Teachers' Value Orientations as Determinants of Preference for External and Anonymous Whistleblowing

Assist. Prof. Dr. Asiye Toker Gökçe
Kocaeli University
Faculty of Education
The Department of Educational Sciences
Umuttepe Campus, İzmit / Kocaeli, Turkey

Abstract

Whistle-blowing indicates disclosing organizational wrongdoings resulting in harm to third parties. An individual's decision to blow the whistle might be based upon organizational, situational or personal factors. This study inquires the relationship between value orientations of teachers and choices for whistle-blowing with particular modes. Descriptive statistics, Correlation matrix, and regression analysis were used for analyzing the data. The sample includes 291 teachers in Turkey. Results revealed that, teachers prefer both external and anonymous reporting slightly. Besides, collectivism positively affects teachers' choices for whistle-blowing modes, while individualism affects positively only anonymous reporting. The results showed that there is no relationship between the values and intentions of the teachers to blow the whistle externally, and anonymously. While there have been many studies examining whistle blowing with different factors in especially marketing, there has not been any intention for examining it in education. Thus, this paper aimed to contribute to the extant literature by choosing Turkey and education as context as most studies have been conducted in the Western cultures, and in accounting or marketing service.

Keywords: Cultural orientation, education, teachers, Turkey, value orientation, whistle-blowing.

Introduction

It has been stated that up to 75% of organization members have attempted to theft, computer fraud, vandalism, sabotage, or absenteeism while three quarters of employees steal at least once from their employer, and that 95% of all organizations experience employee theft. Since prevalence of organizational wrongdoings has become wide spread throughout the world, workplace deviance has been an important issue for researchers and organizations for years (Henle, Giacalone, and Jurkiewicz, 2005; Robinson and Bennett, 1995). Miceli and Near (2005) argue that organization members are the most effective parties to decrease the incidence of unethical behaviors in organizations. One of the responses that organization members show in relation to organizational wrongdoings is whistle-blowing. Whistle-blowing is a process of giving information about the organizational wrongdoings resulting in harm to third parties, and is an effective corporate governance mechanism against organizational wrongdoings (Jubb, 1999; Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, ACFE, 2010).

Whistle-blowing is a prosocial behavior in organization, and an observer's decision to report a wrongdoing is based upon organizational, situational and personal factors. Since whistle-blowers release information deliberately, and employ unconventional methods to make the disclosure, they are at high risk such as being fired (Jubb, 1999; Near et al., 2004). Miceli et. al (2001) suggest that individual traits such as positive and negative affectivity and proactive personality affect the evaluation of wrongdoing and whistle-blowing. Besides, Near et al. (2004) claimed that the type of wrongdoing affects whistle blower's intention to blow the whistle. They found that employees who observed wrongdoing related to mismanagement, sexual harassment, and legal violations were more likely to report it than were employees who observed waste, stealing or discrimination. In addition to the type of wrongdoing, employees' perceptions and moral reasoning are also associated with the decision-making process for blowing the whistle-blowing (Miceli and Near, 1985; Near et al. 2004). Miceli et. al (1991; 2001) argue that whistle-blowers are likely to be valued individuals because they feel constrained to report wrongdoing by their own sense of moral behavior. Moral reasoning requires the ability to recognize and correctly evaluate any ethical dilemma.

Besides, observers do not report when they do not view the form of wrongdoing in question as requiring action on moral grounds. In addition, Liyanarachchi and Newdick (2009) argued that moral courage and moral reasoning are two of the most important factors to understand one's propensity to blow the whistle, and they examined the effect of students' level of moral reasoning, on their intention to whistle blow. Significant research has investigated the whistleblowing on account of demographic and rational decision-making processes (i.e. Brabeck (1984); Miceli and Near, 1985; Miceli et al. (2001); McDevitt and Van Hise, 2002; Keenan, 2002; Tavakoli et al., 2003; and Near et al. 2004; Reidenback and Robin, 1990; and Cohen et al. 1993, 2001); Ohnishi et al (2008).

Observers can experience unhappy situation as a result of whistle-blowing. Over 90% of whistleblowers were made to end their career early, or were blackballing, being labeled as insane, or lost their life savings from lawsuits, or even they lost their lives. Therefore, observers of wrongdoing may not choose to blow the whistle because of a fear of retaliation, and they may choose to exit out instead of to voice out from their organizations. Thus both external and internal whistleblowing is considered as a taboo by people in many countries (Greene, and Latting, 2004; Zhang, Chiu, and Wei, 2009). According to Verschoor (2005) 44% of the employees who become aware of individual or corporate wrongdoing do not report or disclose their observations to anyone. The main reasons why employees decide not to speak out against corporate wrong-doings are lack of remedial action and concern that their objections will not be kept private.

