

Full Length Research Paper

Awareness and ethical orientation of alternatively certified prospective teachers to intention for whistle blowing

Asiye TOKER GÖKÇE

Department of Educational Sciences, Kocaeli University, Umuttepe Campus 41060, Kocaeli/Turkey.

Accepted 11 March, 2013

This study inquires whistle blowing intentions of alternatively certified prospective teachers, investigating their moral reasoning to blow the whistle. Specifically three hypotheses were tested: Overall ethical awareness of the alternatively certified prospective teachers is high; the participants will identify reasons related to philosophical values such as justice, deontology, utilitarianism, relativism and egoism as reasons for reporting wrongdoings; and they are more likely to whistle blow internally or externally when guaranteed their jobs. The sample is 180 prospective teachers who were voluntarily participated in Turkey. The author developed the instrument reviewing the literature. Results revealed that, overall ethical awareness of the participants is high. Philosophical values affect the participant's ethical evaluation; especially justice and relativism have the strongest effect on their ethical reasoning. Lastly, the prospective teachers would prefer whistle-blowing more when they would have job guarantee than they would work as contracted. While there have been many studies examining whistle blowing with different factors such as cultural differences, organizational climate, ethical decision making in especially marketing, there has not been any intention for examining it in education. Thus, this paper aimed to contribute whistle blowing studies exploring whistle blowing intentions, and moral reasoning of prospective teachers.

Key words: Alternative certification, ethical evaluation, education, prospective teacher, whistle-blowing, Turkey.

INTRODUCTION

Whistle-blowing is a process of giving information about the acts resulting in harm to third parties. While whistle-blowing was an important topic among the researchers, it was spotlighted after the economic giants' corruption, such as Enron, WorldCom, and Tyco, in especially the US. A whistle-blower, who sounds the alert on wrongdoings, can be a former or current employee of any organization. Since disclosure involves passing information consciously, and employing unconventional methods, whistle-blower is at a high risk. Actually whistle-blowing is a kind of two-edged sword, because while some whistle-blowers were awarded, others suffered retaliation. For example, David Welch was fired of insider trading in

2002, while Cynthia Cooper, Sherron Watkins, and Coleen Rowley were elected as 'Persons of the Year' by Time magazine in January 6, 2003 (Jubb, 1999; Near et al., 2004; Liyanarachchi and Newdick, 2009). There are regulations for protecting whistle-blowers in countries, such as Australia, Japan, South Korean, New Zealand, United Kingdom, and United States. These countries established legislation, procedures and regulatory bodies to response to the need for whistleblowing (Asian Institute of Management, 2006; Institute of Public Administration, n.d). Since whistle-blowing has not been known as a fact, there is not any regulatory or legislation in Turkey. Therefore organization members, especially

civil servants, could not have reported wrongdoings for years in Turkey. In addition, whistle blowers have been experienced retaliation as a result of whistle-blowing. For example, teacher M. Yiğiter was suspended in April 2010, and teacher V. Kaya was relocated to another school in Istanbul in 2011 after they reported their school principal's fraud (Aktifhaber, 2007; Egitimbirsen, 2010).

A whistle-blower needs to have ability to recognize and evaluate any ethical dilemma correctly which means moral reasoning (Miceli et al., 2001). Since moral courage and moral reasoning are important factors to understanding one's propensity to blow the whistle (Jubb, 1999; Liyanarachchi and Newdick, 2009), researchers (Liyanarachchi and Newdick, 2009; McDevitt and Van Hise, 2002; Keenan, 2002; Tavakoli et al., 2003; Near et al., 2004; Reidenback and Robin, 1990; Cohen et al., 2001; Cruz et al., 2000) have studied level of moral reasoning through philosophical values in their studies. For example, Cohen et al. (1996, 2001) examined ethical awareness, and ethical decisions of Canadian students through philosophical values including justice, deontology, utilitarianism, relativism and egoism. This study builds partly upon their work, and aims to explore whistle-blowing intentions of alternatively certified prospective teachers (ACPT), investigating their moral reasoning to blow whistle. This paper is anticipated to contribute to the whistle-blowing studies attempting to investigate underlying reasons for ethical evaluation, and whistle-blowing intentions of educators in Turkey as most studies have been studied employees in business world (Cohen et al., 2001; Park et al., 2008; Liyanarachchi and Newdick, 2009; Mayhew and Murphy, 2008) in the US and Europe, and little has been reported about the response given by employees in non-Western cultures when they observe wrong doing in their organizations.

Whistle blowing

Whistle-blowing means the disclosure by organization members of illegal or illegitimate practices under the control of their employers, to somewhere that may be able to affect action (Near et al., 1993). Although there are somewhat different definitions of whistle-blowing (Barnett et al., 1993; Near and Miceli, 1985; Larmer, 1992; Miceli et al., 1991; Miceli and Near, 1994) it can be most thoroughly defined as going public with organizational information that threatens the public interest. So, whistle-blowing has been discussed in ethics, law and social sciences with the generally accepted definition by Near and Miceli (1985) that 'it is a disclosure by organization members of illegal, immoral, or illegitimate practices under the control of their employers, to persons or organizations that may be able to effect action'. This definition of whistle-blowing is recognized by empirical research, such as studies of internal auditors (Miceli and Near, 1994), federal employees (Miceli et al., 1999), managers (Keenan, 2002), and nurses (Near et al.,

2004). To make this definition clear it can be said that whistle-blowing is (a) realizing wrongful practices in an organization, (b) being motivated by the desire to prevent unnecessary harm to others, (c) raising concerns about misconduct within an organization or within an independent structure associated with it, (d) giving information (generally to the authorities) about the wrongful practices, (e) exposing such practices to the press or suppressing it in a business or a government office (Groeneweg, 2001).

Whistle-blowing might seem to be a threat to organizational authority structures. Nevertheless, it can improve long-term organizational effectiveness when leaders encourage whistle-blowing in their organizations (Near and Miceli, 1985; Miceli et al., 1999). Whistle-blowers can be a former or current employee of any organization. The organization might be for-profit or non-profit, private or public. Although whistle blowers have generally left the organization before reporting the wrong doing, they might remain within the organization while the wrong doing might be generated the greatest concern. In most cases the whistleblower would be vulnerable to retaliation by the employer while they are rewarded in some instances. However in many cases, the consequences of whistle-blowing have been nothing. Even 62% of 161 whistleblowers were dismissed from their jobs by 1989. Therefore many American organizations presently have policies protecting employees from retaliation victimization. For example, 'Whistleblower Protection Acts' proposes a compensation fund of up to \$500,000 per individual for the public sector in the US (Elliston, 1982; Vinten, 1996; Miceli and Near, 1994; Gobert and Punch, 2000).

Whistle-blowers believe either that they have been ordered to perform some act or they have gained information that the organization is engaged in acts are causing needless harm to third parties or violate human rights (Vinten, 1996; Dawson, 2000; Near et al., 2004). Therefore, whistle-blowing preliminary requires 'realizing wrongdoings', and then 'making decision for blowing whistle' comes. A potential whistle-blower can realize an instance of wrong doing in different grammatical forms: '(1) as a question, "Did you know that...?" (2) As an exclamation, 'That... is terrible!' (3) As an injunction, "Do something about...!" (4) As a mere statement of fact, 'It is the case that..'. (Elliston, 1982; Vinten, 1996; Near et al., 2004).

