Full Length Research Paper

Relationship between whistle-blowing and job satisfaction and organizational loyalty at schools in Turkey

Asiye Toker Gokce

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

This paper examines whistle-blowing at schools in Turkey. Firstly, wrongdoings observed by teachers at schools, and their preference for reporting these were analyzed. Then, differences between the teachers, who blew whistle and the others who did not were examined according to the research variables. The study group involved 283 teachers. The author used a questionnaire to obtain the results. Results showed that 67 of the 283 teachers observed wrongdoings at schools, and 31 of them reported it while 36 did not. The most observed wrongdoings are wasting school resources, using official position for personal interest, and wasting school's money. Whistle-blowing intention increases according to the seniority increase. The teachers prefer informal reporting. There is no difference between the groups in terms of job satisfaction. There is significant difference between the groups in terms of normative commitment. 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.

Key words: Education, job satisfaction, organizational loyalty, organizational commitment, teacher, Turkey, whistle-blowing.

INTRODUCTION

Whistle-blowing is described as 'the 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' (Near et al., 1993). It was investigated that 26% of federal employees engaged in whistle-blowing in 1980, while that increased to 48% in 1992. Whistle-blowing came into the limelight with the fall of American corporations such as Enron, WorldCom, and Tyco due to acts of wrongdoings. While some whistle-blowers were awarded, others suffered retaliation (Micelit et al., 1999; Krebsbach, 2005;

Kaplan and Schultz, 2007; Liyanarachchi and Newdick, 2009).

Whistle-blowing has been perceived as hurtful to organizational interests. Yet managers can improve their organization's effectiveness and efficiency by encouraging whistling in their organizations (Miceli et al., 1999; Liyanarachchi, Newdick, 2009). Though whistle-blowing has not been known clearly as a fact, organization members, especially civil servants, could not report wrongdoings for years in Turkey because of the threat of retaliation for blowing the whistle. For example, teacher

E-mail: asitoker@gmail.com, Tel: 90 262 3032431, 90 533 3372772.

M. Yiğiter was suspended for reporting his school principal for misdeeds in April 2010, while geography teacher V. Kaya was relocated to another school in Istanbul for bringing the school principal's fraud to light in 2011 (Aktifhaber, 2007; Egitimbirsen, 2010). So this study aims to investigate whistle-blowing at schools in Turkey.

This paper is expected to contribute to the extant literature by examining educators in Turkey, as most studies have been on 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 wrongdoing in their organizations.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND FORMATION OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Whistle-blowing

Whistle-blowing is a process of giving information about the acts resulting in harm to third parties. Although there are somewhat different definitions of whistle-blowing (Barnett, 1992; Callahan and Collins, 1992; 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. 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 researches, (example, studies examining internal auditors by Miceli and Near (1994); federal employees by Miceli et al. (1999); managers by Keenan (2002; nurses, and diverse samples from various industries by Near et al. (2004). To make this definition clear, it can be said that whistle-blowing is (a) noticing 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-blowers are those who disclosure wrongdoings, or unethical acts in an organization. A whistle-blower can be a former or current employee of any organization. Besides, whistle-blowers believe either that they have obtained knowledge that the organization is engaged in activities that are causing unnecessary harm to third parties or violate human rights (Elliston, 1982; Vinten,

1996; Dawson, 2001; Near et al., 2004). So, a whistle-blowers must decide whether the act s/he observed is a wrongdoing or not firstly. Robinson and Bennett (1995) introduced a typology of deviant workplace behavior in organizations. Their focus was primarily on wrongdoing that is imposed on the organization or its members. And they concluded that wrongdoing 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. Besides, Near et al. (2004) created taxonomies of wrongdoing in organizations such as waste and discrimination, legal violations mismanagement and sexual harassment, and stealing and safety problems. They claimed that the type of wrongdoing affects whistle blower's intention to blow the whistle. Based on these studies the first research question was proposed as:

1. What kinds of wrongdoings do the teachers observe at schools?

According to Miceli and Near (2005), employees are the most effective parties to decrease the incidence of wrongdoings in organizations, and one of the responses that they show related to the wrongdoings is whistle-blowing. However, observers of any wrongdoing may not choose to blow the whistle because of fear of retaliation. Results of the studies by Greene and Latting (2004) and Zhang et al. (2009) revealed that over 90% of whistle-blowers were blackballed, were made to end their career early, or lost their life savings from lawsuits. Besides, whistleblowing is considered as a taboo by people in many countries. For instance, it has been perceived as a negative act in Turkey (Transparency International, 2011; Nayir and Herzig, 2012). As the results by Verschoor (2005) indicated, 44% of the employees who observed a wrongdoing do not report their observations to anyone. Based on these studies the second research question was proposed as:

2. Do teachers blow whistle when they observe wrongdoings at schools?

Dozier and Miceli (1985) argue that observers' decision for whistle-blowing is affected by their personality traits, and the environment surrounding them. Miceli et +al. (2001) emphasize possible relationship between employees' affectivity and their whistle-blowing intention. So, the substantial body of research has attempted to examine the impact of personality variables, especially gender, on corporate ethical decision-making. For example, Deshpande (1997), Dawson (1997), Deshpande et al. (2000), Fleischman and Valentine (2003) and Kwong et al. (2003) found out differences between men's and women's ethical decision-making for whistle-blowing.