Whistleblowing is perceived as a negative act in Turkey. Complaining openly about ethical misconduct such as bribery has not been common in Turkey. The Global Corruption Barometer Report announced that only 33% individuals have reported paying a bribe while many of the victims of bribery do not lodge formal complaints out of fear of potential harassment and reprisal in the country in 2010 (Transparency International, 2011; Nayir and Herzig, 2012). Nevertheless little is known about attitudes towards whistleblowing in Turkey. Whistleblowing studies have been conducted mostly in the US, and calls have been made for investigating whistleblowing further in non-Western cultures (Park et al. 2005; Nayir and Herzig, 2012). One of the few studies contributing to our understanding of whistleblowing in Turkey was carried out by Park et al. (2008) and Nayir and Herzig (2012). Park et al. (2008) reveals that there is a preference for internal over external reporting in general, and there is no straightforward link between country, cultural orientation and attitudes to whistleblowing. They emphasize for future researcher the necessity to examine the relationship between cultural orientation and attitudes to different modes of whistleblowing. Besides, Nayir and Herzig (2012) confirm that cultural and ethical differences have an influence on the decision whether to and how to whistle blow. Further, their results suggest that it is important to study whistle-blowing from an individual perspective rather than from a national one as there may be significant variations in the individual orientations even within one and the same country. This study builds upon their work, and aims to examine the relationship between Turkish teachers' self-reported intention to choose particular whistleblowing modes and two concepts of individual value orientations, individualism/collectivism and idealism/relativism. This paper is expected to contribute to the extant literature by examining educators in Turkey as most studies have been studied employees in business world (i.e. 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 wrongdoing in their organizations.

Theoretical Background

Whistle-blowing

Near and Miceli (1985) claim that whistle-blowing is a disclosure by organization members of illegal, immoral, or illegitimate practices, to persons or organizations that might be able to affect action. Although there are different definitions of whistle-blowing (see, i.e. Barnett, 1992; Callahan and Collins, 1992; Near and Miceli, 1985; Larmer, 1992; Miceli, Near and Schwenk, 1991; Miceli and Near, 1994) it can be most thoroughly defined as going public with organizational information that threatens the public interest. To make whistle-blowing clear it can be said that it is noticing wrongful practices in an organization; being motivated by the desire to prevent unnecessary harm to others; raising concerns about wrongdoing; giving information generally to the authorities about the wrongdoing; and exposing it to the press or suppressing it in a government office. How whistle-blowing is defined is important because the definition of the construct frames the development of conceptual models and by extension sets the direction of subsequent empirical research (Groeneweg 2001).

In management context, dealing competently with organizational wrongdoings is of growing concern in organizations globally because of their financial destructive results (Nayir and Herzig, 2012). Near and Miceli (1985), and Miceli et al. (1999) argue that whistle-blowing can improve long-term organizational effectiveness when leaders encourage whistle-blowing in their organizations to improve their organization's effectiveness and efficiency. In this respect, whistle-blowing cannot be regarded as a threat to organizational authority structures. So, organization members, stockholders, and society can benefit from the termination of organizational wrongdoings such as fraud, discrimination, or safety violations. From this point, whistle-blowers may suggest solutions to organizational problems (Near & Miceli, 1985; Miceli et al. 1999).

A whistle-blower can be a former or current employee or officer of any institution, for-profit or non-profit, private or public. Besides, a whistle-blower believes either that he/she has been ordered to perform some act or he/she has obtained knowledge that the institution is engaged in activities are causing unnecessary harm to third parties or violate human rights (Elliston, 1982; Vinten, 1996; Dawson, 2001; Near et al. 2004). According to Brabeck, (1984), and Miceli et. al, (2009), whistle-blowers are utilitarian with a high level of moral development, and they are driven by their sense of unity and social responsibility to voice even when they are under strict pressure to keep silent. So an individual's assessment of the ethicality of whistleblowing also affects his/her intention as to whether or not to engage in the practice (Nayir and Herzig, 2012). Besides, an individual's ability to recognize and to evaluate correctly of any wrongdoing is important prerequisite to make right ethical decision to blow whistle (Miceli, et al. 1991; Miceli, Scotter, Near, & Rehg, 2001; Gundlach et al., 2003; Near et al. 2004; Rocha & Kleiner, 2005; Liyanarachchi, Newdick, 2009). To this extent individual's perception, moral reasoning (Miceli and Near, 1985), and individual differences in acceptance of ethical philosophies (Nayir and Herzig, 2012) are related to ethical judgments and behavioral intentions for whistle-blowing.

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). According to Gundlach et al. (2003) moral reasoning and retaliation play a significant role in the whistle-blowing process. 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. 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. 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. Besides, individual values help us to understand the effect of ethical orientation on whistle-blowing Nayir and Herzig (2012). Since whistle-blowing is a controversial situation, individuals need to assess wrongdoing, and need to decide what to do if wrongdoing is present. Therefore identifying value orientation of an individual might help to understand his/her propensity to blow the whistle.

