

AN EXPLORATION OF THE CONCEPT OF VALUES-LED PRINCIPALSHIP

Submitted by

**Christopher Michael Branson M.Ed.St., B.Ed., Grad. Dip. Ed. Admin.,
Dip.T., Grad. Cert. Arts (Theol.), MACE, MACEA**

**A thesis submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements of the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**School of Educational Leadership
Faculty of Education**

Australian Catholic University
Research Services
Locked Bag 4115
Fitzroy
Victoria 3065
Australia

October 2004

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP AND SOURCES

This thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgement in the main text of the thesis.

This thesis has not been submitted for the award of any degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

All research procedures reported in the thesis received the approval of the relevant Ethics/Safety Committees (where required).

Signed: _____ Date: _____
C.M. Branson

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research study was to understand better and reconstruct the concept of values-led principalship. In recent times, in response to constant change and uncertainty, there has been a consistent call for a new form of principalship: values-led principalship. Principals are now being urged to allow values to shape their principalship behaviour. In short, values-led behaviour is said to afford the principal the means of providing appropriate school leadership in unpredictable, and even ambiguous, times.

However, the assertion that values can play a positive role in a principal's performance needs to be substantiated. Despite their innate appeal, the nature and function of values in human endeavours remains somewhat unclear. This research study seeks to redress this lack of understanding by investigating how knowing personal values might help the principal to be led by these values and, thereby, be able to act more effectively as an educational leader.

To this end, this research study is situated within the research paradigm of pragmatic constructivism and informed by the theoretical perspective of symbolic interactionism. The orchestrating perspective was case study with the boundaries of the case defined in terms of the system of secondary schools operating under the auspices of the Catholic Archdiocese of Brisbane. This case study included an open-ended questionnaire, two closed questionnaires, and a series of three semi-structured interviews with five principals.

This research study began with a comprehensive review of literature from psychology, ethics and values theory to establish the relationship between values and behaviour. This review highlighted five important insights in respect to personal values. First, personal values are formed during the general experiences of life. Second, these personal values influence behaviour. Third, personal values are subjective inner-world phenomena that are more likely to be tacit and subliminal influences upon one's behaviour. Fourth, having knowledge of one's own personal values is not a natural or a common occurrence and the gaining of this particular form of self-knowledge is difficult and requires effort and appropriate processes. Finally, the appropriate process for gaining self-knowledge of one's personal values is through self-reflection and introspection.

Based on these insights, the researcher identified four research questions.

1. How knowledgeable are the principals of their own personal values?
2. How have the personal values of the principals been formed?
3. Can a principal gain increased self-knowledge of his or her personal values and the relationship of these personal values to his or her educational leadership behaviour?
4. Does an increased level of self-knowledge of personal values bring about values-led principalship?

In general, the findings of this research study suggest that values-led principalship is a simplistic conceptualisation that does not reflect the complex relationships between the inner Self and behaviour. The concept of values-led principalship assumes self-knowledge of personal values and the deliberate application of this knowledge to influence personal

behaviour. By not considering the formation of personal values and the inner antecedents of personal values within the Self, any self-knowledge of one's personal values remains notional. Notional self-knowledge maintains the tacit, subliminal influence of personal values on behaviour. Thus, personal values are directing or driving behaviour resulting in values-driven rather than values-led principalship.

From an instrumental perspective, this finding raises a number of issues in respect to the professional development of principals. As a consequence, the following propositions are advanced:

1. The professional development of principals should prepare them to incorporate regular self-reflective and introspective practices;
2. The professional development of principals should challenge them to develop a rich knowledge of their inner Self;
3. The professional development of principals should assist them to appreciate how their whole life experience is woven into their leadership behaviour; and
4. Contemporary principals require formal professional mentoring programmes to assist them to more truly clarify and understand the antecedents of their leadership behaviours.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with sincere and heartfelt gratitude that I acknowledge the invaluable contribution made by my supervisor at the Australian Catholic University, Dr Gayle Spry, towards the completion of this thesis. It was a privilege to have had the support and guidance of such a dedicated, knowledgeable, understanding, interested, and enthusiastic supervisor. Similarly, I wish to warmly acknowledge the wisdom and encouragement regularly afforded to me by my co-supervisor at the Australian Catholic University, Associate Professor Denis McLaughlin. Their exemplary supervision not only enabled me to gain purpose, confidence, clarity and inspiration in my exploration of the concept of values-led principalship but also ensured that this research study was a stimulating, beneficial and positive learning experience.

Also, I am exceedingly grateful to the Executive Director of Brisbane Catholic Education, Mr David Hutton, for allowing me to conduct this research study within the secondary schools under his direction within the Archdiocese of Brisbane. Moreover, I wish to thank my colleagues, the Principals in these Catholic secondary schools, for their unfailing support, interest and willingness to participate in my research study.