Valentine and Rittenburg (2004) and Rehg et al. (2008) found that there was significant association with gender and whistle-blowing. The results by Roxas and Stoneback (2004) revealed that the ethicality of men and women was different. Based on these studies the third research question was proposed as:

3. Is there any difference between the teachers who blew whistle and who did not in respect to gender, work tenure, education, and seniority?

Typology of whistle-blowing

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 indicates reporting wrongdoing by pursuing formal organizational communication channels, while blowing whistle informally refers informing someone trusted about the wrongdoing (Park et al., 2008). Blowing the whistle internally means reporting wrongdoing to a supervisor within the organization, while blowing the whistle externally indicates reporting a wrongdoing to outside parties believed to have the power to correct it.

Observers are more likely to follow internal whistle-blowing when they believe in the existence of effective internal channels of complaint in their organizations. On the other hand, they probably report the wrongdoing externally, when it involves harm to the public or employees (Miceli and Near, 1994; Vinten, 1996; Park et al., 2008). When the observer uses his/her real name, or gives any information about him/her, then identified whistle-blowing comes. However, when s/he uses a nickname, or gives no information about him/her, anonymous whistle-blowing comes (Park et al., 2008). Based on this, the fourth research question was proposed as:

4. What kinds of modes do teachers prefer for whistle-blowing?

Organizational loyalty and job satisfaction

Models explaining whistle-blowing emphasize individual's job satisfaction and organizational loyalty or commitment as individual traits affecting decision-making for whistle-blowing (Miceli et al., 1991). Hence, organizational loyalty and job satisfaction are two of the most important issues needed for understanding organizational behavior. Loyalty refers to a willingness to sacrifice in the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Business Ethics (Vandekerckhove and Commers, 2004). It means identifying with organi-zation and feeling responsibility toward organization.

Loyalty requires feelings of duty and responsibility. Employees' loyalty lessens when they leave their organization while it grows in positive and rewarded work conditions (Mueller, Wallace and Price, 1992). Organizational commitment refers to the degree to which an employee feels loyalty to the organization, while job satisfaction indicates degree to which an employee has positive emotions toward the work role (Currivan, 1999). While job satisfaction point outs positive emotions toward a particular job, organizational commitment indicates the degree to which an employee feels loyalty to a particular organization (Mueller et al., 1992). While some researchers argue that there are relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Mueller et al., 1992), Currivan (1999) could not find significant relationship between them. The terms 'organizational loyalty' and 'organizational commitment' were used interchangeably in this study.

According to Near and Miceli (1985), whistle-blowers consider themselves to be very loyal employees and try to use internal whistle-blowing; when punished for this, then they use external whistle-blowing. Whistle-blowers believe that they are behaving in a loyal manner, helping their managers by calling their attention to the wrongdoings in their organization. Besides, Miceli et al. (1991) argue that whistle-blowers are likely to be valued, committed members of the organization. While some researchers consider whistle-blowers as loyal employees, others consider them as snitches or traitors (Near and Miceli, 1990, 1995). Although Near and Miceli (1990, 1995) examined relationship between employee loyalty and whistle-blowing, they could not find any evidence. They suggest for further researchers to examine possible effects of job satisfaction and loyalty on decision-making for whistle-blowing.

Besides, scholars argue that organizational members have some obligations; one of which is described as loyalty, and whistle-blowing violates that obligation in organizations (Vandekerckhove and Commers, 2004). Vandekerckhove and Commers introduce the concept of 'rational loyalty', describing it as explicit set of mission statement, value statement, goals and code of conduct of an organization. They argue that an organization can demand this is the kind of loyalty from their employees, and whistle blowing can be accepted as an act of rational loyalty. They suggest that managers should set internal and external channels and procedures for employees who want to raise a concern to protect them who blow the whistle as an act of rational loyalty. Based on these studies the 5th, 6th, and 7th research questions were proposed as:

5. Is there any difference between the teachers who blew the whistle and the others who did not in respect to their job satisfaction?
6. Is there any difference between the teachers who blew the whistle and the others who did not in respect to their

organizational commitment?