Realizing wrongdoings

Claimed that the type of wrong doing affects whistle blower's intention to blow the whistle; Near et al. (2004) created taxonomies of wrong doing in organizations such as waste and discrimination; legal violations mismanagement and sexual harassment; and stealing and safety problems. Previously, Robinson and Bennett (1995) introduced a typology of deviant workplace behavior in organizations. Their focus was on wrong

doing that is enforced by the organization. They concluded that wrong doing varies along two dimensions and can be classified into four types. The framework consists of the two dimensions: (1) Minor vs. Serious, which describes the severity of the deviant behavior, and (2) Interpersonal vs. Organizational, which represents the target of the deviant behavior.

Decision-making

The decision-making process for blowing the whistle is associated with the potential whistle-blower's traits and moral reasoning. Miceli and Near (1985), Miceli et al. (2001) claim that an individual's perceptions and attitudes about whistle-blowing are related to the decision to blow the whistle. Besides, individual traits such as positive and negative affectivity and proactive personality affect the evaluation of wrong doing and whistle-blowing. And many empirical studies (Arnold and Ponemon, 1991; Brabeck, 1984; Chan and Leung, 2006; Miceli et al., 1991; Near and Miceli, 1986) claimed that moral reasoning influences an individual's decision-making process when deciding to blow the whistle. For example, a study found that the higher the individual's level of moral reasoning, the more likely he or she is to do the right thing Liyanarachchi and Newdick, (2009). In addition, Miceli et al. (2001) showed that people were less likely report wrongdoings when they did not feel compelled morally. These results show that, in general, individuals with higher levels of moral reasoning are more likely to blow the whistle than are individuals with lower levels of moral reasoning.

Further researchers (Gundlach et al., 2003; Rocha and Kleiner, 2005) suggest that level of moral reasoning and perceived threat of retaliation against whistle-blowing are the two most important factors to understand one's tendency to blow the whistle, along with personality variables. In addition, Near and Miceli (1996) suggest that the decision to blow the whistle is affected by the personality traits of the individual, and the environment surrounding the individual. Besides, Lurie and Albin (2006) suggest that the point of ethical theories revalidate one's moral convictions on a nonreligious basis. And they claimed that an ethical theory can be used to look back at what happened in a specific situation and explain what exactly was or was not moral in that case. Since whistle-blowing is a controversial situation, individuals need to assess wrongdoing, and need to decide what to do if wrong doing is present. So having information about level of moral reasoning of the possible whistle-blower might help to understand one's propensity to blow the whistle. The ability to recognize and to correctly evaluate any ethical dilemma is the most important prerequisite to making the right ethical decisions (Miceli et al., 2001).

An ethical dilemma is a situation in which the person does not know how to act because of conflicting beliefs about what is axiologically required (Lurie and Albin, 2006). The researchers (McDevitt and Van Hise, 2002;

Keenan, 2002; Tavakoli et al., 2003; Near et al., 2004) evaluated materiality levels in ethical dilemmas in various studies in line with Rest's model. Besides, Reidenback and Robin (1990), Cohen et al. (1993, 2001), and Cruz et al. (2000) have used the Multi-dimensional Ethics Scale for examining ethical judgments in many studies, including the philosophical values such as justice, utilitarianism, relativism and egoism.

According to the Woiceshyn, (2011) Rest's model has been particularly influential in terms of the actual decision process. The model identifies ethical decision-making process as involved in four steps: identifying the moral issue, making a moral judgment, establishing moral intent, and engaging in moral action. The first step, identifying the moral issue, requires having moral awareness, which means identifying the ethical aspects of a dilemma. If an individual does not recognize a problem, s/he cannot do anything about it. Thus moral awareness is the basic ability to recognize that an ethical violation has occurred. The second step, making a moral judgment, includes formulating the morally ideal policy for action through reasoning. The third step, establishing moral intent, requires having moral motivation, which entails having the necessary motive or will to act in an ethical manner. And the last step engaging in moral action involves having the moral character to execute and implement what ought to be done.

Most of the studies (i.e. McDevitt and Van Hise, 2002; Keenan, 2002; Tavakoli et al., 2003; and Near et al., 2004) validated this model and tested the impact of a wide variety of factors on the decision process, evaluating materiality levels in ethical dilemmas. Having used ethical dilemmas in their research, Brabeck (1984) and Dozier and Miceli (1985) suggest that an individual's ability to resolve or interpret an ethical dilemma is affected by his/her moral reasoning. Brabeck (1984) found that those with higher levels of moral reasoning are more likely to whistle blow. Besides, Lysonski and Gaidis (1991) suggest that the ethical sensitivity of students is comparable to real employees. Miceli et al. (2001) showed that people were less likely report wrongdoings when they did not feel compelled morally. Ohnishi et al (2008) found that nurses do not decide to whistle-blow when they have an awareness of wrongdoing. Park et al (2008) found that Confucian ethics had mixed effects on whistle blowing intentions. Zhang et al (2009) examined impact of decision-making process to internal whistle-blowing. Liyanarachchi and Newdick, (2009) examined the effect of students' level of moral reasoning, on their propensity to whistle blow. Keenan (2002) and Near, et al (2004) studied levels of moral reasoning and the effect of culture for whistle blowing. In addition, Cohen et al. (1993, 1996, 2001) examined existence of different materiality levels implementing ethical scenarios through philosophical values such as justice, deontology, utilitarianism, relativism and egoism. Cohen et al. (1993, 1996, 2001); Cruz et al. (2000), and Reidenback and Robin (1990) have used The Multi-dimensional Ethics

Scale for examining ethical judgments in many studies, including the philosophical values; justice, deontology, utilitarianism, relativism and egoism. Further many studies have investigated students' moral reasoning levels and how these affect their ability to interpret ethical dilemmas (Arnold and Ponemon, 1991; Chan and Leung, 2006; Uddin and Gillett, 2002; and Welton et al., 1994). The results of these studies show that an individual's moral reasoning level or moral judgment affects their ethical behavior.

The multidimensional ethics scale

The Multidimensional Ethics Scale (MES) provides understanding of the philosophies that underlie ethical judgments. Using this scale presumes that individuals utilize more than one rationale in making ethical judgments, and that the significance of these rationales differs among problem situations. Using MES allows an investigation of not only what the respondent believes, but also why s/he believes it (Reidenbach and Robin, 1990). Based on five contemporary moral philosophies justice, relativism, egoism, utilitarianism, and deontology, Reidenbach and Robin developed the MES. After the applications of various marketing scenarios, the scale (MES) revised into 8-item by Reidenbach and Robin (1990). Reidenbach and Robin (1990) aimed to measure three orthogonal constructs by the MES. The first one, named moral equity dimension, was included items related to the philosophies of justice (fair/unfair, just/unjust), relativism (acceptable/unacceptable to my family), and deontology (morally right/not morally right). Second one relativistic dimension, was included two relativist items (traditionally acceptable / unacceptable, culturally acceptable / unacceptable). The last one named contractualism dimension, was included two deontological items (violates / does not violate an unspoken promise, violates / does not violate an unwritten contract) Reidenbach and Robin, 1990; Cruz et al., 2000). In an accounting context, Cohen et al. (1996; 2001) have modified Reidenbach and Robin's MES scale to include 12 items representing five moral philosophies: moral equity, contractualism, relativism, egoism, and utilitarianism.

