being to individuals. Furthermore, there were also factors affecting the teacher candidates' preferences of values. Values develop in cultural environments, are formed based on what is cared about, and what is not, in that culture, and are learned as of childhood (Şişman, 1994). Values emerge culturally and reveal a preference (Gudmundsdottir, 1991), and constitute the basic characteristics of culture (Hofstede, 1980). In a study, on South Africans, Indians and Europeans, Furnham (1984), found that the importance attached to values changed based on historical, political and socio-cultural differences. Europeans highlighted friendship and love, whereas South Africans featured equality and peace. Accordingly, it can be argued that due to their preferences of the values of universalism, conformity and benevolence at a high level, they would have a positive influence on the working environments at schools when they start the profession, and would also support the activities towards cooperation and interaction with colleagues, taking care of students, taking part in collaborative practices at school and increasing the quality of education.

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

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

In the study, the relationships between teacher candidates' individual values and leadership orientations
were investigated. Positive and significant relationships were revealed between all dimensions of individual
values and those of leadership orientations. There were positive and significant relationships between the
individual values of achievement, universalism, traditionalism, power, security, hedonism, conformity, self-
direction, stimulation and benevolence, and the leadership orientations of structural, symbolic, political and
human resources frames. In other words, an increase in one of the variables led to an increase in the other
variable, or the vice versa, a decrease in a variable led to a decrease in the other variable. In this regard, teacher
candidates' individual values seem to be an important variable in enhancing their leadership orientations.

In the literature, there are similar results showing that individual values are related to leadership. Illies and Reiter-
Palmon (2008) reported that power, achievement and hedonism were effective in leadership, whereas Sosik
(2005) found that traditionalism, cooperative working, self-transcendence and self-enhancement were positively
related to charismatic leadership. Groves and LaRocca (2012) revealed that the values of self-enhancement,
openness to novelty, self-transcendence and collective working were positively related to transformational
leadership. Agrawal and Krishnan (2000) stated that the values of power, achievement and benevolence were
significant variables in effective leadership. Individual values are regarded as important in the literature on
leadership (Burns, 1978; Michie & Gooty, 2005; Sosik, 2005; Grojean, Resick, Dickson & Smith, 2007). These
values are deemed as vital in the selection of leaders and evaluating differences (Byrne & Bradley, 2007). Besides,
they are important motivational tools for leadership (Shamir, 1990). Consequently, individual values
are said to be significant variables in leadership orientations, and thus in making sense of the problems
encountered within the organisation and ensuring the solutions. Considering that schools face different
problems today, it can be inferred that leadership orientations, and thus individual values as a related variable,
are influential in the solution of these problems.

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

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