7. Are job satisfaction and organizational commitment the reasons the teachers do whistle-blowing?

Significant research has investigated whistle blowing on account of demographic and rational decision-making processes. These attempts generally can be categorized into four. In the first category scholars have studied characteristics of a whistle blower, and examined situational and contextual variables to blow the whistle (Near, et al., 1993; Miceli and Near, 1985; Miethe and Rothschild, 1994). For example, Near et al. (2004) studied moral reasoning and the effect of culture for whistle-blowing, and explained the factors contributing to reasons for reporting internally or externally. Ohnishi et al. (2008) found that nurses do not decide to whistle-blow when they observe a wrongdoing. Park et al. (2005) found that Confucian ethics had significant effects on whistle-blowing intentions in South Korea. Zhang et al. (2009) examined decision-making process of internal whistle-blowing in China, and they concluded that by fixing problems internally, managers can ensure that intimate information remains confidential, which fosters organizational accountability. Liyanarachchi and Newdick (2009) examined the effect of students' level of moral reasoning on their propensity to whistle blow when faced with a serious wrongdoing in New Zealand, and they concluded that the higher the individual's level of moral reasoning, the more likely he or she is to do the right thing.

In the second category attempts have focused on variables to predict volume of retaliation that will subsequently be suffered by whistle blowers. For instance, Tavakoli et al. (2003) examined U.S.A. and Croatian managers, and found significant differences between them on reporting fear of retaliation for whistleblowing. Besides, Rehg et al. (2008) studied gender and power relation for whistle-blowing and they found significant association with gender and whistle-blowing with regard to volume of retaliation.

In the third category, authors have examined whistle-blowing comparing different cultures. For example, Keenan (2002) found no significant difference between American and Indian managers in the likelihood of blowing. Besides, Park et al. (2008) examined students from South Korea, Turkey, and the U.K, and concluded that there are significant variations related to nationality and cultural orientation related to the modes of whistle-blowing.

Lastly, scholars have studied conditions under which whistle-blowers can be effective (Miceli and Near, 2002). For instance, Lewis et al. (2001) examined whistle-blowing procedures in higher education in the UK. In addition, Heyes and Kapur (2008) examined how responsive regulators should be to whistleblower tip-offs, and developed a behavioral model adopting the methods of behavioral law and economics.

Whistle blowing is considered as a negative act, and complaining openly about wrongdoings such as bribery has not been common in Turkey. According to the Global Corruption Barometer Report only 33% individuals have reported paying a bribe while many of 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). Besides, there have not been lots of studies contributing to our understanding of whistleblowing in Turkey. Park et al., (2008) examined the effect of cultural orientation of undergraduate students from South Korea, Turkey, and the U.K, and found that there are significant variations related to nationality and cultural orientation among the students. They emphasize for future researcher the necessity to examine the relationship between cultural orientation and attitudes to different modes of whistleblowing. Özdemir (2010) examined educators' opinions on organizational dissent, and developed an organizational dissent scale. He asked opponent behaviors for seeking different modes of whistleblowing, and concluded that teachers hardly blow whistle when faced with a serious wrongdoing at their schools. Nayir and Herzig (2012) examined the relationship between value orientations of Turkish managers and their choices for particular whistle-blowing modes in Turkey. They 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. Oktem and Shahbazi (2012) examined students from Turkey and Iran. They concluded that there was no difference between the groups in terms of whistle-blowing intentions. Contrarily, Turkish and Iranian societies have similar attitudes toward different forms of whistle-blowing behaviors. Gökçe (2013) examined the relationship between value orientations of Turkish teachers and their choices for particular whistle-blowing modes in Turkey.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is a screening model. To get answers for the 3rd, 5th, and 6th questions two groups, who blew whistle after the observation of a wrongdoing and who did not, included in the sample were compared according to the study variables. However this study does not include any comparison of experimental group with control group. The data were obtained by a questionnaire, and analyzed by using SPSS 17.

Sample

Firstly, the author announced the aim of the study to the teachers through accessibility in Kocaeli, a big city of Turkey, in the 2011-2012 academic year. After the announcement, 283 teachers were recruited according to their willingness to participate in the study. Therefore, the research sample included 283 teachers who worked at public schools in Kocaeli. Initial analysis showed that 199 of 283 surveys were suitable for the analysis. Besides, 67 of 199 indicated

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the participants.

		N	%
Gender	Female	35	52
	Male	32	49
Age	20-30	27	40
	31-44	40	60
Branch	Classroom	5	7
	Branch	62	93
Work experience	1-5 years	17	25
	6-10 years	22	33
	11-25 years	28	42
Work tenure	Yes	65	98.5
	No	2	1.5
Education	Undergraduate	55	86
	Graduate	9	14
School type	Kindergarden	8	11.9
	Elementary 1st level	17	25
	Elementary 2nd level	12	17.9
	High school	30	45

that they observed a wrongdoing in last year at their schools. After the initial analysis, the participants were interviewed by the author related to the survey questions. Most of the participants expressed their fear of being punished when they reported the wrongdoings to authorities. While they were volunteered to participate in this study, some of the participants noted at the end of the questionnaires that they preferred not answering the questions related to their demographic features because of fear of possible punishment by their principals or by the managers working at the Ministry of National Education. Besides, some of them added at the end of the questionnaires that the school principals acted unethical, or did wrongdoings under the safeguard of the managers in the ministry. This fear of disclosure of wrongdoings is interesting because these teachers are civil servants and have job tenure. Nevertheless, news related to whistle-blowers such as Yiğiter and Kaya seem to affect these teachers negatively toward disclosing any wrongdoing. Consequently, the 67 teachers were studied for further analyses. Details of the participants can be found in Table 1.