Whistle-blowing Intention and Value Orientation

Liyanarachchi, and Newdick (2009) suggest Rest's proposition of a four stage model for the ethical decision making process. The process includes moral issue recognition, moral judgment, moral intention, and moral behavior. 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. Making a moral judgment includes formulating the morally ideal policy for action through reasoning. Establishing moral intent requires having moral motivation, which entails having the necessary motive or will to act in an ethical manner. And engaging in moral action involves having the moral character to execute and implement what ought to be done (Rogojan, 2009; Woiceshyn, 2011). The previous studies (McDevitt and Van Hise, 2002; Keenan, 2002; Tavakoli et al., 2003; and Near et al., 2004) evaluated individuals' materiality levels in ethical dilemmas in various studies in line with Rest's model.

Whistle-blowing Intention and Cultural Orientation

Miceli et al. (2009) suggest that cultural characteristics affect decision of the observers, who have witnessed wrongdoing, whether they have the responsibility for reporting it, and benefits of acting. Hence theories about cultural differences have been used by researchers to explain questions about the international context of whistle-blowing. 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. They applied Hofstede's formulation, and used individualism, and collectivism as two separate dimensions of cultural variations to explain social behavior of whistle blower.

According to Hofstede (cited by Taras, 2010) individualism is one of the four primary dimensions of which could differentiate the cultures of the world. The individualism refers to the extent to which 'the ties between individuals are loose'. On the other hand, collectivism is at the opposite end of the individualism. Collectivism refers to the extent to which people view themselves as a small part of a larger group. Individualist person looks primarily after his/her own interest and the interest of his/her immediate family, while collectivist person looks through birth or later events to belong tight in-groups. In-group might be extended family, clan, or organization. This kind of group protects the interest of its members, but in turn expects their permanent loyalty (Taras, 2010). Employees within an individualistic culture tend to protect their own interests (Sims and Keenan, 1999) and will most likely also try to protect these, when they decide to report organizational wrongdoing Nayir and Herzig (2012). Besides, previous research (Dozier and Miceli 1985; Miceli and Near 1992) has found that as cost perceptions are associated with reporting intentions, employees may calculate the costs and benefits of the reporting channel they choose. The fear of being labeled a troublemaker, appearing disloyal, and the possibility of victimization by managers and colleagues may work as powerful disincentives against speaking up openly about organizational wrongdoing. Individualistic employees may even be more concerned about these costs of reporting. Collectivists, in contrast, are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups in an organization (Sims and Keenan, (1999), and disfavor whistleblowing generally because it damages the unity of the organizations (Brody et al., 1998). Therefore, whistle-blowing tendencies might be influenced by individualism and collectivism (Sims and Keenan, 1999, and individualists tend to be more positive towards whistleblowing than collectivists generally (Park et al., 2005).

Typology of Whistle-blowing

There are different ways to blow the whistle. An individual might blow the whistle internally, externally; named, or anonymously. Park et al. (2008) 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 formally means reporting wrongdoing in an institutional form. A whistle-blower reports such wrongdoing by pursuing formal organizational protocols or communication channels. However whistle-blowing informally comes out when the whistle-blower personally informs someone s/he trusts or close associates about the wrongdoing (Park et al. 2008). Blowing the whistle internally refers to reporting wrongdoing to a supervisor or someone else within the organization who can correct the wrongdoing. The whistle-blower reports such wrongdoing to a top manager, bypassing managerial hierarchy despite the other available channels in the organization. In contrast, blowing the whistle externally means reporting a wrongdoing 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 wrongdoing 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). Zhang et al. (2009) argue that disclosing insider information to outsider's breaches obligations to the organization, violates the written or unspoken contract, and elicits damaging publicity. Therefore, external whistleblowing can cause serious damage to the organizations as compared to internal whistleblowing. Therefore ethically internal whistleblowing is preferred (Park & Blenkinsopp, 2009). Internal whistleblowing gives organization managers opportunity to deal with the wrongdoing without the pressure of external publicity. In addition, by fixing problems internally, managers can ensure that intimate information remains confidential which foster organizational accountability and learning (Zhang et al. 2009). Lastly, identified whistle-blowing refers to an instance in which the individual reporting the wrongdoing uses his or her real name, or when information to identify whistle-blower is provided. However using a nickname, or giving no information about him/herself while blowing the whistle, means anonymous whistle-blowing (Park et al., 2008).

Hypotheses

Individualism/Collectivism as Determinants of Whistleblowing Mode Choice

Nayir and Herzig, 2012 argue that, more individualistic employees may be more likely to prefer an anonymous approach when reporting organizational wrongdoing than their collectivistic counterparts. More individualistic employees may also be more likely to report organizational wrongdoing using external channels in comparison to their more collectivistic colleagues. Besides, more individualistic employees may likely feel more comfortable and less threatened when they whistle-blow to outside channels whereas collectivistic employees may not. So the first set of hypotheses is as below:

H1a More individualistic individuals are more likely to report an intention to whistle-blow anonymously.
H1b More individualistic individuals are more likely to report an intention to whistle-blow externally.
H1c More collectivistic individuals are less likely to report an intention to whistle-blow anonymously.
H1d More collectivistic individuals are less likely to report an intention to whistle-blow externally.