Internal and external whistle-blowing

According to the Rest's (Woiceshyn, 2011) model engaging in moral action is the last step. In this step, the individual decides whether to report the wrong doing s/he observed or not. There are different ways to blow the whistle. An individual might blow the whistle internally, externally, named, or anonymously. Park, et al., (2008) Blenkinsopp, proposed a typology of whistle-blowing based on three dimensions. Each dimension represents individual's choice for whistle-blowing formally or

informally, internally, or externally, and identified or anonymously.

Blowing the whistle internally means reporting wrong doing to a supervisor or someone else within the organization who can correct the wrongdoing. The whistle-blower reports such wrong doing to a top manager, bypassing managerial hierarchy despite the other available channels in the organization. However, blowing the whistle externally refers reporting a wrong doing to outside parties believed to have the power to correct it. Outside parties includes the media, a Member of Parliament or a professional body. Wrongdoings that are eventually reported externally are first reported internally. If a wrong doing involves harm to the public or employees it will probably result in external whistle-blowing. Employees who believe in the existence of effective internal channels of complaint are more likely to follow internal whistle-blowing. Moreover, the absence of sound internal reporting channels deters individuals who discover wrongdoings in an organization to disclose their observations to anyone (Miceli and Near, 1994; Vinten, 1996; Park et al. 2008).

Researchers have examined the relationship between culture and whistle-blowing intentions comparing different cultures. For example, while Keenan (2002) found no significant difference between American and Indian managers in the likelihood of blowing the whistle, Tavakali et al (2003) found a significant difference between the U.S. and Croatian managers with respect to both individual and organizational tendencies to whistle blow. Besides, Park et al. (2008) found that there are significant variations related to nationality and cultural orientation among undergraduate students from South Korea, Turkey, and the U.K. The results of that study revealed a general preference for anonymous over identified whistle-blowing is relatively weak in Turkey and the U.K., but much stronger in South Korea. Nayir and Herzig (2012) examined the relationship between value orientations of Turkish managers and their choices for particular whistle-blowing modes in Turkey.

Alternatively certified prospective teachers

Alternative Certification provides graduates of certain departments of universities shorter but intensified programs in order to be a teacher. Alternative teacher education has a history of decades in Turkey (Gökçe, 2001, 2010). These alternative certification programs have been performed by Faculties of Education namely 'Pedagogic Formation Certification Program' by the time 2012, in Turkey. Alternatively certified teachers, who are especially graduates from the Faculties of Art and Science, represent different age groups, backgrounds and experiences. Although these alternative certification programs have been performed in countries, alternatively certified teachers have not been well accepted by school principals, teachers graduated from Faculties of

Education, and education inspectors. Besides, academicians have also been criticized these programs for years (Gökçe, 2001, 2010).

Formation Programs include 'introduction to education', 'class management', and 'special teaching methods' serve an introduction the complexity of the role of teachers at schools for the attendees. Cohen et al. (2001) suggest that these courses can examine some of the ethical dimensions of educational cases and students can evaluate the damaging results of the actions they analyzed. The issues in these cases can be interpreted from different philosophical perspectives including stages of moral development and dimensions of moral judgment including philosophical values such as justice, utilitarianism, relativism and egoism. Further Cohen et al. (2001) examined entry-level students, graduate students and accounting professionals and studied the differences in ethical decision-making between Canadian university business students and accounting professionals.

Park et al. (2008) examined university students from South Korea, Turkey and the U.K with regard to different materiality levels implementing ethical scenarios through philosophical values. Mayhew and Murphy (2008) studied fourth-year students who had just completed a newly instituted ethics program and fifth-year accounting students who did not receive the ethics program at a university in the Midwestern United States. And they suggest that ethics education does not necessarily result in internalized ethical values, but it can impact ethical behavior. Liyanarachchi and Newdick (2009) examined the effect of students' level of moral reasoning, on their intention to blow whistle in New Zealand. Although the literature on whistle-blowing has grown over recent years, little research is available in Turkey on this issue. So the aim of this paper is to address whistle-blowing intentions of ACPTs' whistle blowing intentions investigating their moral reasoning to blow the whistle. Since the level of moral reasoning is the one of the most important factors to understanding one's propensity to blow the whistle (Liyanarachchi and Newdick, 2009), students' reasoning for ethical evaluation needed to be examined in ethical dilemmas. In addition, since the ethical sensitivity of students is comparable to real employees (Lysonski and Gaidis, 1991), ACPT were examined in the study. Therefore this study aims to investigate relationship between ACPTs' ethical awareness and their possible whistle blowing intentions. Since the level of moral reasoning is one of the most important factors to understand one's propensity to blow the whistle (Liyanarachchi and Newdick, 2009), ACPT need to be examined with their ethical materiality levels in ethical dilemmas as a first step of the study. So, ACPTs' materiality levels were examined through eight dilemmas. The research hypothesizes that:

H1: *Overall ethical awareness of the ACPT is high.*

There is the question of how someone decides whether

wrong doing is serious enough to whistle-blow. Thus, employees need to consider and balance several philosophical values when facing an ethical decision in organizations. Cohen et al. (1993, 1996, 2001); Cruz et al. (2000), and Reidenback and Robin (1990) have used The Multi-dimensional Ethics Scale for examining ethical judgments in many studies, including the philosophical values; justice, deontology, utilitarianism, relativism and egoism. Thus by extending prior researches, the following hypothesis is presented:

H2: *The ACPT will identify reasons related to philosophical values such as justice, deontology, utilitarianism, relativism and egoism as reasons for reporting wrongdoings.*

As researchers (Vinten, 1996; Miceli and Near, 1994; Gobert and Punch, 2000) suggest whistleblower would be vulnerable to retaliation by the employer. They might be rewarded and remain within the organization or have nothing. Even some of the whistleblowers were dismissed from their jobs. Even some regulations protecting whistleblowers in many countries, there has not been any regulation against possible retaliation in Turkey. Teachers are recruited by the Ministry of National Education as permanently (by wage settlement) or temporarily (by contracting) in Turkey. So the last hypothesis is designed as follows:

H3: *The ACPT are more likely to whistle blow internally or externally when guaranteed their jobs.*

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample

In order to explore the level of moral reasoning and attitudes toward the various ways of whistle blowing, 187 ACPTs who were studied at a big University in Marmara region in Turkey were included, and 180 of which participated in the study voluntarily in 2011. Since ACPs were not compulsory for the universities, they were not widespread in Turkey. So the sample was selected towards accessibility criteria. The survey was administered to the students who were voluntary to participate it, and they provided anonymous responses. All students were provided with written information about the nature and purpose of the study at the beginning of the instrument. Details of the sample can be found in Table 1.

As Table 1 shows, most of the participants (82%) were female, while 18% were male participants. More than half of the prospective teachers were between the years of 20 to 24 while 10% were 30 to 39 years old. Lastly, half of the participants were social sciences prospective teachers, while 39% were math, and 10% were art teachers.