Of the study group, 35 (52%) were females and 32 (49%) were male participants. 40% were below 30 years, while more than half (60%) were older than 30 years. Most of the teachers (93%) have branches other than classroom teaching, and were undergraduates (82%). Only two of the teachers work as contract staff while the others have work tenure. One fourth (25%) have less than 6 years work experience while 42% have more than 10 years work experience.

Instrument

The author developed the questionnaire reviewing the literature. The participants were given the descriptions of wrongdoing and whistle-blowing at the beginning of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire involves four scales. 10 items describing wrongdoings were listed in the first scale, and the participants were asked to check the box before the item if they observed it at their schools in last year. The wrongdoings list was created by Miceli and Near (1988) and Near et al. (2004) (Table 2). Then the participants were asked whether they blew the whistle or not when they observed the wrongdoing at their school.

In the second scale, attitudes of the participants who indicated their intention for whistle-blowing with 'yes' were asked to check the box before the items describing whistle-blowing ways. This scale was created by the author examining the results of the study by Park et al. (2008) (Table 7). The first two scales of the questionnaire were ranged from 0 (no) to 1 (yes).

The third scale was short form of Minnesota Job Satisfaction questionnaire (1977) with 20 items. Factor analysis of the 20 items resulted in two factors; intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction (MSQ, 1977). The questionnaire was translated into Turkish by Baycan (1985), and the Turkish form of the questionnaire has been used by researchers for years in Turkey. Each item was measured on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). The scores obtained on each item represented the respondents' level of satisfaction with a particular factor. Items for measuring intrinsic satisfaction were 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 20, while 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 19 were for measuring extrinsic satisfaction. 20 items, as a whole, were for measuring total satisfaction of the participants (MSQ, 1977). The Cronbach's Alpha was .88 for intrinsic satisfaction, and .86 for extrinsic satisfaction. The Cronbach's Alpha for all items was .92.

The fourth scale was Revised Employee Commitment Survey by Meyer and Allen (2004). To Meyer and Allen (2004), commitment can be characterized by different mindsets: desire, obligation and

Table 2. Percentages of wrongdoings observed by teachers at their schools.

Wrongdoings	n	%
Use of official position for personnel benefit	33	49
Violate laws or regulations seriously	33	48
Stealing of school fund	31	46
Stealing of school stuff	30	45
Toleration a wrongdoing resulting in harm to public/students health	29	43
Wasting by a badly managed program	28	42
Wasting school fund by buying unnecessary benefit or service from inappropriate people	27	40
Accepting bribes / kickbacks	27	40
Wasting school fund by buying unnecessary benefit or service	26	39
Unfair advantage to contractor	20	30

Table 3. The rate of whistle-blowing by teachers.

	n	%
Yes	31	46
No	36	54
Total	67	100

cost. The survey has three dimensions with six statements for each scale. The first six items measure *affective commitment*; the second set of six items for measuring *normative commitment*, and the last set of six items for measuring *continuance commitment* of individuals. Meyer and Allen (2004) argue that employees with a strong affective commitment stay because they 'want to', those with strong normative commitment stay because they feel they 'ought to', and those with strong continuance commitment stay because they 'have to' do so. The items 3, 4, 5, and 13 are 'reverse-keyed' which means these items have been worded such that strong agreement actually reflects a lower level of commitment (Meyer and Allen, 2004). The survey has been used by scholars (Al, 2007; Çöp, 2008; Polat and Uğurlu, 2009) and translated into Turkish for years in Turkey. The original survey ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), but it ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) in this study. Cronbach's Alpha of the survey was .93. Cronbach's alpha for the affective commitment dimension was .95; for the normative commitment dimension, .87; and for continuance commitment dimension, .80.

Also personal information (gender, age, branch, education, job tenure, work experience, and school type) was asked at the beginning of the questionnaire. In addition, the participants were asked to indicate their years spent in the school in this section, because the study examined their observations at schools in the last 12 months.

RESULTS

Since the data were normally distributed, variances were supposed to be homogeny.

Type of Wrongdoings the Participants Observed at Schools

To get answers for the first question of the study, the educators were asked to indicate wrongdoings they observed at their schools in the scale. So, the wrong-doings observed by the teachers discovered through descriptive statistics are shown in Table 2.

According to Table 2, the teachers observe 'using personal position for self-interest'; 'violating laws or regulations seriously'; 'stealing school fund'; and 'stealing school stuff' mostly while they observed 'unfair advantage to contractor' at least at their schools.

Rate of whistle-blowing by teachers

To get answers for the second question of the study, the educators were asked whether they blow whistle or not when they observed a wrongdoing in their school. So the percentages of whistle-blowing by teachers are shown in Table 3.

As Table 3 demonstrates, nearly half of the teachers (46%, n=31) blew whistle while the others (54%, n=36) did not. The table shows that more than half of the teachers did not report when they observed a wrongdoing at their schools.