Finally, I thank my wife, Sue, and my daughters, Philippa and Courtney, for their patience, tolerance, interest, understanding, and encouragement throughout the considerable time it has taken to complete this research study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP	Page
	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF TABLES	xi
Chapter 1 - SETTING THE SCENE	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Research Problem	2
1.3 Purpose of the Research	3
1.4 Research Questions	4
1.5 Theoretical Framework	5
1.6 Design of the Study	8
1.7 Significance of this Study	9
1.8 Limitations of this Study	10
1.9 The Outline of this Thesis	11
Chapter 2 - CLARIFYING THE RESEARCH PROBLEM : THE CONTEXT OF PRINCIPALSHIP	14
2.1 Introduction	14
2.2 Societal Change	16
2.3 Organizational Theory	18
2.4 Leadership Theory	21
2.5 Economic Rationalism	24
2.6 Educational Reform	26
2.7 Educational Administration	29
2.8 Contemporary Research	32
2.9 Conclusion	34

Chapter 3 - TOWARDS THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS : UNDERSTANDING VALUES-LED BEHAVIOUR	37
3.1 Introduction	37
3.2 Describing Values	37
3.3 How Personal Values Influence Behaviour	40
3.3.1 Self Concept	41
3.3.2 Self-Esteem	42
3.3.3 Motives	43
3.3.4 Personal Values	44
3.3.5 Beliefs	51
3.3.6 Behaviours	52
3.4 Gaining Self-Knowledge of Personal Values	53
3.5 A Conceptual Framework	55
3.6 Identifying the Research Questions	58
3.7 Conclusion	60
Chapter 4 - IDENTIFYING THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	62
4.1 Introduction	62
4.2 Pragmatic Constructivism	62
4.3 Symbolic Interactionism	68
4.4 Case Study	72
4.5 Conclusion	74
Chapter 5 - THE DESIGN OF THIS STUDY	76
5.1 Introduction	76
5.2 The Design of the Study	77
5.2.1 Open-ended Questionnaire	78
5.2.2 Closed Questionnaire	79
5.2.3 Semi-Structured Interviews	83
5.3 Specific Details of the Research Design	87
5.3.1 Participants	87
5.3.2 The Researcher	90
5.3.3 The Data Collection, Analysis and Interpretation Procedures	92
5.3.4 Validity Issues	97
5.3.5 Ethical Considerations	99
5.4 Conclusion	101

Chapter 6 - DISPLAYING THE DATA	102
6.1 Introduction	102
6.2 The Exploration Data	102
6.2.1 Data Gained from Step 1 – the Values Nomination Questionnaire	103
6.2.2 Data Gained from Step 2 – the Leadership Practices Inventory	104
6.2.3 Data Gained from Step 3 – the Values Selection Questionnaire	106
6.2.4 Data Gained from Step 4 – the Initial Semi-Structured Interview	109
6.3 The Inspection Data	111
6.3.1 Data Gained from Step 5 – the Analysis and Synthesis of the Highest Ranked Leadership Behaviours	113
6.3.2 Data Gained from Step 6 – Recording Relevant Aspects of the Principal’s Personal History	116
6.3.3 Data Gained from Step 7 – Discovering the Associated Beliefs	119
6.3.4 Data Gained from Step 8 – the Visual Displays	126
6.4 Conclusion	137

Chapter 7 - DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS	138
7.1 Introduction	138
7.2 How knowledgeable are the principals about their personal values?	138
7.3 How have the personal values of the principals been formed?	148
7.4 Can a principal gain increased self-knowledge of his or her personal values and the relationship of these personal values to his or her educational leadership behaviour?	156
7.5 Does an increased level of self-knowledge of personal values have the potential to bring about values-led principalship?	162
7.6 Conclusion	166

Chapter 8 - REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS	169
8.1 Purpose of the Research	169
8.2 The Research Questions	171
8.3 The Theoretical Framework	172
8.4 The Design of the Study	175
8.5 Research Questions Answered	176
8.6 Conclusions from the Study	179
8.7 Propositions Resulting from the Study	180
8.8 Limitations of this Research Study	183
8.9 Recommendations for future research	186
8.10 Conclusion	188
APPENDICES	190
1. The Values Nomination Questionnaire	190
2. The Leadership Practices Inventory	191
3. The Values Selection Questionnaire	195
4. The guiding questions for the semi-structured interviews	196
5. Ethics Approval letter	198
6. Letter to the participants	201
7. Consent Form	203
REFERENCES	204