Instrument

Case studies or ethical scenarios have been asserted as the most useful tools for examining ethical issues (Kaynama et al., 1996; Okleshen and Hoyt, 1996; Stevens, 2001) and previous studies have integrated scenarios approach to determine the level of

Table 1. Sample demographics.

		N	%	Mean	SD	Total
Gender	Female	144	82	1.18	.38	175
	Male	31	18			
Age	20-24	101	58	2.54	.76	173
	25-29	30	31			
	30-39	18	10			
Departments	Art	18	10	2.29	.64	174
	Social	88	51			
	Math	68	39			

influence in their respondents' whistle blowing intentions (Kaplan and Schultz, 2007). In addition, multiple scenarios were used to explore a variety of moral dilemmas, including the conflict between loyalty and honesty, and between efficiency and following rules (Cohen et al, 1996). The approach, using scenarios, is adopted in studies in accounting area of research, and is recommended when using a hypothetical ethical scenario (Liyanarachchi and Newdick, 2009). In addition, Hudson and Miller (2005) developed scenarios for their studies to test ethical orientation and awareness of the tourism students. Therefore the author developed the questionnaire with eight scenarios in Turkish to measure ACPT s' ethical awareness, and their intentions toward reporting wrongdoings externally or internally. Each scenario, involving a short description of an ethical situation, was modified from Cohen et al. (1993, 1996, 2001) to the potential events that ACPT may encounter at their schools. Consequently, the first part of the instrument consisted of eight scenarios describing a wide variety of ethical dilemmas that might be faced by any teacher, an action taken by the actor described in the scenario, and the MES with 18-item sequence on the seven point Likert-Type ranging from never (1) to very likely (7) (Appendix A). Secondly, the participant's attitudes toward the modes of whistleblowing were measured by Park et al. (2008). This part involves questions to measure the participants' intentions to blow whistle internally or externally. Further, personal information (gender, age, and departments) was asked at the beginning of the questionnaire.

Multi-dimensional Ethics Scale (MES)

The 18-itemed MES exposes a moral evaluation within the philosophical views of justice, utilitarianism, deontology, relativism and egoism. The first 15 items of the MES expose a moral evaluation within the philosophical views of justice, utilitarianism, deontology, relativism and egoism. The last 3 items ask participants to indicate their belief of ethical situation, whether they would do whatever the subject of the scenario do and whether their colleagues would do whatever the subject do (Flory et al., 1992; Cohen et al., 1993, 1996, 2001; Hyman, 1996). It was translated and modified into Turkish (Appendix A). After translation, MES was compared to the other translation into Turkish by Çakar and Arbak (2008). Since numerous scholars (Flory et al., 1992; Cohen et al., 1993, 1996; 2001; Hyman, 1996) analyzed, and performed factor analysis for the MES, a new factor analysis was not needed, and was not performed for this study. Instead, the reliability analysis was performed to eliminate items based on the Cronbach's coefficient alpha. As a result, five items (4, 7, 9, 12, and 14) involved in egoism, utility, and deontology were dropped from the MES for all scenarios as their Cronbach's alphas were below 0.30

(Büyüköztürk, 2004). Consequently, egoism was not included in the scale of the modified MES. This result is in line with the Cohen et al. (1993, 1996) who found that egoism is not significant underlying reason to influence ethical decision. Besides, the items included in the 'utilitarianism' were dropped from the MES for the 1st and 6th scenario. The Cronbach's alpha values of the ethical evaluation with philosophical reasons for the eight scenarios are shown in Table 2.

The Cronbach's alpha of the modified MES for the first scenario was 0.77, for the second scenario was 0.83, for the 3rd scenario was 0.86, for the 4th scenario was 0.85, for the 5th scenario was 0.80, for the 6th scenario was 0.77, for the 7th scenario was 0.82, and for the last scenario was 0.79. Since the Cronbach's alpha values were above 0.30 the reliability of the scales is acceptable for statistical analysis (Büyüköztürk, 2004).

Many whistle blowing studies agree that moral reasoning influences an individual's decision making process when deciding to blow the whistle (Brabeck, 1984; Chan and Leung, 2006; Miceli et al., 1991; Near and Miceli, 1986; Gundlach et al. 2003). Thus the students were asked to evaluate the scenarios ethically within the question of 'is it ethical?' to decide whether they were release the case ethical or not. To test H1, three items (Item16 would you do it?; Item17. would your peers do it?; and Item18. is it ethical?) were analyzed to measure overall ethical awareness of the participants in line with the Cohen et al. (1996, 2001).

In addition, participants' answers to item 18 (Is it ethical?) were regressed with their beliefs related to justice, utilitarianism, relativism and egoism and to identify as reasons for whistle blowing (Cohen et al. 1996, 2001) to test H2. The participants were asked with the questions, involved in justice, relativism, deontology, and utilitarianism to find out their reasoning for ethical evaluation for each scenario. Each item, involved in justice, relativism, deontology, and utilitarianism was rated on the seven points Likert-type in the modified Multi-dimensional Ethics Scale for each scenario. The scale was comprised five dimensions; justice (The actor's act is just/unjust; fair/unfair), relativism (The act of the actor is culturally acceptable; traditionally acceptable; acceptable to my family), deontology (self sacrificing; shows compassion or caring; the actor obligated to act this way), and utilitarianism (The act of the actor produced greatest utility to everyone; minimizes benefits while maximizes harm). The respondents are required to evaluate the action in the each scenario along the items to measure their moral evaluation (Appendix A).

Finally, to test H3, participants' propensity to report misdeeds internally or externally depending on their job guarantee examined by asking them, 'would you whistle blow internally or externally if you were guaranteed your job, or were worked as contracted teacher on a five-point Likert sub-scale, ranging from never (1) to very likely (5) for each scenario.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As noted in sample section, 187 questionnaires were performed to the participants and 180 of which was suitable for the analysis. So, 180 questionnaires were analyzed for the study.

Test of the hypotheses

Overall ethical awareness of the ACPT

Cohen et al. (1996, 2001) measured overall ethical awareness of Canadian business students calculating

Table 2. Cronbach's alpha values of the ethical evaluation with philosophical reasons for eight scenarios.

Scenario	Justice	Relativism	Utilitarianism	Deontology
1	.74	.70	-	.56
2	.83	.80	.54	.66
3	.59	.79	.79	.68
4	.86	.77	.63	.66
5	.86	.78	.82	.57
6	.71	.74	-	.64
7	.83	.81	.65	.62
8	.62	.82	.81	.55

Table 3. Means and standard deviations of the each ethical scenario.

Scenario	I would undertake the same action (1) / not (7)			My colleagues would undertake the same action (1) / not (7)			Ethical (1) /Unethical (7)		
	Mean	SD	Median	Mean	SD	Median	Mean	SD	Median
1	5.56	1.90	7.00	4.70	1.49	4.00	5.59	1.78	6.00
2	6.58	1.26	7.00	5.25	1.54	5.00	6.71	1.03	7.00
3	5.67	1.93	7.00	4.67	1.73	4.00	5.74	1.80	7.00
4	4.03	2.17	4.00	3.44	1.67	4.00	5.43	1.88	6.00
5	5.91	1.72	7.00	4.79	1.77	5.00	6.54	1.21	7.00
6	5.55	1.83	6.00	4.44	1.75	4.00	6.27	1.40	7.00
7	6.52	1.16	7.00	5.23	1.66	6.00	6.77	0.79	7.00
8	5.97	1.49	7.00	4.81	1.79	4.00	6.53	1.11	7.00

means of the MES item (The action described earlier is ethical/unethical) through eight vignettes. Therefore, means of the three separate items (*The probability that I would undertake the same action is low/high; the probability that my colleagues would undertake the same action is low/high; and the action described above is ethical/unethical*) were calculated to find out overall ethical awareness of the participants (H1) for each scenario (Table 3).