Factors affecting the participants' whistle-blowing

To get answers for the third question of the study, the difference effects of gender, work tenure, education, and seniority on teachers' preference of whistle-blowing were analyzed by t-test, and ANOVA. The t-test result for gender and the teachers' preference of whistle-blowing are shown in Table 4.

As Table 4 shows, there is significant difference bet-ween the teachers' whistle-blowing in terms of gender $[t_{(65)}= 2.09, p<.05]$. According to the results, males blew a whistle (x =0.59) more than the females did (x =0.34). Since all participants, except for one teacher, had job guarantee, the analyses to seek difference between the participants' whistle-blowing in terms of work tenure could not be done. The t-test result for education and the participants' preference of whistle-blowing are shown in

Table 4. T-test results for the difference effect of gender and whistle-blowing.

	n	$\overline{X}$	sd	df	t	p
Female	35	0.34	0.48	65	2.09	.040*
Male	32	0.59	0.49			

p<.05.

Table 5. T-test results for the difference effect of education and whistle-blowing.

	n	$\overline{X}$	sd	df	t	p
Undergraduate	55	0.51	0.50	62	1.60	.113
Graduate	9	0.22	0.44			

p<.05.

Table 6. ANOVA results for the different effect of seniority and whistle-blowing.

	n	$\overline{X}$	sd	df	F	p
1-5 year **	17	0.17	0.39			.009*
6-10 year	22	0.45	0.50	64	5.134	
11-25 year**	28	0.64	0.48			

*p<.05, ** significant difference.

Table 5.

As Table 5 shows there is not any difference in whistle-blowing between the teachers in terms of education. According to the means scores, undergraduate partici-pants seemed to prefer reporting ($\overline{x}$ =0.51) to the graduates ($\overline{x}$ =0.22). The t-test did not result with a difference. This result might be because of the inequality of the numbers of the participants [graduate (n=9) – undergraduate (n=55)]. The difference between the teachers' rate of whistle-blowing was analyzed according to seniority by using ANOVA (Table 6).

According to Table 6 there is significant difference between the teachers in terms of reporting wrongdoings. The results indicated that there are differences between the participants who had1-5 years experience ($\overline{x}$ = 0.17) and those who had 11-25 years of experience ($\overline{x}$ = 0.64) in terms of whistle-blowing [F$_{(2-64)}$=5.134, p<.05].

Modes of whistle-blowing by the teachers

To get answer for the fourth question of the study, the participants' answers for choosing modes of whistle-blowing were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Percentages for the items of the modes of whistle-blowing used in the analysis are presented in Table 7.

As Table 7 shows, most of the participants seem to preferred informal reporting channels. They revealed that

they report the wrongdoing mostly informally to close associates who could correct it (n=13); and to someone close to them (n=9). Besides, while they report the wrongdoing to deputy principal (n=7) as internal reporting, they let parents know about it (n=5), which is external reporting. Besides, the results revealed that the participants seemed to have not preferred reporting the wrongdoing to the other teachers/staff, or letting people know through social websites.

The participants' whistle-blowing intentions and job satisfaction

To get answers for the 5th question of the study, the difference between the teachers who blew the whistle and the others who did not was analyzed in terms of their job satisfaction (Table 8).

As Table 8 shows, there is not any difference between the teachers in terms of job satisfaction in whistle-blowing [t($_{65}$)=1.63, p<.05].

The participants' whistle-blowing intentions and organizational commitment

To get answers for the 6th question of the study, the difference between the teachers who blew the whistle

Table 7. Percentages for the items of the modes of whistle-blowing by the participants.

	Mode of whistle-blowing	n	%
	Reported the wrongdoing to the other teachers or staff within the school	-	
	Reported it to deputy principal	7	10.4
Internal	Let parents know about it	5	7.5
	Let press know about it	1	1.5
	Let people through social websites	-	
	Reported it by using my real name	1	1.5
External	Reports the wrongdoing by giving detailed information about myself	3	4.5
Identified	Reports it using an assumed name	2	3
	Reports the wrongdoing but don't give any information about myself	2	3
	Use official channels to report it	5	7.5
Anonymously	Reports it by means of procedures already in place	1	1.5
	Informally report it to close associates who could correct it	13	19.4
Formal	Informally report it to someone who close to me	9	13.4
Informal			

Table 8. T-test results for whistle-blowing and job satisfaction of the participants.

Participants	n	$\overline{X}$	sd	df	t	p
Whistle-blower	31	3.08	0.77	65	1.63	.108
Not whistle-blower	36	3.39	0.75			

p<.05.

Table 9. T-test results for whistle-blowing and job satisfaction of the participants.

	Participants	n	$\overline{X}$	sd	df	t	p
Organizational	Whistle-blower	31	2.41	1.04	65	1.86	.067
commitment	Not whistle-blower	36	2.89	1.05			

p<.05

and the others who did not was analyzed in terms of their loyalty. The t-test results are shown in Table 9.