LIST OF FIGURES

	Description	Page
Figure 2.1	Significant variables in the context of principalship	15
Figure 3.1	A diagrammatical representation of the different sources of values (Source: Hodgkinson, 1996).	39
Figure 3.2	A diagrammatical representation of Hodgkinson's analytical model of personal values.	47
Figure 3.3	A diagrammatical representation of the various dimensions of the Self as presented by the literature, which shows how these dimensions are able to interact in order to influence a person's behaviour.	56
Figure 5.1	A diagrammatical representation of the cognitive processes used to code, sort, inspect, and visually display the data	93
Figure 6.1	A diagrammatical representation of the cognitive processes used to explore, inspect, and visually display the relationship between an individual's personal values and his or her educational leadership behaviours.	112
Figure 7.1	A display of the comparative level of each principal's self-knowledge of their personal values based on his or her ability to nominate all of their personal values relative to the expected number of 30 to 40 values.	139
Figure 7.2	A display of the respective number of personal values selected by each principal as compared to the maximum expected number of between 30 and 40 values.	141
Figure 7.3	A graph showing a comparison of the number of consistently identified personal values by each principal with the total number of personal values initially identified in the Values Nomination Questionnaire.	143

LIST OF TABLES

	Description	Page
Table 2.1	The current transformation in organizational culture (Source: Shriberg, Shriberg, & Lloyd, 2002, p. 212).	19
Table 4.1	An overview of the theoretical framework for this exploration of the concept of values-led principalship as developed in this chapter.	74
Table 5.1	Research methodology showing the multiple data collection methods.	78
Table 5.2	The schedule used for the semi-structured interviews.	83
Table 6.1	A composite listing of each principal's nominated personal values as recorded on their respective Values Nomination Questionnaire.	103
Table 6.2	The data gained from the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) for each of the participating principals.	105
Table 6.3(a)	The Selected and Added values chosen by Principal A.	107
Table 6.3(b)	The Selected and Added values chosen by Principal B.	107
Table 6.3(c)	The Selected and Added values chosen by Principal C.	108
Table 6.3(d)	The Selected and Added values chosen by Principal D.	108
Table 6.3(e)	The Selected and Added values chosen by Principal E.	109
Table 6.4	Confirmation and personal redefinition of the two key educational leadership behaviours nominated by each principal as being central to their principalship.	110
Table 6.5(a)	A display of the general and specific behaviours integral to the accomplishment of each of the two highest ranked leadership behaviours for Principal A.	113
Table 6.5(b)	A display of the general and specific behaviours integral to the accomplishment of each of the two highest ranked leadership behaviours for Principal B.	114
Table 6.5(c)	A display of the general and specific behaviours integral to the accomplishment of each of the two highest ranked leadership behaviours for Principal C.	114

Table 6.5(d)	A display of the general and specific behaviours integral to the accomplishment of each of the two highest ranked leadership behaviours for Principal D.	115
Table 6.5(e)	A display of the general and specific behaviours integral to the accomplishment of each of the two highest ranked leadership behaviours for Principal E.	115
Table 6.6(a)	Accounts from the personal history of Principal A that influences his/her particular choice of educational leadership behaviour.	117
Table 6.6(b)	Accounts from the personal history of Principal B that influences his/her particular choice of educational leadership behaviour.	117
Table 6.6(c)	Accounts from the personal history of Principal C that influences his/her particular choice of educational leadership behaviour.	118
Table 6.6(d)	Accounts from the personal history of Principal D that influences his/her particular choice of educational leadership behaviour.	118
Table 6.6(e)	Accounts from the personal history of Principal E that influences his/her particular choice of educational leadership behaviour.	119
Table 6.7(a)	Principal A's personal understandings about his/her leadership behaviour and the associated beliefs that support these behaviours.	121
Table 6.7(b)	Principal B's personal understandings about his/her leadership behaviour and the associated beliefs that support these behaviours.	122
Table 6.7(c)	Principal C's personal understandings about his/her leadership behaviour and the associated beliefs that support these behaviours.	123
Table 6.7(d)	Principal D's personal understandings about his/her leadership behaviour and the associated beliefs that support these behaviours.	124
Table 6.7(e)	Principal E's personal understandings about his/her leadership behaviour and the associated beliefs that support these behaviours.	125
Table 6.8(a)	The visual display of the first of Principal A's highest ranked leadership behaviours.	127