Idealism/Relativism as Determinants of Whistleblowing Mode Choice

Forsyth and Nye (1990) argue that personal moral philosophy is a framework which is used by an individual to decide on an ethical dilemma. It helps guidelines for moral judgments, and solutions to ethical dilemmas. Individuals' moral beliefs, attitudes, and values comprise an integrated conceptual system or personal moral philosophy which can be contrasted in terms of relativism and idealism. Idealism, describes the individual's concern for the welfare of others. Highly idealistic individuals believe that ethically correct actions will consistently produce desirable outcomes. They always avoid harming others. In contrast, relativism describes the degree to which individuals apply universal moral principles as the basis for ethical decisions. They generally feel that moral actions depend on the nature of the situation Forsyth (1992). Idealistic individuals, with higher levels of ethical reasoning are more likely to blow the whistle than are more relativistic individuals. While idealistic individuals may act out of a sense of duty (Vinten 1995); relativists may be less concerned when they observed a wrongdoing in their organization. Therefore, more idealistic employees may do prefer internal disclosure without trying to hide their identity. On the other hand, relativistic employees may prefer to use external channels to blow the whistle because of their less loyalty towards their organization (Nayir and Herzig, 2012). Studies such as Brabeck (1984), Dozier and Miceli (1985), and Arnold and Ponemon (1991) confirm that an individual's ability to resolve or interpret an ethical dilemma is affected by his or her moral reasoning. Therefore the second set of hypotheses is as below:

H2a More idealistic individuals are less likely to report an intention to whistle-blow anonymously.
H2b More idealistic individuals are less likely to report an intention to whistle-blow externally.
H2c More relativistic individuals are more likely to report an intention to whistle-blow anonymously.
H2d More relativistic individuals are more likely to report an intention to whistle-blow externally.

Methodology

Sample

The research sample includes 291 educators who were voluntary to participate the study 2011-2012 education year in Turkey. Details of the sample can be found in Table 1

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the sample

		N	%	Total
Gender	Female	184	64	288
	Male	104	36	
Age	23-29	116	41	283
	30-39	124	44	
	40-49	36	13	
	50-60	7	2	
Work Experience	1-5	118	40	291
	6-10	70	24	
	11.-15	64	22	
	16-20	25	9	
	21-25	9	3	
	26-	5	2	
Education	2-years	11	4	290
	Undergraduate	257	88	
	Graduate	23	8	

Of the 291 educators 64% were female, and 36% were male participants. The age range of the educators was 23 to 60 years. Most of the participants have less than 15 year work experience. Besides, most of them were undergraduate degree.

Instrument

The author developed the questionnaire adopted the instrument reviewing the literature (Park et al., 2008; Taras, 2010; Nayir and Herzig, 2012; Nayir, 2012; Redfern and Crawford, 2004). The participants were given the descriptions of wrongdoing and whistle-blowing at the beginning of the questionnaire. Then the participants' attitudes toward the two ways of reporting to blow the whistle when they observe a wrongdoing were measured by Park et al. (2008) in the first part of the study. The scale was ranging from completely disagree (1) to completely agree (5). Cronbach's alpha for the external whistleblowing dimension was .62. Likewise, the two items of Park et al.'s (2008) Cronbach's alpha for external whistle-blowing scale was 0.61. Further, the anonymous whistle-blowing scale was loading on one factor and Cronbach's alpha was 0.72. Similarly, the two items of Park et al.'s (2008) anonymous whistle-blowing scale were loading on one factor and Cronbach's alpha was 0.64 (Table 2).

The value orientations scale was ranging from completely disagree (1) to completely agree (5). The scale was consisted of four factors: individualism, collectivism, idealism, and relativism. The cultural value orientations of the teachers, individualism and collectivism, were measured using adapted Hofstede's scale by Chew (Taras, 2010; Nayir, 2012), in the second part of the questionnaire. The scale measures two of the values: individualism and collectivism. The value orientations scale was ranging from completely disagree (1) to completely agree (5). The scale was consisted of four factors: individualism, collectivism, idealism, and relativism.

The individualism scale originally consisted of six items. Exploratory factor analysis revealed a one-factor solution. One item was deleted from the scale as it has low loading (below 0.5). The reliability of the measure was assessed with Cronbach's alpha 0.79 for this scale (Table 2). These results are consisted with the results of Nayir and Herzig (2012) which was one factor and, whose Cronbach's alpha was 0.60. The Collectivism scale originally consisting of five items (Nayir and Herzig, 2012) was reduced as four items after the exploratory factor analysis. Similar to Nayir and Herzig (2012), one item was deleted from the scale as it has low loading (below 0.5). The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.63. These results are consisted with the results of Nayir and Herzig (2012) which was one factor and, whose Cronbach's alpha was 0.58.