As Table 9 shows, there is not any difference between the teachers in terms of their loyalty in whistle-blowing $[t_{(65)}=1.86, p<.05]$.

Job satisfaction and organizational loyalty as reasons for whistle-blowing to get answer for the last question of the study Point

As Table 10 demonstrates, there was significant correlation coefficients between the variables are presented in Table 10. Biserial Correlation statistics were computed to see if significant relationships existed between the variables of interest (Field, 2000).

Descriptive statistics (means, and standard deviations) for the all scales as well as the positive correlation between the participants' job satisfaction and organizational loyalty, while there was not any relationship between that variables and whistle-blowing. Hence results of the correlation analysis showed that there was not any correlation between the teachers 'whistle-blowing conditions and their job satisfaction and organizational loyalty. Since the correlation results did not confirm any relationship between the teachers' whistle-blowing conditions and the variables, regression analysis could not be performed.

Table 10. Means, standard deviations, and Point Biserial correlations between whistle-blowing intentions and the variables

	Mean	Sd	Whistle-blowing	Job satisfaction	Organizational loyalty
Whistle-blowing	.46	.50			
Correlation			1		
Sig.(2-tailed)					
N			67		
Job Satisfaction	3.25	.77			
Correlation			.198	1	
Sig.(2-tailed)			.108		
N			67	67	
Organizational commitment	2.67	1.07			
Correlation			.225	.717	1
Sig.(2-tailed)			.067	.000**	
N			67	67	67

**p<.01

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study examined whistle-blowing with any possible relationship between job satisfaction and organizational loyalty at schools in Turkey. Before examining the results in more detail, some of the limitations should be acknowledged. There might be drawbacks in the use of limited number of participants, in terms of their generalizability to the wider population. Hence, the samples in this study may not even be representative of the population of teachers in Turkey. Despite this limitation, the study offers a number of important insights.

The purpose of this study was to examine whistle-blowing at schools in Turkey. For this purpose, seven research questions were constructed: (1) What kinds of wrongdoings do the teachers observe at schools? (2) Do teachers blow whistle when they observe wrongdoings at schools? (3) Is there any difference between the teachers who blew whistle and those who did not in respect to gender, work tenure, education and seniority? (4) What kinds of modes do teachers prefer for whistle-blowing? (5) Is there any difference between the teachers who blew the whistle and the others who did not in respect to their job satisfaction? (6) Is there any difference between the teachers who blew the whistle and the others who did not in respect to their organizational commitment? (7) Are job satisfaction and organizational commitment reasons for the teachers to do whistle-blowing?

To get answer for the first question, percentages of the wrongdoings observed by the teachers at their schools were calculated. The analysis revealed that teachers observed 'using personal position for self-interest'; 'violating laws or regulations seriously'; 'stealing school fund'; and 'stealing school stuff' mostly at their schools.

These findings are in line with the results by Miceli and Near (1988) and Near et al. (2004) which included 'using personal position for self-interest' in 'stealing' category. 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. Although the number of sample was small, the result of the study is significant. Hence, future researchers should study wrongdoings at schools with large groups. Besides, they should do qualified researches in addition to quantified researches to gain detailed information about the wrongdoings at school.

To get answer for the second question, percentages of the participants' scores were used since they were asked 'answers with yes-no question'. The results revealed that half of the teachers blew whistle while the other half did not. The reason why half of the teachers did not blow whistle might be due to fear of retaliation by the schools.

Besides, the teachers stated that the school principals do wrongdoings under the protection of managers in the Ministry. Hence, they believe that nothing would be corrected or changed after their disclosure of the wrongdoings at schools. Also, they read retaliation news related to whistle-blowing teachers frequently. Furthermore, this result is in line with Miceli et al. (1991) who argue that employees who have lower hierarchical levels in an organization do not prefer whistle-blowing. They suggest that these lower level employees stay with their organizations because of extrinsic rewards rather than because of loyalty or shared values. Turkish education system is centralized and teachers are civil servants in Turkey. However, the teachers might consider themselves as relatively poor performers with little salaries

hence they might prefer being 'inactive observers', as Miceli et al. (1991) described.

Woiceshyn (2011) argues that religion has a direct effect as well as ethical philosophy on ethical decision-making. Hence the results might be interpreted from the religious point. From the religious point of view, Islam culture might affect the teachers' decision-making for whistle-blowing. All participants of the study are Muslims. There is an order in Hucurat section in Quran as; 'do not seek Muslims' dishonors ...'. Besides, there are many statements of Prophet Muhammad such as 'do not seek your intimates' (Kandemir, 2012). Although these statements are related to personal wrongdoings, Muslims might consider these orders for all kinds of misconducts in culture or organizations. Hence future researchers should examine effect of religion on decision-making for whistle-blowing in different cultures.