As shows in Table 3, the means indicate that the ACPT believe each act is unethical in all ethical scenarios. They relieved that they would be unwilling to undertake the same action more than their colleagues would be in all scenarios. However their answers are neutral (Mean=4.03) though they believe that their colleagues would undertake the same action (Mean=3.44) in the 4th scenario. Nevertheless their belief for that scenario is slightly unethical (Mean=5.43). The 4th scenario was related to copy software. The result might result from the failure of strict measures taken by the government against employing copy software in Turkey. So the participant might believe that using copy software is no unethical. Consequently, the H1 cannot be rejected according to the mean scores as the participants believe

that each act is unethical.

Underlying reasons for reporting wrongdoing

To test the H2, participants' answers were analyzed to measure their moral evaluation related to justice, relativism, utilitarianism, and deontology to blow a whistle. Table 4 illustrates the means of the items in each factor for each scenario.

The means in Table 4 indicate that the students believe each act is unethical in all scenarios. Besides, the mean scores of justice, utilitarianism, and relativism are higher than the scores of deontology and utilitarianism in all scenarios. According to Table 4, it can be claimed that, based on the philosophical values (especially justice, and utilitarianism), the overall ethical awareness of the participants is high.

Further answers of the participants were analyzed to explore the reasons for whistleblowing. To do this, the ethical orientation of the participants was measured to find out their reasons for whistleblowing within the philosophical beliefs of justice, utilitarianism, relativism and egoism (Cohen et al., 1996, 2001). Thus the participants'

Table 4. Means of the justice, relativism, deontology, and utilitarianism of each scenario.

Scenario	Ethical(1)/Unethical (7)		Justice		Relativism		Deontology		Utilitarianism	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	5.59	1.78	5.40	1.67	4.84	1.47	4.53	2.14	-	-
2	6.71	1.03	6.64	1.03	6.36	1.15	6.47	0.95	5.96	1.29
3	5.74	1.80	5.29	1.69	5.64	1.50	4.98	1.82	5.29	1.73
4	5.43	1.88	4.22	2.01	4.91	1.62	3.80	1.67	2.29	1.45
5	6.54	1.21	6.38	1.23	6.27	1.15	5.44	1.41	3.60	1.91
6	6.27	1.40	5.96	1.45	5.79	1.44	4.42	1.68	-	-
7	6.77	0.79	6.58	1.03	6.52	0.95	5.83	1.38	6.01	1.42
8	6.53	1.11	6.12	1.24	6.22	1.19	5.11	1.49	5.57	1.87

overall ethical evaluation was regressed on the four factor scores as follows:

$$\text{Evaluation}_i = a + \beta_1 (\text{justice})_i + \beta_2 (\text{relativism})_i + \beta_3 (\text{deontology})_i + \beta_4 (\text{utilitarianism})_i + e_i$$

where subscript *i* refers to an individual.

Table 5 illustrates the regression between the intension to whistle blow and the constructs as reasons for whistleblowing of the questionnaire for each scenario.

As Table 5 demonstrates, the justice had the strongest influence in the 1st, 6th, and 7th scenarios on the prospective teachers' ethical evaluation ($p < .001$). In addition, relativism had the strong influence in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 8th scenarios on the participant's ethical evaluation ($p < .001$, $p < .05$). On the other hand, deontology has the influence only in the 2nd scenario ($p < .001$) participant's ethical evaluation. While utilitarianism had positive effect in the 2nd, the 3rd, the 7th scenarios, and negative effect in the 4th scenario ($p \leq .001$), it had no effect in the scenario 1 and, the scenario 6 on the participants' ethical evaluation as mentioned before.

The pattern of regression coefficients in Table 5 is quite different from the pattern of means in Table 4. While justice seemed to have the strongest influence in the 1st, 2nd, 5th, 6th, and 7th scenarios in Table 4, it was not in the 2nd, and 5th scenarios in Table 5 on the participant's ethical evaluation. In addition, while relativism seemed to have effect on the participant's ethical evaluation, it was not seem to have the greatest regression coefficient for the scenario 7 in Table 5 as it is in Table 4. According to Table 4, deontology had the greatest influence on scenario 2, while justice had the greatest influence on scenario 2 shown in Table 5 on the participants' ethical evaluation.

Specifically, Table 5 shows that justice and relativism have the strongest effects ($p < .001$, $p < .05$), while deontology and relativism do not on the participant's ethical evaluation in scenario 1. Besides, relativism, and utilitarianism have the strongest effects ($p < .001$) in scenario 3. Scenario 4 elicited the most complex reasoning, because all ethical criteria (justice, relativism,

deontology, and utilitarianism) affect the prospective teachers during ethical decision making in that scenario as scenario 2 ($p < .001$).

Overall, these findings support Hypotheses 2 in the eight scenarios generally. Further, justice and relativism seem to have the strongest effect on the prospective teachers' ethical orientation in the seven scenarios except for scenario 2. However, Table 5 shows that scenario 2 elicited one of the most complex reasoning, because all ethical criteria (justice, relativism, deontology, and utilitarianism) affect the prospective teachers during ethical decision making in that scenario. Tables 4 and 5 show that the regression coefficients are different between scenarios supporting Cohen et al. (1996). Further, these results are consistent with studies by Cohen et al. (1993), and Cruz et al. (2000) who find that these constructs influence ethical decisions described in their scenarios.

The preferences for particular modes of whistleblowing

To test Hypotheses 3, the answers of the four items (*I would report the case to the appropriate persons within the school if I worked as permanent staff; I would report the case to the appropriate authorities outside of the school if I worked as permanent staff; I would report the case to the appropriate persons within the school if I worked as contracted staff; and I would report the case to the appropriate authorities outside of the school if I worked as contracted staff*) were analyzed to measure the likelihood that the prospective teachers would blow the whistle internally or externally according to having tenure or working as contracted employee. Descriptive statistics for all scenarios for the prospective teachers are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

As Table 6 demonstrates the participants, supposing themselves as permanent staff, showed a marked preference for internal over external reporting in general. Therefore according to Table 6, they believed that they would prefer reporting internally more than reporting

Table 5. Regression coefficients of ethical evaluation for the scenarios.