The scale used to measure the ethical value orientation of teachers, idealism and relativism, was originally developed by Forsyth (1980), and was translated and adapted into Turkish by Yazıcı and Yazıcı (2010). The scale consisted of 20 items; 10 items for measuring idealism, and 10 items for measuring relativism. Five items from individualism, and three items from relativism were used in this research, as Nayir and Herzig (2012) did their study. Exploratory factor analysis revealed a one-factor solution, and the reliability of the measure was assessed with Cronbach's alpha 0.77 for the individualism scale (Table 2). These results are consisted with the results of the individualism scale by Nayir and Herzig (2012) which was one factor and, whose Cronbach's alpha was 0.71. Lastly, exploratory factor analysis revealed a one-factor solution, and the reliability of the measure was assessed with Cronbach's alpha 0.83 for this scale (See Table 2). Also personal information (gender, age, and departments) was asked at the beginning of the questionnaire. The reliability measures (Cronbach's alpha) are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Reliability measures of the variables

	Cronbach's Alpha
External whistleblowing	.62
Anonymous whistleblowing	.72
Individualism	.79
Collectivism	.63
Idealism	.77
Relativism	.83

Results

Mean and standard deviations for the items of the mode of whistleblowing intentions used in the analysis are presented in Table 3. It is noteworthy that the mean values for anonymous and external whistle-blowing tend to lie below the middle of the scale. These results are consisted with the results of Park et al. (2008) whose study revealed that the mean scores of the Turkish students was 2.85 for the external whistle-blowing, and was 2.98 for anonymous whistle-blowing. Besides, Nayir and Herzig (2012) found their study that the mean scores of the Turkish managers was 2.38 for the external whistle-blowing, and was 2.61 for anonymous whistle-blowing.

Table 3. Mean values and standard deviations of the items

	N	Mean	Sd
External whistleblowing	289	**2.82**	.92
I would provide information to outside agencies (madde=4)	280	2.37	1.50
I would inform the public of it (madde=5)	277	1.87	1.55
Anonymous whistleblowing	288	2.55	1.19
I would report it using an assumed name (madde=8)	286	2.24	1.29
I would report the wrongdoing but wouldn't give any information about myself (madde=9)	287	**2.83**	1.40

Mean and standard deviations for the values are demonstrated in Table 4. As Table 4 shows, mean score for the idealism (Mean =4.67) has the highest level while collectivism (Mean =2.75) has the lowest level among the values. These results are partly consisted with the results of Nayir and Herzig (2012). Their study revealed that the mean score for idealism of the Turkish managers was 3.98 as the highest level, but the mean score for individualism was 3.02 as the lowest level among the values.

Table 4. Mean values and standard deviations of the items

	N	Mean	Sd
Individualism	290	3.06	.97
Collectivism	290	2.75	.89
Idealism	290	4.67	.59
Relativism	289	3.71	1.16

Correlation matrix for the variables used in the analysis is presented in Table 5. The results confirm significant relationships between the cultural orientations of the teachers and the way wrongdoing within the school is reported.

However, the results revealed that there is not any relationship between the ethical values of the teachers and their whistleblowing modes. As Table 5 shows, there were significant positive correlations between collectivism and the two types of whistleblowing, while there was significant positive correlation between individualism and anonymous reporting channels. Besides, there is a strong (positive) relationship between relativism, and idealism, and external and anonymous whistleblowing. Finally, results of the correlation analysis shows that there was not any correlation between the individualism and relativism values and anonymous reporting channels. Therefore the results revealed in the correlation analysis do not support the second set of hypotheses (H2a, H2b, H2c, and H2d). These results are not consisted with the results of Nayir and Herzig (2012) who found relationship between the idealism, and individualism and intention to blow the whistle externally, and anonymously.

Table 5. Pearson correlations between value orientations and ways of whistleblowing intentions

	Individualism	Collectivism	Idealism	Relativism	External whistleblowing	Anonymous whistleblowing
Individualism						
Pearson correlation	1					
Sig.(2-tailed)						
N	290					
Collectivism						
Pearson correlation	-.020	1				
Sig.(2-tailed)	.729					
N	290	290				
Idealism						
Pearson correlation	.022	-.069	1			
Sig.(2-tailed)	.705	.239				
N	290	290	290			
Relativism						
Pearson correlation	.098	-.021	.257*	1		
Sig.(2-tailed)	.097	.723	.000			
N	289	289	289	289		
External whistleblowing						
Pearson correlation	.009	.136*	-.081	.037	1	
Sig.(2-tailed)	.875	.021	.172	.536		
N	288	288	288	287	289	
Anonymous whistleblowing						
Pearson correlation	.117*	.149*	-.082	-.028	.299**	1
Sig.(2-tailed)	.048	.012	.165	.634	.000	
N	287	287	287	286	288	287