To get answer for the 3rd question, t-tests were applied to find out difference between the teachers who blew whistle and those who did not in respect to gender, and education. ANOVA was used for analyzing the difference between seniority and the participants' condition. The results of the study revealed that male teachers reported wrongdoings they observed more than the females did. Miceli et al. (2001) and Near et al. (2004) found that gender affects decision to blow whistle in their study. The results of the study revealed that education did not have any effect on whistle-blowing while superiority affects it. The results indicate that teachers with higher seniority blow whistle more than the others with lower seniority. New teachers try to adapt themselves to the profession and to school environment especially in their induction period. Hence they might have difficulties to decide which kind of acts they observe at schools are wrongdoings. They might need more professional practice to have professional self-confidence for disclosing wrongdoings at schools. So, the teachers with higher seniority might consider themselves more responsible for correcting wrongdoings at schools. Therefore, possible effect of seniority and even age is suggested to be examined for future researches.

To get answer for the fourth question, percentages of the participants scores were used since they were asked 'answers with yes-no question'. The results revealed that most of the teachers use informal channels for reporting wrongdoings. Besides, they prefer both internal external reporting at their schools. These findings are in line with Nayir and Herzig (2012).

To get answer for the fifth and the sixth question, t-tests were used. The results revealed that there was not any difference in whistle-blowing between the teachers in terms of job satisfaction and their organizational loyalty.

To get answer for the last question, logistic regression was performed to see any effect of the variables on whistle-blowing as reasons. Yet the Point Biserial correlation results did not confirm any relationship between the variables (job satisfaction, organizational commitment)

and teachers' whistle-blowing conditions. Hence the results revealed that neither job satisfaction nor organizational commitment affects the teachers' whistle-blowing choices.

These results are in line with the results of Vandekerckhove and Commers (2004), and Near and Miceli (1990, 1995) as they could not find relationship between the variables and whistle-blowing. But Near and Miceli (1990, 1995) suggest that further researchers should examine these relationships.

Teachers might not like their profession; or they might not feel loyalty to their schools as work place because of different reasons, while they have professional committed. Hence, future researchers should examine teachers' job satisfaction by scales seeking their professional satisfaction instead of their work place (school) satisfaction. Besides, as mentioned earlier, whistle-blowing is considered as a negative act in Turkey. Teachers believe that they would be punished because of their disclosure in spite of being rewarded or promoted at schools. Also, they fear being labeled as 'fink'.

This study contributes to the literature of whistle-blowing, examining individual differences with particular modes of whistle-blowing and effects of job satisfaction and organizational loyalty. Therefore, this study is believed to address an important question as studies suggest relationships between the decision-making to blow whistle and job satisfaction and organizational loyalty. In choosing education as context, the study is supposed to bring attention to the organizational behavior by examining study questions in school settings to the third parties (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

Aktifhaber (2007). Müdürü Şikayet Eden Öğretmen Sürüldü. www.aktifhaber.com.

Al A (2007). Investigating the managerial competency level of the principals at foreign languages departments of the universities and the level of commitment to the organization of the instructors of English. Master Thesis. Kocaeli University, Kocaeli.

Baycan A (1985). An analysis of the several aspects of job satisfaction between different occupational groups. Master Thesis. Bogazici University, İstanbul.

Barnett T (1992). A Preliminary investigation of the relationship between organizational characteristics and external whistle-blowing By employees, J. Bus. Ethics 11:949-959.

Callahan ES, Collins JW (1992). Employee attitudes toward whistle-blowing: management and public policy implications. J. Bus. Ethics 11:939-948.

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.

Currivan DB (1999). The causal order f job satisfaction and organizational commıtment in models of employee turnover. Hum. Resour. Manage. 4(9):495-524.

Çöp S (2008). A practice on the organizational justice and organizational commitment perception of worker's in the tourism sector or Turkey and Poland. Master Thesis. Gazi University, Ankara.

Dawson LM (1997). Ethical differences between men and women in the sales profession. J. Bus. Ethics 16:1143-1152.

Dawson, S. (2001). Whistleblowing: A broad definition and some issues for Australia, (Working paper by Victoria University of Technology). http://www.bmartin.cc/dissent/documents/Dawson.html.

Deshpande SP (1997). Managers' perception of proper ethical conduct: the effect of sex, age, and level of education, J. Bus. Ethics 16(1):79-85.

Deshpande SP, Joseph J, Maximov VV (2000). Perceptions of proper ethical conduct of male and female Russian managers, J. Bus. Ethics 24(2):179-183.

Dozier JB, Miceli MP (1985). Potential predictors of whistle-blowing: A prosocial behavior perspective. Acad. Manage. Rev. 10(4):823-836.

Egitimbirsen (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.

Field A (2000). Discoreving statistics. London: Sage Publication.

Fleischman G, Valentine S (2003). Professionals' tax liability assessments and ethical evaluations in an equitable relief innocent spouse case. J. Bus. Ethics 42:27-44.

Gökçe AT (2013). Teachers' value orientations as determinants of preference for external and anonymous whistleblowing. Int J. Hum. Soc. Sci. 3(4):163-173.

Greene A, Latting JK (2004). Whistle-blowing as a form of advocacy: Guidelines for the practitioner and organization, Soc. Work 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.