Table 6.8(b)	The visual display of the second of Principal A's highest ranked leadership behaviours.	128
Table 6.9(a)	The visual display of the first of Principal B's highest ranked leadership behaviours.	129
Table 6.9(b)	The visual display of the second of Principal B's highest ranked leadership behaviours.	130
Table 6.10(a)	The visual display of the first of Principal C's highest ranked leadership behaviours.	131
Table 6.10(b)	The visual display of the second of Principal C's highest ranked leadership behaviours.	132
Table 6.11(a)	The visual display of the first of Principal D's highest ranked leadership behaviours.	133
Table 6.11(b)	The visual display of the second of Principal D's highest ranked leadership behaviours.	134
Table 6.12(a)	The visual display of the first of Principal E's highest ranked leadership behaviours.	135
Table 6.12(b)	The visual display of the second of Principal E's highest ranked leadership behaviours.	136
Table 7.1	Values that were chosen by Principal C from the Values Selection Questionnaire list that are possible synonyms for personal values listed on the Values Nomination Questionnaire.	144
Table 7.2	List of Principal D's nominated values that were not added to the list of selected values.	145
Table 7.3	Values that were chosen by Principal D from the Values Selection Questionnaire list that are possible synonyms for personal values listed on the Values Nomination Questionnaire.	146

CHAPTER 1

SETTING THE SCENE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The impetus for this study was a pragmatic concern for effectiveness in principalship. I came to this study as a newly appointed principal¹, keen to demonstrate effectiveness in the position. Committed to learning more about the role of principal, I reflected on my experience of principalship. As a teacher, subject coordinator, pastoral coordinator, deputy principal, and school consultant, I had observed principals in action and had noticed different priorities and approaches to the role. Although these principals were aware of the developments in leadership theory, it was my experience that these theories did not appear to dominate their practice. Rather these theories were used in an eclectic fashion as principals made professional judgements about what aspects of leadership theories were pertinent to any given situation. For the most part, this approach seemed to work.

However, experienced and successful principals are now reporting that their job is getting harder. New demands from parents, policy-makers and the wider community seems to be restricting their professional judgement and leading to job dissatisfaction and levels of stress. In changing and uncertain times, principals are reporting new feelings of uncertainty, inadequacy and vulnerability. As a consequence, many are searching for new ways to understand their educational leadership role so as to rebuild their confidence, re-establish their purposefulness, and re-direct their principalship behaviours.

Educational administration is not work for the faint-hearted. It requires both brains and heart: brains because the problems of schooling ... present 'wicked problems' of enormous complexity requiring levels of understanding and analysis honed both by years of study and years of experience; heart because the key to responding to the challenges of the work is all about caring relationships. ... The work also requires courage and a tough skin because school leaders are attacked on all sides (Starratt, 2003, p. 242).

¹ The researcher was appointed to the position of principal of a co-educational secondary college administered by Brisbane Catholic Education in the Archdiocese of Brisbane to take effect as from 1st January 1997.

1.2 RESEARCH PROBLEM

Beyond my immediate experience of the principalship, I was also aware that leaders and managers, in general, were experiencing difficulty in changing and uncertain times. In 1992, The Commonwealth Government established the Karpin Task Force to investigate the ability of Australian industrial leaders to meet the challenges of the new century. In its final submission, *Report of the Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills* (1995), the Karpin Task Force concentrated on analysing the Australian situation, comparing Australia with international best practice, identifying trends and challenges that needed to be considered, and developing strategies for change. This report identified the global drivers of change as being: changing values and attitudes, the globalisation of markets, the customisation of products and services, new technology, and the importance of knowledge. In the light of these conclusions, it was the view of the Task Force that Australian industry needed to change its leadership paradigm.

Taking up this challenge, organizational theorists support the establishment of “developmental organizations” and “developmental leadership” (Gilley & Matycunich, 2000). This organizational form is built on the realization that corporate and individual goals are inextricably linked and that the best way to thrive in an uncertain environment is to ensure that every person in the organization is able to perform at their full potential. Thus, personal growth and development are given highest priority. To this end, developmental leaders need to engage the principle of “organizational consistency” through a process of “values alignment”. Here, the leaders’ guiding values are not only integrated with those of the organization but are also allied with a concern for employee growth and development. The developmental leader identifies personal values and beliefs, considers how these values and beliefs compare with the organizational goals, reflects on the impact of these values and beliefs upon employee growth and development, and makes adjustments so as to align personal values and beliefs with those of the organization and the needs of the employees. “Conducting a values alignment helps developmental leaders identify what is considered important – an essential element in making decisions that impact upon the well-being of the organization” (p. 81).

This notion of a developmental organization and developmental leadership has been accepted within the theory and practice of educational administration. Schools as

developmental organizations are said to require a new type of principal (Crowther, Kaagen, Ferguson, & Hann, 2002). Amongst other things, this new type of principal would be “values-led” (Day, 2000). In line with the principle of organizational consistency, and the process of values alignment, the values-led principal would be knowledgeable in respect to personal values and have a commitment to align these values with their behaviours. Here it is claimed that knowledge of personal values would help the principal to be led by these values and, thereby, be able to act more effectively as a principal. Exploring the accuracy of this perception became the focus of this study.