Scenario 1						Scenario 2						
Confidence Intervals						Confidence intervals						
β_1	SD	t	Sig.	Lower	Upper	β_2	SD	t	Sig.	Lower	Upper	
Constant		3.86	.000					.636	.526			
Justice	.386	.080	5.25	.000	.261	.575	.280	.074	3.78	.000	.134	.426
Relativism	.237	.094	3.11	.002	.106	.476	.223	.062	3.25	.001	.078	.322
Deontology	.054	.059	.773	.440	-.071	.161	.339	.056	6.61	.000	.259	.480
Utilitarianism	-	-	-	-	-	-	.200	.039	4.19	.000	.086	.239
R=.574, R ² =.329, Adjusted R ² =.318, F _(3,175) =28.648						R=.829, R ² =.688, Adjusted R ² =.680, F _(4,174) =95.764						
Scenario 3						Scenario 4						
95.0% confidence intervals						95.0% confidence intervals						
β_3	SD	t	Sig.	Lower	Upper	β_4	SD	t	Sig.	Lower	Upper	
Constant		1.95	.052					5.60	.000			
Justice	.115	.085	1.43	.154	-.046	.290	.324	.080	3.79	.000	.146	.463
Relativism	.364	.094	4.65	.000	.252	.623	.418	.091	5.31	.000	.304	.663
Deontology	.019	.019	0.24	.803	-.133	.171	.002	.083	.021	.000	-.162	.166
Utilitarianism	.309	.322	4.55	.000	.182	.461	-.101	.079	-1.67	.000	-.287	.024
R=.669, R ² =.448, Adjusted R ² =.435, F _(4,173) =35.132						R=.658, R ² =.433, Adjusted R ² =.420, F _(4,173) =33.003						
Scenario 5						Scenario 6						
95.0% confidence intervals						95.0% confidence intervals						
β_5	SD	t	Sig.	Lower	Upper	β_6	SD	t	Sig.	Lower	Upper	
Constant		4.16	.000					5.74	.000			
Justice	.284	.081	3.48	.001	.122	.443	.394	.072	5.29	.000	.238	.521
Relativism	.389	.076	5.33	.002	.257	.558	.289	.075	3.73	.000	.132	.427
Deontology	.055	.062	0.76	.450	-.076	.170	-.024	.055	-.358	.721	-.128	.089
Utilitarianism	.070	.039	1.14	.256	-.033	.122	.005	.060	.082	.935	-.113	.122
R=.655, R ² =.429, Adjusted R ² =.416, F _(4,174) =32.727						R=.601, R ² =.362, Adjusted R ² =.347, F _(4,174) =24.646						
Scenario 7						Scenario 8						
95.0% confidence intervals						95.0% confidence intervals						
β_7	SD	t	Sig.	Lower	Upper	β_8	SD	t	Sig.	Lower	Upper	
Constant		8.01	.000					5.60	.000			
Justice	.351	.061	4.58	.000	.158	.398	.163	.063	2.31	.022	.021	.270
Relativism	.292	.059	4.11	.000	.126	.360	.434	.063	6.39	.000	.279	.527
Deontology	.039	.036	0.65	.519	-.047	.093	.151	.048	2.36	.019	.018	.206
Utilitarianism	.207	.033	3.49	.001	.050	.180	.138	.035	2.34	.020	.013	.151
R=.725, R ² =.525, Adjusted R ² =.515, F _(4,173) =47.895						R=.677, R ² =.458, Adjusted R ² =.446, F _(4,174) =36.754						

p<.001, p<.05.

externally when they worked as permanent staff in all scenarios.

Table 7 shows that the prospective teachers prefer internal more than external reporting when they supposed themselves as contracted staff. The gap between the mean scores of internal over external reporting is

not as high as the scores in Table 6, except for the scores for t scenarios 2 and 3. According to Table 7, the prospective teachers would prefer reporting internally more than reporting externally when they supposed themselves as worked contracted staff in all scenarios. In addition, Tables 6 and 7 indicate that the mean scores of

Table 6. Descriptive statistics results for the participant's attitudes toward whistle blowing according to having job tenure for each scenario.

Scenario	Have tenure/ Internal reporting				Have tenure / External reporting			
	N	Mean	SD	Median	N	Mean	SD	Median
S1	178	3.80	1.02	4.00	176	3.59	1.18	4.00
S2	171	4.28	0.88	5.00	177	3.99	0.99	4.00
S3	172	3.84	1.16	4.00	173	3.53	1.19	4.00
S4	171	3.15	1.22	3.00	172	2.91	1.18	3.00
S5	175	3.98	1.06	4.00	176	3.74	1.12	4.00
S6	173	3.56	1.19	4.00	176	3.41	1.24	3.00
S7	173	4.17	1.00	4.00	175	3.91	1.09	4.00
S8	172	4.13	0.92	4.00	173	3.90	1.05	4.00

Table 7. Descriptive statistics results for the participant's attitudes toward whistle blowing according to 'working contracted' for each scenario.

Scenario	Contracted staff (Internal reporting)				Contracted staff (External reporting)			
	N	Mean	SD	Median	N	Mean	SD	Median
S1	175	3.38	1.19	4.00	177	3.34	1.25	3.00
S2	172	3.73	1.12	4.00	176	3.59	1.18	4.00
S3	173	3.42	1.21	4.00	174	3.26	1.23	3.00
S4	173	2.92	1.19	3.00	173	2.85	1.18	3.00
S5	172	3.55	1.16	4.00	173	3.44	1.18	4.00
S6	168	3.35	1.25	3.00	173	3.23	1.31	3.00
S7	172	3.75	1.20	4.00	173	3.71	1.24	4.00
S8	175	3.71	1.15	4.00	173	3.60	1.24	4.00

the participants, who suppose themselves as permanent staff, for the external reporting are higher than the scores of ones, who suppose themselves as contracted, for the internal reporting except for the scenario 3 and 4. This means that the prospective teachers would prefer whistle-blowing more when they would have job guarantee than they would work as contracted. Consequently the H3 cannot be rejected according to the mean scores, as possibility of blowing whistle internally or externally of the students is high when guaranteed their jobs (Tables 6 and 7). This finding is consistent with that of (Vinten, 1996; Miceli and Near, 1994; Gobert and Punch, 2000).

Conclusion

This study examined differences in ethical decision-making among samples drawn from the prospective teachers. Before examining the results in more detail, some of the methodological limitations should be acknowledged. There might be drawbacks in the use of prospective teachers as participants, in terms of their generalizability to the wider population. Besides, the use of self-reported attitudes means that the prospective teachers' responses might merely reflect prevailing social

norms, or be subject to social desirability effects (Park et al., 2008). In addition, the samples in this study may not even be representative of the population of ACPT in Turkey. Further, the scenarios to which the participants were asked to respond are very specific, and it may be that their responses in part reflect their attitudes toward that particular form of wrongdoing. Despite this limitation, the study offers a number of important insights.

The purpose of this study was to elicit whistleblowing intentions of ACPT. There were eight hypotheses; Overall ethical awareness of the ACPT is high (H1); The ACPT identified reasons related to philosophical values such as justice, deontology, utilitarianism, and relativism as reasons for reporting wrongdoings (H2); and The ACPT are more likely to whistle blow internally or externally when guaranteed their jobs (H3). Thus this study is supposed to contribute to the existing whistle-blower literature by examining alternatively certified teachers.

This study examined differences in ethical decision-making and attitudes toward whistle-blowing between samples drawn from ACPT in a large university in the Marmara region in Turkey. The prospective teachers' ethical evaluations were measured within the philosophical values (justice, utilitarianism, deontology, and relativism). The eight brief scenarios included in this study included a variety of ethical dilemmas, several of

which prospective teachers might expect to face at schools in their careers as teachers. Generally, each scenario required respondents to choose (or compromise) between two competing rationales. Meanwhile reliability of the MES was in line with the results by Cohen et al. (2001).