Heyes A, Kapur S (2008). An economic model of whistleblower policy. JLEO, 25(1):157-182.

Kandemir Y (2012). Kimsenin mahremiyetine girmemeli. http://www.mumsema.com.

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.

Keenan JP (2002). Comparing Indian and American managers on whistleblowing. Employee Responsibilities Rights J. (14:79-89.

Krebsbach K (2005). The Long Lonely Battle of David E. Welch. http://www.americanbanker.com.

Kwong KK, Yau OHM, Lee JSY, Sin LYM, Tse, ACB (2003). The effects of attitudinal and demographic factors on intention to buy pirated CDs: The case of Chinese consumers. J. Bus. Ethics 47:223-235.

Larmer RA (1992). Whistle-blowing and employee loyalty. J. Bus. Ethics 11:125-128.

Lewis D, Ellis C, Kyprıanou A, Homewood S (2001). Whistleblowing at work: the results of a survey of procedures in further and higher education. Educ. Law 13(3):215-225.

Newdick C, Liyanarachchi G (2009). The ımpact of moral reasoning and retaliation on whistle-blowing: New Zealand Evidence. J. Bus. Ethics 89:37-57.

Mayhew BW, Murphy PR (2008). The Impact of ethics education on reporting behavior, J. Bus. Ethics 86:397-416.

Meyer JP, Allen NJ (2004). TCM Employee Commitment Survey Academic Users Guide. www.audacityblog.info.

Miceli MP, Near JP (1985). Characteristics of organizational climate and perceived wrong doing associated with whistleblowing decisions. Pers. Psycol. 38(3):525-544.

Miceli MP, Near JP (1988). Individual and situational correlates of whistle-blowing Pers. Psycol. 41:267-281.

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. Manage. 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 Occup. 26:129-151.

Miceli MP, Scotter JRV, Near JP, Rehg MT (2001). Individual differences and whistle-blowing. Acad. Manag. Proc. pp.1-6.

Miceli MP, Near JP (2002). What makes whistle-blowers effective: Three field studies. Hum. Relat. 55:455-479.

Miceli MP, Near JP (2005). Standing up or standing by: What predicts blowing the whistle on organizational wrongdoing? Res. Pers. Hum. Resour. Manage. 24:95-136.

Miethe TD, Rothschild J (1994). Whistleblowing and the control of organizational misconduct. Sociol. Inquiry 64:322-347.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. (1977). http://www.psych.umn.edu/psylabs

MSQ (1977). Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form. www.psych.umn.edu

Mueller CW, Wallace JE Price JL (1992). Employee commitment resolving some issues. Work Occup. 19(3):211-236.

Nayir DZ, Herzig H (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, Dworkin TM, Miceli MP (1993). Explaining the whistleblowing process: Suggestions from power theory and justice theory. Organ. Sci. 4(3):393-411.

Near JP, Miceli MP (1990). When whistleblowing succeeds: Predictors of effective whistle-blowing. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Acad. Manage. Proc. 1:175-179.

Near JP, Miceli MP (1995). Effective whistle-blowing. Acad. Manage. Rev. 20(3):679-708.

Near JP, Rehg MT, Scotter JRV, Miceli MP (2004). Does type of wrongdoing 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):631-642.

Oktem MK, Shahbazi G (2012). Attitudes toward different forms of whistleblowing in Turkey and Iran. Middle-East J. Sci. R. 12(7):945-951.

Özdemir M (2010). The opinions of administrators and teachers working in public high schools in Ankara province on organizational dissent. Doctoral Dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara.

Park H, Rehg MT, Donggi L (2005). The influence of Confucian ethics and collectivism on whistleblowing intentions: A study of South Korean public employees, J. Bus. Ethics 58(4):387-403.

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.

Polat S, Uğurlu CT (2009). İlköğretim müfettişlerinin örgütsel bağlılık, mesleki tükenmişlik ve işten ayrılma niyetleri arasındaki ilişki. The Congress Book of I. International Turkey Educational Researches, Çanakkale.

Robinson SL, Bennett RJ (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. Acad. Manag. J. 38(2):555-572.

Rehg MT, Miceli MP, Near JP, Scotter JRV (2008). Antecedents and outcomes of retaliation against whistleblowers: Gender differences and power relationships. Organ. Sci. 19(2):221-240.

Roxas ML, Stoneback JY (2004). The Importance of gender across cultures in ethical decision-making. J. Bus. Ethics 50(2):149-165.

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):49-64.

Transparency International (2011). Global corruption barometer. http://www.transparency.org.

Valentine SR, Rittenburg TL (2004). Ethical evaluations in global business situations. J. Bus. Ethics 51:1-14.

Vandekerckhove W, Commers MSR (2004). Whistle blowing and rational loyalty. J. Bus. Ethics 53:225-233.

Verschoor C (2005). Is this the age of whistleblowers? Strat. Financ.

86(7):17-18.

Vinten G (1996). Whistleblowing in the health-related professions. The Indian J. Med. Ethics, 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.

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.