An initial review of the literature however, found that the concept of values-led principalship had been poorly researched. A review of the Educational Research Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) database revealed 9033 documents associated with the study of the role of the school principal. Of these, 3761 were written between 1990 and 2002 but only 70 focussed on values and principalship. Moreover, of these 70 studies only 3 studies (Campbell-Evans, 1991; Laible & Harrington, 1998; Moorhead & Nediger, 1991) document attempts to synthesize the array of personal values that influence a principal’s behaviour. This paucity of research in respect to the influence of personal values on principalship behaviour has been described as a “blank spot” (Heck & Hallinger, 1996; 1999) in educational leadership research. Elsewhere, this blank spot within educational leadership research has been considered undesirable and there has been a call to redress this omission through further research (Begley, 1996, 2000; Crowther, Hann, & Andrews, 2002; Strachan, 1999).

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this research study was to understand and reconstruct the concept of values-led principalship; how the knowing of personal values might help the principal to be led by these values and, thereby, be able to act more effectively. In particular, this research study investigated values-led principalship from the perspective of five secondary principals working in the system of schools under the auspices of the Catholic Archdiocese of Brisbane. By exploring each participating principal’s self-knowledge of their personal values and inspecting how these personal values influence his or her particular principalship behaviour, this research study has investigated a hitherto blank spot in educational leadership research.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions that guided this study were developed following a comprehensive review of literature in respect to values-led principalship, and focussed on the nature of personal values and their association with personal behaviour. Five important insights in respect to personal values were identified. First, personal values are formed during the general experiences of life. Second, these personal values influence behaviour. Third, personal values are subjective inner-world phenomena that are more likely to be tacit and subliminal influences upon one's behaviour. Fourth, having knowledge of one's own personal values is not a natural or a common occurrence and the gaining of this particular form of self-knowledge is difficult and requires effort and appropriate processes. Finally, it is proposed that self-reflection and introspection are appropriate processes for gaining self-knowledge of personal values.

Based on these insights, the researcher identified the following research questions:

Research Question 1: How knowledgeable are the principals about their own personal values?

This research question investigates the proposition in the literature that personal values are subliminal inner-world phenomena and as such, having self-knowledge of one's personal values is not a natural or a common occurrence (McGraw, 2001). A concern for the level of self-knowledge of personal values recognizes that the concept of values-led principalship is dependent upon the principal having self-knowledge of personal values and deliberately applying these values in their role. Thus, this research question is addressed by an examination of the principal's level of self-knowledge of personal values.

Research Question 2: How have the personal values of the principals been formed?

This research question investigates the claims in the literature that personal values are formed during the general experiences of life and become the most influential source of values that impact upon any individual (Hodgkinson, 1996). Although the importance of personal values is assumed, the literature proposes that there is little general understanding of their nature and their formation (Zimmerman, 2001). The research methods associated with this question assisted the participating principals in determining how their personal values were acquired. Beyond this outcome for the participants, it was

thought that this research question would illumine the values formation process and, thereby, informs future plans for personal and professional development in support of values-led principalship.

Research Question 3: Can a principal gain increased self-knowledge of his or her personal values and the relationship of these personal values to his or her educational leadership behaviour?

The literature posits the understanding that personal values are often tacit, subliminal, intangible, inner influences on behaviour (Sarros, Densten, & Santora, 1999). Usually, people are unaware of many of their values, and when they endeavour to openly clarify them, there is a strong possibility that they may unintentionally or intentionally state false values (Cashman, 1998; McGraw, 2001). This means that knowledge of personal values is an achievement and not a given (Nerlich, 1989). People have to purposely strive towards coming to know their personal values. Moreover, the best process for coming to know personal values is through introspection based on reflective self-inquiry and reflective self-evaluation (Hall, Lindzey, & Campbell, 1998). This research question asks whether it is possible to develop a ‘tool’ that facilitates such reflective self-inquiry and reflective self-evaluation.

Research Question 4: Does an increased level of self-knowledge of personal values have the potential to bring about values-led principalship?

This research question responds to the longstanding claim in the literature (Hodgkinson, 1996; Hogarth, 1987) that there is no tangible link between a personal value and a preferred behaviour, as individuals tend to justify their behaviour on expected beneficial outcomes, rather than on a conscious commitment to any inherent values. Hence, this research question focused directly on the potential impact that the gaining of self-knowledge of personal values had on principalship behaviour. It allowed the researcher to gather data pertinent to exploring the extent to which the gaining of self-knowledge of personal values could bring about values-led principalship in order to positively influence principalship behaviour.