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

To test the hypotheses regression analysis was used. A part of the first set of hypotheses (H1a and H1c together) suggested that individualism is positively and collectivism is negatively related to the willingness to blow the whistle in anonymous mode. As shown in Table 6, individualism appears to have a positive effect on anonymous whistleblowing, but so does collectivism. This provides partial support of the hypothesis. Besides, the second set of hypotheses (H2a, and H2c) suggested that idealism is negatively and relativism is positively related to the willingness to blow the whistle in anonymous mode. However, the results in the Table 6 reject the second set of hypotheses (H2a, and H2c), as the results of the correlation analysis in Table 5.

Table 6. Regression model for anonymous whistleblowing

Variable	β	SE	t-value
Individualism	.121*	.071	2.059
Collectivism	.139*	.079	2.377
Idealism	-.079	.122	-1.301
Relativism	-.017	.063	-.279
R^2	.042		
F	3.051		

β =standardized beta, $p<0.05$

The other part of the first set of hypotheses (H1b and H1d together) suggested that individualism is positively and collectivism is negatively related to the willingness to blow the whistle in external mode. As Table 7 reveals, contrary to the hypotheses, collectivism appears to have a positive effect on external whistleblowing, but does not individualism. This result rejects the H1b and H1d. Besides, the second set of hypotheses (H2b, and H2d) suggested that idealism is negatively and relativism is positively related to the willingness to blow the whistle in external mode. Similar to the results in Table 6, the results in the Table 7 reject the second set of hypotheses (H2a, and H2c), as the results of the correlation analysis in Table 5.

Table 7. Regression model for external whistleblowing

Variable	β	SE	t-value
Individualism	.005	.056	.087
Collectivism	.124*	.062	2.112
Idealism	-.097	.095	-1.591
Relativism	.064	.049	1.044
R^2	.027		
F	1.981		

β =standardized beta, p<0.05

Discussion and Conclusion

This study aimed to examine the relationship between the value orientations of educators in organizational settings and their preferences for particular modes of whistle-blowing. The analysis first revealed an unexpected finding. There was a strong relationship between both relativism and idealism, and external and anonymous whistleblowing. Furthermore, this study demonstrates that potential whistleblowers are generally reluctant to express their observations about organizational wrongdoings to external parties and if they were intending to blow the whistle, they would do it with the highest level of anonymity. To this extent there is evidence of support for the view expressed by Nayir and Herzig (2012) that whistleblowing in Turkey is often viewed as risky for individuals.

In our first set of hypotheses, it was claimed that more individualistic individuals would be more likely to report an intention to use an external and anonymous mode of whistle-blowing whereas collectivistic individuals would be less likely to do so. These hypotheses were slightly confirmed. Opposing to the first set of hypotheses, collectivists expressed that they would externally raise their voice against the wrongdoing they observe in their schools, and prefer an anonymous form of whistleblowing while individualists, did not. Individualists revealed that they would not report the wrongdoing they observe in their schools to external parties but prefer report anonymously. Since the tendency towards internal whistleblowing was not analyzed, deriving conclusions related to a particular preference of individualists for internal over external reporting mechanisms would be incorrect.

Hofstede and McCrae, (2004) suggest that people are integrated from birth on ahead into strong, cohesive in-groups, protecting them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty in collectivist societies. The results of the study support this description. To this extent there is evidence of support for the expectation that externally whistleblowers may want to appear in a positive light as heroic defenders of values which are more important than company loyalty (Nayir and Herzig, 2012). The strong relationship between external and anonymous whistle-blowing shows that individualistic teachers, as Nayir and Herzig (2012) suggest, appear not to believe that spreading of a wrongdoing might help them to advance their career and put them into the situation of 'hero'.

In the second set of hypotheses, it was claimed that the ethical value orientations of educators would influence preferences for particular whistleblowing modes. While Nayir and Herzig (2012) confirmed that idealism and relativism affect individuals for potential reporting the wrongdoings externally or anonymously, this study did not confirmed these hypotheses. This study contributes to the literature of whistleblowing and the influence of personal and ethical characteristics of individuals on the decision to use particular modes of whistleblowing. Therefore, this study is believed to address an important question as studies suggest close relationships between attitudes and actual behavior. In choosing Turkey as context, the study was build upon previous study by Park et al. (2008), and Nayir and Herzig (2012).

In choosing education as context, the study is supposed to bring attention to the organizational behavior by examining relationship between the value orientations and preferences for particular modes of whistle-blowing in school settings to the third parties (i.e. educational policy makers, educational administrators, and researchers). 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

Arnold, D. F. and Ponemon, L. A. (1991). Internal auditors perceptions of whistle blowing and the influence of moral reasoning: An experiment. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory, 10,* 1–15.

Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, (2010). *2010 Report to the Nations on Occupational Fraud and Abuse*, Austin, TX.

Barnett, T. (1992). A Preliminary investigation of the relationship between organizational characteristics and external Whistle-Blowing by employees. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 11, 949-959.

Brabeck, M. M. (1984). Ethical Characteristics of Whistle-Blowers. *Journal of Research in Personality, 18,* 41–53.

Brody, R. G., Coulter, J. M., and Mihalek, P. H. (1998). 'Whistle-Blowing: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Ethical Perceptions of U.S. and Japanese Accounting Students', *American Business Review,* 16(2), 14–23.

Henle, C. A., Giacalone, R. A., and Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2005). The role of ethical ideology in workplace deviance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 56(3), 219–230.

Callahan, E.S. and Collins, J. W. (1992). Employee attitudes toward Whistle-Blowing: Management and public policy implications. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 939-948.

Chan, S. Y. and Leung, P. (2006). The Effects of Accounting Students Ethical Reasoning and Personal Factors on Their Ethical Sensitivity. *Managerial Auditing Journal, 21*, 436–457.

Cohen, J.R., Pant, L.,W., and Sharp, D.J. (1993). Culture-Based Ethical Conflicts Confronting Multinational Accounting Firms. *Accounting Horizon, 7* (3), 1-13.

Cohen, J.R., Pant, L.W., Sharp, D.J. (2001). An Experimentation of Differences in Ethical Decision–Making Between Canadian Business Students and Accounting Professionals. *Journal of Business Ethics, 30*, 319-336.

Dawson, S. (2001). *Whistleblowing: A Broad Definition and Some Issues for Australia*, (Working paper by Victoria University of Technology). Retrieved 27 April, 2012, http://www.bmartin.cc/dissent/documents/Dawson.html.

Dozier, J. B. ve Miceli, M.P. (1985). Potential Predictors of Whistle-Blowing: A Prosocial Behavior Perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(4), 823-836.

Elliston, F. A. (1982). Civil Disobedience and Whistleblowing: A Comparative Appraisal of Two Forms of Dissent. *Journal of Business Ethics, 1,* 167-177.

Forsyth, D. R. (1980). A taxonomy of ethical ideology. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39(1), 175–184.

Forsyth, D. R., & Nye, L. (1990). Personal moral philosophies and moral choice. *Journal of Research in Personality,* 24, 398–414.

Forsyth, D. R. (1992). Judging the morality of business practices: The influence of personal moral philosophies. Journal of Business Ethics, 11(5/6), 461–470.

Greene, and Latting, (2004). Whistleblowing as form of advocacy: Guidelines for the practitioner and organization. *Social worker*, 49(2), 219-230.

Groeneweg, S. (2001). *Three Whistleblower Protection Models: A Comparative Analysis of Whistleblower Legislation in Australia, the United States and the United Kingdom.* Public Service Commision of Canada.

Gundlach, M. J., Douglas, S. C. and Martinko, M. J. (2003). The Decision to Blow theWhistle: A Social Information Processing Framework. *Academy of Management Review, 28* (1), 107–123.

Hofstede, G., & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Personality and culture revisited: Linking traits and dimensions of culture. Cross-Cultural Research, 38(1), 52-89.

Jubb, P.B., (1999). Whistleblowing: A Restrictive Definition and Interpretation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 21*(1), 77-94

Larmer, R. A. (1992). Whistle-blowing and employee loyalty. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 11, 125-128.

Liyanarachchi, G., Newdick, C. (2009). The Impact of moral reasoning and retaliation on whistle-blowing: New Zealand evidence. *Journal of Business Ethics, 89,* 37–57.

Lurie, Y. and Albin, R. (2006). Moral dilemmas in business ethics: From decision procedures to edifying perspectives. *Journal of Business Ethics, 71,* 195–207.

Keenan, J.P., (2002). Comparing Indian and American Managers on Whistleblowing. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 14,* 79-89.

Miceli, M. P. and Near, J. P. (1985). Characteristics of Organizational Climate and Perceived Wrongdoing Associated with Whistleblowing Decisions. *Personnel Psychology, 38* (3), 525-544.

Miceli, M. P. Near, J. P., Schwenk, C. R. (1991). Who Blows the Whistle and Why? *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 45* (1), 113-130.

Miceli, M., Near, J. P. (1992). Blowing the whistle: The organizational and legal implications for companies and employees. New York: Lexington.

Miceli, M. P., Near, J. P. (1994). Relationships among Value Congruence, Perceived Victimization, and Retaliation against Whistleblowers: The Case of Internal Auditors'. *J. Management, 20*, 773–794.

Miceli, M. P., Rehg, M., Near, J. P. and Ryan, K. C. (1999). Can Laws Protect Whistle-Blowers? Results of a Naturally Occurring Field Experiment. *Work and Occupations,* 26, 129–151.