The results revealed that the prospective teachers recognize unethical acts, and believe that they would be unwilling to undertake the unethical action more than their colleagues would be except for the scenario 4. Therefore H1 is supported in the eight scenarios. These results are in line with the Mayhew and Murphy (2008).

The regression results indicate that scenario 2, and 4 elicit the most complex reasoning, because all ethical criteria (justice, relativism, deontology and utilitarianism,) seem to affect the prospective teachers, during ethical decision-making in these scenarios. Additionally, justice and relativism seem to have the strongest effect on the prospective teachers' ethical orientation in the seven scenarios except for the scenario 2. While justice has the strongest influence in the scenario1, 6, and 7; relativism has strong influence in the scenario3, 4, 5, and 8 on the prospective teachers' ethical reasoning. However, deontology affects only scenario 2 strongly. Besides, utilitarianism has effect in scenario 2, 3, 4, and 7, while it has no effect in scenario1 and, 6 on the prospective teachers' ethical evaluation. Consequently, the findings support H2 in the eight scenarios generally. In addition, these results are in line with Cruz et al. (2000), who found that these constructs influence ethical decisions described in their scenarios, and Hudson and Miller (2005), who studied tourism students. In addition, the study results are consistent with the results of studies by Cohen et al. (1993, 1996, 2001) revealing that egoism is not a significant underlying influence on ethical decisions, and students' responses display complex reasoning for ethical evaluation. The results indicate that all scenarios presented different regression weights. As noted earlier, the scenarios were modified from Cohen et al. (1996, 2001), and created from the real cases at schools in Turkey. So these findings have important implications for the design of training programs. For example, scenarios 2, 3, and 7 seemed to evoke strong considerations of utilitarian cost-benefit tradeoffs in the overall evaluation of the morality of taking the actions described. In the 1st, 5th, and 6th scenarios, however, utilitarian reasoning was considered irrelevant. In the scenario 4, utilitarian reasoning has negative effect the reason of which might be lack of strict measures taken by the government against usage of copy software in Turkey. Further, the ACPT seem to place relativism on the base of their ethical evaluation. Besides, they placed justice based on their ethical evaluation except for the scenario 3, and placed deontology based on their ethical evaluation except for the scenarios 5 and 7. These results show the probability that alternative certification programs placed a strong emphasis on justice, relativist reasoning and deontology,

while weak emphasis on utilitarian reasoning. If the view is held that justice and deontology should play a more important role in the educators' ethical evaluation, alternative certification sessions could be regarded as emphasizing the importance of justice and fairness issues, and the limitations of the cost-benefit approach according to these results.

Lastly, the results reveal that the probability of participants' preference of reporting internally or externally depends on their job guarantee. The prospective teachers who supposed themselves with job guarantee indicate that they would report internally or externally more than the others would do. Besides, all participants indicated that they would prefer reporting internally more than externally when they both guaranteed job or worked as contracted. As a result, H3 is supported by these findings. Additionally, these findings are in line with the results shown by Park et al. (2008).

Teachers, as models for students, need to be well trained. Students learn being just, fair or behave democratic from their teachers as well as education programs. So teachers should be enabling to realize and evaluate ethical issues at schools. Teacher training programs at faculty of educations have been improved by the government for years in Turkey. These programs last four years to prepare students to the real world. However, alternative certification programs have tried to achieve this aim in a year for years. So, differences between these two kinds of programs have been attracting attention of the researchers, and teacher training policy makers.

I hope this study will bring attention to the darker side of organizational behavior, and school management by examining whistle-blowing with level of studying ACPT. While lots of studies (Brabeck, 1984; Miceli et al., 1991, 2001; Cohen et al., 2001; Keenan, 2002; Near et al., 2004; Ohnishi et al., 2008; Liyanarachchi and Newdick, 2009; Lysonski and Gaidis, 1991) have been conducted to explain intentions for reporting wrong doing of a whistle-blower, any attempt to examine alternatively certified teachers' intention for whistle-blowing was found in the literature. So this paper is concluded with a consideration of directions for future research. There are good grounds for assuming that studies replicating the present research design could be worthwhile.

REFERENCES

- Aktifhaber (2007). *Müdürü Şikayet Eden Öğretmen Sürüldü*. www.aktifhaber.com.
- Asian Institute of Management (2006). *Whistleblowing in the Philippines: Awareness, attitudes and structures*. Research Monograph, Contract No. 7137453. Hills Governance Center. www.aim-hills.ph
- Arnold DF, Ponemon LA (1991). Internal auditors perceptions of whistle blowing and the influence of moral reasoning: An experiment. *Auditing: A J. Pract. Theory* 10:1-15.
- Barnett T, Daniel S, Taylor GS (1993). The internal disclosure policies of private sector employees: An initial look at their relationship to employee whistleblowing. *J. Bus. Ethics* 12(2):127-136.