1.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This research study is situated within the research paradigm of pragmatic constructivism. The initial philosophical choice of constructivism followed a review by Heck and

Hallinger (1999) of new generation research methodologies in educational leadership and school improvement. This review highlights constructivist approaches to research that “reveal how leadership unfolds within the school setting as a shared, constructed phenomenon”, and “forces us to accept that our educational organizations are constructed realities, as opposed to systems or structures that operate more independently of the individuals in them” (p. 148). This review also notes that several researchers used constructivist approaches to investigate “the relationship of social cognition and values to school leaders’ problem solving and decision making” (p. 147).

In short, constructivism strives to understand and reconstruct that which is unknown through using a distinctive research paradigm with its own ontological, epistemological and methodological claims (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, pp. 111-112). From an ontological perspective, “constructivism’s relativism ... assumes multiple, apprehendable, and somewhat conflicting social realities that are the products of human intellects, but that may change as their constructors become more informed and sophisticated”. From an epistemological perspective, constructivism accepts a “transactional/objectivist assumption that sees knowledge as created in interaction between the investigator and the respondents”. Constructivism relies on a hermeneutic/dialectical methodology aimed at understanding and reconstructing the previously held problematic constructions.

However, while situating this research study within the research paradigm of constructivism, the researcher was aware of the polarized positions within the constructivist research community as theorists argue as to whether knowledge is constructed by individuals or within societies (Bowe & Berv, 2000; Phillips, 2000). Faced with these polarized positions, Schwandt (1994) and Burbules (2000) recommend that we put aside these epistemological debates and adopt a more pragmatic constructivist perspective. This understanding of constructivism operates within a problem-based framework that focuses on real-life problems and gives priority to ‘doing’ rather than ‘knowing’. Such research begins with exploration of problematic human activity from the perspective of the individual’s conscious thoughts or awareness. Here, the researcher comes to know the person’s perceptions, meanings, understandings, and interpretations so as to be able to reconstruct how these influenced the person to act as they did. Regardless of whether or not these perceptions, meanings, understandings, and interpretations were derived from either a social or psychological basis, the insights gained about why the

person acted as they did are considered to be valid and informative forms of knowledge. In this way, pragmatic constructivist research uses these perceptions, meanings, understandings, and interpretations to help construct knowledge about the phenomenon being studied and, thereby, further the clarification of its nature.

Convinced of this argument, the researcher accepted advice from Denzin and Lincoln (1994) that pragmatic constructivism research be positioned within the theoretical perspective of symbolic interactionism. Symbolic interactionism comes from the field of social psychology that subscribes to a deterministic view of human behaviour in which the reasons, or causes, of human behaviour are said to arise from the social situations that individuals encounter (Charon, 1998). In particular, symbolic interactionism is influenced by four key beliefs. First, that what is real for human beings always depends on their own active intervention, their own interpretation or definition. Second, the worthiness of knowledge is judged by how practical, applicable, and useful it is in helping to understand a given social situation. Third, the elements within the particular social situation are defined in terms of their specific usefulness in that situation. Finally, the initial focus of social research should be on the actions and behaviours that are occurring, which are then used to guide further exploration.

In line with these beliefs, the researcher accepted the view of Merriam (1998) and others (Sarantakos, 1998; Yin, 1994) that case study methodology offered an appropriate orchestrating perspective for this pragmatic constructivist study. Conventionally, case study has been associated with the methodological choice of using qualitative rather than quantitative methods (Merriam, 1998). However, in this research study, case study is not a methodological choice but rather an orchestrating perspective or a choice of what is to be studied. Case study, as an orchestrating perspective, draws boundaries around the human activity to be studied and provides the link between the basic assumptions of the theoretical perspective with the selection of appropriate and relevant research methods by describing the intended strategy or plan of action (Glesne, 1999). A key prerequisite for choosing an appropriate orchestrating perspective is that it must be closely suited to the issue being investigated, so that it can not only help the researcher to understand and explain the meaning of the particular phenomena, but also cause as little disruption to the participant and his or her environment as possible (Merriam, 1998).