Miceli, M. P. Scotter, J. R. V., Near, J.P., and Rehg, M.T. (2001). Individual Differences and Whistle-blowing. *Academy of Management Proceedings*. 1-6.

Miceli, M. P. Near, J.P. (2005). Standing up or standing by: What predicts blowing the whistle on organizational wrongdoing? Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 24, 95-136.

Miceli, M. P., Near, J.P., and Dworkin, TM. (2009). A Word to the Wise: How Managers and Policy-Makers can Encourage Employees to Report Wrongdoing. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 86,379–396.

Mayhew, B.W. and Murphy, P.R. (2008). The Impact of ethics education on reporting behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 86*, 397–416.

McDevitt, R. and Van Hise, J. (2002). Influences in ethical dilemmas of increasing intensity. *Journal of Business Ethics, 40*(3), 261-274.

Nayir, D. Z., Herzig, C. (2012). Value orientations as determinants of preference for external and anonymous whistleblowing. *J Bus Ethics, 107*, 197–213.

Nayir, D.Z. (2012). *Kurumsal Etik ve Whistleblowing*. Pozitif Press.

Near, J.P. ve Miceli, M.P. (1985). Organizational Dissidence: The Case of Whistle-Blowing. *Journal of Business Ethics, 4*, (1), 1-16

Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1986). Retaliation against whistle-blowers: Predictors and effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71,137-145.

Near, J. P. and Miceli, M. P. (1996). Whistle-blowing: Myth and reality', *Journal of Management*, 22(3), 507– 526.

Near, J.P., Rehg, M.T., Scotter, J.R.V., Miceli, M.P. (2004). Does type of wrongdoing affect the whistleblowing process? *Business Ethics Quarterly, 14*(2), 219-242.

Ohnishi, K., Hayama, Y., Asai, A. And Kosugi, S. (2008). The process of whistleblowing in a Japanese psychiatric hospital, *Nursing Ethics*, 15, 5.

Park, H., Rehg, M. T. and Donggi, L. (2005). The Influence of Confucian Ethics and Collectivism on Whistleblowing Intentions: A Study of South Korean Public Employees, *Journal of Business Ethics* 58(4), 387–403.

Park, H., Blenkinsopp, J., Oktem, M. K., Omurgonulsen, U. (2008). Cultural Orientation and Attitudes Toward Different Forms of Whistleblowing: A Comparison of South Korea, Turkey, and the U.K. *Journal of Business Ethics, 82*, 929–939.

Park, H., and Blenkinsopp, J. (2009). Whistleblowing as planned behavior - A survey of South Korean police officers. *Journal of Business Ethics, 85*(4), 545-556.

Redfern, K. and Crawford, J. (2004). An Empirical Investigation of the Ethics Position Questionnaire in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Business Ethics* 50: 199-210

Reidenbach, R., Robin, D. (1990). Toward the development of a multidimensional scale for improving evaluations of business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics, 9,* 639-653.

Robinson, S. L., and Bennett, R. J. (1995) A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 555-572.

Rocha, E. and Kleiner, B. H. (2005). To blow or not to blow the whistle? That is the question. *Management Research News, 28*(11/12), 80–87.

Rogojan, P. (2009). Deviant Workplace Behavior in Organizations: Antecedents, Influences, and Remedies. Master Thesis. Retrieved September 22, 2010, from :http://othes.univie.ac.at/

Sims, R. L. and J. P. Keenan: 1999, 'A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Managers' Whistleblowing Tendencies', *International Journal of Value-Based Management,* 12(2), 137–151.

Taras, V. (2010). Catalogue of Instruments for Measuring Culture. University of North Carolina, Department of Business Administration, Retrieved: 03 May 2012 from www.vtaras.com

Tavakoli, A. A., Keenan, J.P., Crnjak-Karanovic, B. (2003). Culture and whistleblowing an empirical study of Croatian and United States managers utilizing Hofstede's cultural dimensions. *Journal of Business Ethics, 43* (1-2), 49.

Transparency International. (2011). Global corruption barometer. Retrieved September 28, 2012, from http://www.transparency.org.

Verschoor, C. (2005). Is this the age of whistleblowers? *Strategic Finance*, 86(7), 17–18.

Vinten, G. (1996). Whistleblowing in the health-related professions. The *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics.* Retrieved website: http://www.issuesinmedicalethics.org

Woiceshyn, J. (2011). A Model for Ethical Decision Making in Business: Reasoning, Intuition, and Rational Moral Principles. *J Bus Ethics, 104*, 311–323.

Yazıcı, A. and Yazıcı, S. (2010). A study of the relaibility and validity of ethics position questionnaire. *Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*. 8(4), 1001-1017.

Zhang, J., Chiu, R., Wei, L. (2009). Decision-Making Process of Internal Whistleblowing Behavior in China: Empirical Evidence and Implications, *Journal of Business Ethics* 88, 25–41.