- Brabeck MM (1984). Ethical Characteristics of Whistle-Blowers. *J. Res. Person.* 18:41-53.
- Büyükköztürk Ş (2004). *Data analysis for social sciences hand book*, (4th ed). Ankara: Pegem Press.
- Chan SY, Leung P (2006). The effects of accounting students ethical reasoning and personal factors on their ethical sensitivity. *Manage. Auditing J.* 21:436-457.
- Cohen JR, Pant LW, Sharp DJ (1993). Culture-based ethical conflicts confronting multinational accounting firms. *Account. Horiz.* 7(3):1-13.
- Cohen JR, Pant LW, Sharp DJ (1996). Measuring the ethical awareness and ethical orientation of Canadian auditors. *Behav. Res. Account.* 8:98-119.
- Cohen JR, Pant LW, Sharp DJ (2001). An experimentation of differences in ethical decision-making between Canadian business students and accounting professionals. *J. Bus. Ethics* 30:319-336.
- Cruz CA, Shafer WE, Strawser JR (2000). A multidimensional analysis of tax practitioner's ethical judgments. *J. Bus. Ethics* 24(3):223-245.
- Çakar U, Arbak Y (2008). Effects of business education on ethical evaluations. *J. Akdeniz İ.İ. B.F.* (16):1-19.
- Dawson, S. (2000). Whistleblowing: A broad definition and some issues for Australia, (Working paper by Victoria University of Technology). <http://www.bmartin.cc/dissent/documents/Dawson.html>.
- Dozier JB, Miceli MP (1985). Potential predictors of whistle-blowing: A prosocial behavior perspective. *Acad. Manage. Rev.* 10(4):823-836.
- Egitimbersen (2010). Milli Eğitimden ilginç savunma istemi. www.ogretmenportali.net.
- Elliston FA (1982). Civil disobedience and whistleblowing: A comparative appraisal of two forms of dissent. *J. Bus. Ethics* 1:167-177.
- Flory S, Phillips T, Reidenbach R, Robin R (1992). A multidimensional analysis of selected issues in accounting. *Account. Rev.* 67(2):284-302.
- Gobert J, Punch M (2000). Whistleblowers, the public interest, and the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, *The Modern Law Rev. Lim.*, <http://www.ebsco.com>.
- Gökçe AT (2001). A Study on alternatively certified classroom teachers (ACTs) through the perceptions of ACTs principals and inspectors. Master Thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Gökçe AT (2010). Alternatively certified elementary school teachers in Turkey. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.* pp.1064-1074.
- Groeneweg S (2001). Three Whistleblower Protection Models: A Comparative Analysis of Whistleblower Legislation in Australia, the United States and the United Kingdom. Public Service Commission of Canada.
- Gundlach MJ, Douglas SC, Martinko MJ (2003). The Decision to blow the whistle: A Social Information Processing Framework. *Acad. Manage. Rev.* 28(1):107-123.
- Hyman MR (1996). A Critique and Revision of the Multidimensional Ethics Scale. *Journal of Empirical Generalisations in Marketing Science*1(1).
- Hudson, Miller (2005) Ethical orientation and awareness of tourism students. *J. Bus. Ethic* 62:383-396.
- Institute of Public Administration Australia. (n.d). Whistleblowing. <http://www.ipaa.org.au/>
- Jubb PB (1999). Whistleblowing: A restrictive definition and interpretation. *J. Bus. Ethics* 21(1):77-94.
- Kaplan SE, Schultz JJ (2007). Intentions to report questionable acts: An examination of the influence of anonymous reporting channel, internal audit quality, and setting. *J. Bus. Ethics* 71(2):109-124.
- Kaynama A, King A, Smith WL (1996). The Impact of a Shift in Organizational Role on Ethical Perceptions: A comparative study. *J. Bus. Ethics* 15(5):581-590.
- Keenan JP (2002). Comparing Indian and American managers on whistleblowing. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 14:79-89.
- Larmer RA (1992). Whistle-blowing and employee loyalty. *J. Bus. Ethics* 11:125-128.
- Liyanarachchi G, Newdick C (2009). The Impact of moral reasoning and retaliation on whistle-blowing: New Zealand evidence. *J. Bus. Ethics* 89:37-57.
- Lysonski S, Gaidis W (1991). Across-cultural comparison of the ethics of business students. *J. Bus. Ethics* 10:141-151.
- Lurie Y, Albin R (2006). Moral dilemmas in business ethics: From decision procedures to edifying perspectives. *J. Bus. Ethics* 71:195-207
- Mayhew BW, Murphy PR (2008). The Impact of ethics education on reporting behavior. *J. Bus. Ethics* 86:397-416.
- McDevitt R, Van Hise J (2002). Influences in ethical dilemmas of increasing intensity. *J. Bus. Ethics* 40(3):261-274.
- Miceli MP, Near JP (1985). Characteristics of organizational climate and perceived wrong doing associated with whistleblowing decisions. *Pers. Psychol.* 38(3):525-544.
- Miceli MP, Near JP, Schwenk CR (1991). Who blows the whistle and why? *Ind. Labor Relat. Rev.* 45(1):113-130.
- Miceli MP, Near JP (1994). Relationships among value congruence, perceived victimization, and retaliation against whistleblowers: The case of internal auditors'. *J. Manag.* 20:773-794.
- Miceli MP, Rehg M, Near JP, Ryan KC (1999). Can laws protect whistle-blowers? Results of a naturally occurring field experiment. *Work Occupations* 26:129-151.
- Miceli MP, Scotter JRV, Near JP, Rehg MT (2001). Individual differences and whistle-blowing. *Acad. Manage. Proc.* pp.1-6.
- Nayir DZ, Herzig C (2012). Value orientations as determinants of preference for external and anonymous whistleblowing. *J Bus Ethics* 107:197-213.
- Near JP, Miceli MP (1985). Organizational dissidence: The case of whistle-blowing. *J. Bus. Ethics* 4(1):1-16
- Near JP, Miceli MP (1986). Retaliation against whistle-blowers: Predictors and effects. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 71:137-145.
- Near JP, Dworkin TM, Miceli MP (1993). Explaining the whistleblowing process: Suggestions from power theory and justice theory. *Organ. Sci.* 4(3).
- Near JP, Miceli MP (1996). Whistle-blowing: Myth and reality', *J. Manag.* 22(3):507-526.
- Near JP, Rehg MT, Scotter JRV, Miceli MP (2004). Does type of wrong doing affect the whistleblowing process? *Bus. Ethics Q.* 14(2):219-242.
- Ohnishi K, Hayama Y, Asai A, Kosugi S (2008). The process of whistleblowing in a Japanese psychiatric hospital. *Nurs. Ethics* 15(5).
- Okleshen K, Hayama Y, Asai A, Kosugi S (1996). The process of whistleblowing in a Japanese psychiatric hospital. *Nurs. Ethics* 15(5).
- Park H, Blenkinsopp J, Oktem MK, Omurgonulsen U (2008). Cultural Orientation and Attitudes Toward Different Forms of Whistleblowing: A Comparison of South Korea, Turkey, and the U.K. *J. Bus. Ethics* 82:929-939.
- Reidenbach R, Robin D (1990). Toward the development of a multidimensional scale for improving evaluations of business ethics. *J. Bus. Ethics*, 9, 639-653.
- Robinson SL, Bennett RJ (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Acad. Manage. J.* 38:555-572.
- Rocha E, Kleiner BH (2005). To blow or not to blow the whistle? That is the question. *Manag. Res. News*, 28(11/12):80-87.
- Stevens B (2001). Hospitality ethics: Responses from human resource directors and students to seven ethical scenarios. *J. Bus. Ethics* 30(3):233-242.
- Tavakoli AA, Keenan JP, Crnjak-Karanovic B (2003). Culture and whistleblowing an empirical study of Croatian and United States managers utilizing Hofstede's cultural dimensions. *J. Bus. Ethics* 43(1-2):49.
- Uddin N, Gillett PR (2002). The Effects of Moral Reasoning and Self-Monitoring on CFO Intention to Report Fraudulently on Financial Statements. *Account. Organ. Soc.* 40(1):41-51.
- Vinten G (1996). Whistleblowing in the health-related professions. *The Indian J. of Med. Ethics.* <http://www.issuesinmedicalethics.org>.
- Welton RE, Davis JR, LaGrone M (1994). Promoting the moral development of accounting graduate students: An instructional design and assessment. *Account. Educ. Int. J.* 3(1):35-50.
- Woiceshyn J (2011). A model for ethical decision making in business: Reasoning, intuition, and rational moral principles. *J. Bus. Ethics* 104:311-323. Doi: 10.1007/s10551-011-0910-1.
- Zhang J, Chiu R, Wei L (2009). Decision-making process of internal whistleblowing behavior in China: empirical evidence and implications. *J. Bus. Ethics* 88:25-41.

Appendix A: MES.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	Just							Unjust
2	Fair							Unfair
3	Culturally acceptable							Culturally unacceptable
4	Personally acceptable							Personally not acceptable
5	Traditionally acceptable							Traditionally unacceptable
6	Acceptable to my family							Not acceptable to my family
7	Not self-promoting for the actor							Self-promoting for the actor
8	Personally satisfying for the actor							Not personally satisfying for the actor
9	Produces the greatest utility							Produces the least utility
10	Minimizes benefits while maximizes harm							Maximizes benefits while minimizes harm
11	The probability that I would undertake the same action is high							The probability that I would undertake the same action is low
12	The probability that my peers would undertake the same action is high							The probability that my peers would undertake the same action is low
13	The action described above is ethical							The action described above is unethical