1.6 DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Within this case study, the boundaries of the case were defined in terms of secondary school principals working in the system of Catholic schools conducted under the auspices of the Archdiocese of Brisbane. The five principals in this research study represented a “non-probabilistic” (Merriam, 1998) and “purposeful” (Patton, 1990) sample of principals from the 26 secondary colleges. In order to form this sample, this research study applied the “daisy chaining” (Gordon, 1994, p. 6) properties associated with using the Delphi Method whereby a selection of five principals was non-probabilistically chosen from the total “universe” (Sutherland, 1975, p. 471) of potential participating principals. Briefly, this process collated the respective recommendations from three different, but relevant, sources: the Director of Schools within Brisbane Catholic Education, the eight Area Supervisors who oversee the performance of the systemic Catholic secondary school principals, and the 26 systemic Catholic secondary principals. Each of these sources was asked to nominate the 5 principals they perceived to be the most suitable for this research study and the results of these three sources of nominations were tallied to determine the final participants. As a result of this selection process, two female and three male principals were chosen to participate in this research study. The level of principalship experience varied from only one year to almost twenty years. Two principals were in single sex schools and all of the principals were in charge of a standard year 8 to 12 school. The principals ranged from 40-50 years of age.

This case study involved two stages of research: a “stage of exploration” and a “stage of inspection” (Charon, 1998). Through exploration, the researcher is attempting to describe in detail what is happening in the particular complex social situation. The purpose is to become holistically acquainted with the particular area of social life and to develop some focus of interest for the second stage of inspection. This exploratory stage involves isolating important elements within the explored situation and describing the situation in relation to those elements. Inspection also involves forming descriptive statements about each important element in the situation, then applying that description to other interactive situations.

The exploration stage of this research study commenced with an open-ended questionnaire, the *Values Nomination Questionnaire* (appendix 1). Essentially, this

questionnaire was a sheet of paper with many blank rectangles and participants were asked to reflect on their personal values and to record these values by writing a value in a rectangle. This exploration stage continued with two closed questionnaires. The *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) (appendix 2) created by Kouzes and Posner (2001) was used as a starting point for developing a synthesis of the key educational leadership behaviours for each of the participating principals. The *Values Selection Questionnaire* (appendix 3) required each principal to simply select his or her values from a comprehensive list of value words. The list provided to each principal included 170 potential values, which were compiled from the literature (McGraw, 2001; Senge, Roberts, Ross, Smith, & Kleiner, 1994).

The inspection stage of the research study utilised a series of semi-structured interviews in order to investigate issues raised in the exploration stage. These semi-structured interviews complemented the pragmatic constructivist nature of this research study (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). The advantage of using a semi-structured interview is that it is open and natural in its approach while also ensuring that the direction of the conversation is controlled and focused (Burns, 1995). This style of interview limited the researcher's biases and preconceptions in directing the line of the interview (Burns, 1997), and allowed the research study to explore interesting thoughts as they emerged from the interview (Stake, 1995).

1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

This research study is deemed significant for a number of reasons.

First, this research study addresses the blank spot within research in respect to the influence of personal values on principalship behaviour. Despite long-held assertions within the academic literature (Day, 2000; England & Lee, 1974) that personal values are important influences on leadership behaviour, there has been a lack of corroborative research in support of these assertions (Begley, 1996; Sarros et al., 1999).

Secondly, this research study developed an instrument to visually display the subliminal relationship between personal values and principalship behaviour. This research study acknowledges that the relationship between personal values and principalship behaviour

was more often assumed than understood (Zimmerman, 2001). By developing a clear and effective way to visually display this relationship between the principal's personal values and leadership behaviour, this research study provides a process for reflective self-inquiry and reflective self-evaluation.

Finally, this research study provides new insights into professional development. The findings in this research study identify the need for professional development opportunities for principals to move beyond a dominant focus on professional behaviour and challenge principals to engage in self-reflection. It supports the view that principals need help and guidance in the essential area of making explicit their inner Self so that they can begin to critique the relationship between behaviour, beliefs, values, motivations, and purposes. This research study also suggests that the professional development of principals should focus on reviewing the formation of their inner Self over a lifetime, and challenges them to achieve greater congruence among their inner Self, their personal values, and their leadership behaviour.

1.8 THE LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

Notwithstanding the significance of this research study, the following limitations are acknowledged. This study was limited in its scope, as it focused on only principals within the systemic Catholic secondary schools in the Archdiocese of Brisbane. Furthermore, it concentrated its attention on only five of these principals in its search for a more informed and comprehensive understanding of the relationship between personal values and educational leadership behaviour. Hence, the findings presented are specific to the situations described herein and do not claim to represent the whole population. Therefore, this research seeks its important response from within those who read it. Its external validity will rely upon the "reader user generalizability" (Merriam, 1998, p. 211) through "case to case transfer" (Firestone, 1993, p. 16).

In addition, this research study recognises the inherent limitations of a constructivist research paradigm and the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). This research study aimed to understand values-led principalship in order to achieve a more informed and sophisticated reconstruction of this phenomenon. The 'product' of this research was judged according to quality criteria of authenticity and

trustworthiness. Thus this study is positioned to avoid a “positivist approach” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994) and does not seek to explain reality through the accumulation of objective knowledge and produce verified hypotheses established as facts or laws. There is no attempt to discern what was generally true about the leadership behaviour of the principal, and a deliberate decision was made not to collect data to validate the accuracy of the participant’s perceptions. In addition, the conventional, positivist benchmarks of rigour such as internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity have not been applied. Likewise this research study avoids taking a critical stance; it does not seek to critique and transform oppressive structures through the accumulation of structural and historical insights. This study did not set out to judge the nature of the principal’s leadership but rather to richly describe it. It was more relevant within the purpose of this research to focus on explicating the principal’s way of knowing about his or her leadership behaviour (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1990; Groundwater-Smith, 1998) without fear of judgement and contradiction. Thus the emphasis was on the principal’s thinking behind their leadership behaviour and not on specifically observing, categorizing, and judging the behaviour itself.

Finally, this research study was somewhat constrained by the self-interest of the researcher. In this sense, this research has a self-indulgent (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992) quality as the topic and methodology were selected in response to the researcher’s own professional biases, experiences, perceptions, and working context. More particularly, this study did involve principal participants who were colleagues and professional friends. While this research into the concept of values-led principalship occurred within this relatively intimate and small group, the achievement of a mutual benefit for both the researcher and the participating principal was always the paramount feature of this study.

1.9 OUTLINE OF THIS THESIS

While this chapter provided a succinct overview of the important aspects of this particular research study, the following chapters present a more detailed and comprehensive perspective.

Chapter 2 explores the current contextual influences upon the role of a principal in order to further clarify the research problem. In particular, an initial review of the literature

alerted the researcher to a new understanding of organizational leadership (Sarros, 2002; Terry, 1993) in the context of social transformation, and a new emphasis on values (Blackmore, 1999; Greenfield, 1995; Hodgkinson, 1991) as well as a call for a new type of principal, who is “values-led” (Day, 2000). However, this chapter also highlights the paucity of contemporary research focusing on values-led principalship. Hence, this initial literature review guided this research study to focus directly on exploring the concept of values-led principalship.

Chapter 3 reviews literature in respect to psychology, ethics, and values theory so as to develop a comprehensive understanding of the concept of values-led principalship. First, it develops a conceptual map of the Self, which includes the phenomenon of self-concept, self-esteem, motives, values, beliefs, and behaviours. A description is provided of each of these respective parts of the Self, particularly values, and, moreover, how each is related to, and influences, the other parts of the Self. Another essential inclusion within this literature-guided discussion is an exploration of the level of self-knowledge that one has about each of these parts of his or her Self. This chapter concludes by identifying the research questions that were to guide the research study.

Chapter 4 identifies the theoretical framework that was considered to best support this study. It examines the epistemological landscape in order to identify an appropriate research paradigm and to clarify the most suitable theoretical perspective for this exploration of the concept of values-led principalship. This chapter argues the case for a research paradigm of pragmatic constructivism and a theoretical perspective of symbolic interactionism with a case study approach as the orchestrating perspective.

Chapter 5 outlines how this case study approach is to be practically implemented. This chapter presents an argument for the implementation of multiple research methods through the use of questionnaires and interviews as essential to understanding and reconstructing the concept of values-led principalship. This was achieved through the two research stages of exploration and inspection as appropriate for research informed by the theoretical perspective of symbolic interactionism (Charon, 2001).

Chapter 6 displays the data gathered by the multiple research methods used in this study. The format of this display of the data follows the design of this study outlined in the

previous chapter. In particular, the display of the data is subdivided into two sections representing the two stages of exploration and the inspection. Within these two sections, the display of the data is further subdivided so as to mirror the respective steps of data collection outlined in the previous chapter.

Chapter 7 uses the research questions to further analyse and discuss the data. This analysis and discussion provides a better understanding of the nature of the relationship between a principal's personal values and his or her leadership behaviour. The resulting interpretation of the data suggests the principals could not be considered to be values-led principals. The data show that, although personal values do influence the principal's behaviour, he or she was not really aware of what these values were, or how they were affecting their behaviour. In this sense, the participating principals were being values-directed or values-driven, rather than values-led in their approach to principalship.

Finally, Chapter 8 discusses the knowledge gained from this exploration of the concept of values-led principalship. Based on the knowledge gained from this research study it is argued that the concept of values-led principalship is a simplistic conceptualisation that does not reflect the complexity of the whole Self. It not only overlooks the complexity of the processes associated with personal values formation, but it also assumes a simplistic relationship between personal values and the principal's leadership behaviour. This research study concludes by offering four propositions in respect to the professional development of principals. Also, areas for further research are identified.