

A STUDY ON PROFESSIONAL ETHIC PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOL PRINCIPALS¹

*#A., Esra, ASLAN, **Nurhayat ÇELEBİ, *Bülent AKDAĞ, *Müge YÜKSEL *A.Nilgün CANEL,
*Seval İMAMOĞLU,**Selma DÜNDAR

*Marmara University, Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Goztepe Campus 34722 Goztepe-
ISTANBUL-TURKEY

**Marmara University, Educational Administration and Inspection TURKEY

*#E-mail address for correspondence : aeaslan@hotmail.com

Abstract : *This study is planned for recognition of the gap in ethical codes that will compose a reference for teachers and school principals in our country when performing their profession. At the study, the answer was sought for the question of how teachers and school principals “define the professional ethics” as detailed below. Two different focus groups consisting of teachers and school principals were asked how they define the professional ethics and the received written responses were examined by content analysis and the findings were interpreted accordingly. The responses of teachers and school principals related to ethical concepts were gathered under 11 main topics for each focus group. These are “Sense of Duty, Human Sensitivity, Social Responsibility, Honesty, Virtuousness, Equality, Tolerance, Objectivity, Justice, Believing in Supremacy of Law and Non-code”. Later, the expressions gathered under these topics were compared with the ethical concepts in the philosophy literature.*

According to the findings, it was observed that teachers and school principals do not regard the professional ethics concepts in the same meaning with the ethical concepts in the philosophy literature and that they do not perceive most of the concepts in the literature within the borders of professional ethics and as defined in the literature. Teachers and school principals associated ethics with irrelevant concepts instead of ethics-related concepts due to their lack of ethical knowledge that may prevent their compliance with the “ethical values” when performing their profession. These study findings give rise to thought that teachers and school principles lack some cognitive codes in abstract intellectual discussion and reference issues that would form a base when they face ethical dilemmas.

Keywords: *Ethics, profession ethics, ethical codes of teachers, ethical codes of school principals.*

INTRODUCTION

Human is a creature developing conceptions and values; evaluates himself and everything around from this point of view. Therefore, one of the main problems of human is his search for conceptions and behaviors for life and himself (Gunay 2006). The individual’s attitude against people he establishes relations with, and his decisions and behaviors reflect the direction attributed to his life. The direction attributed to life depends on how he evaluates the other person and himself.

Kucuradi (1998) explains this situation as follows:

... In our relationships with people and ourselves, in our interest in our and others’ actions and results; at the basis of our existence as a person with a certain integrity with our surroundings, era, past and future,

¹ This study is carried out by extent of EGT-Â- 060308-0051 number project which is decided on 06.03.2008 date and 03/2008 number assembly of Marmara University Rector Science Resource Projects Commission Chairman by Ass. Prof. Dr. Nurhayat Çelebi’s leader

there is our sense of value and this sense of value is based on our sense of human – our expectations from human and ourselves...

Although values are easy-to-explain and comprehensible when handled on the basis of individual relationship, the fact that the human exists in a historical and cultural world requires handling the values along with their social views. As Gunay (2006) also mentions; the values may be contravened occasionally while those may be realized in actions and works of art of the people who are members of a society depending on historical conditions.

Ethics, as a value, is primarily the research and comprehension of life to be demanded. In other words; it means falling into place of all activities and purposes; knowing what will be or will not be done; what will be demanded or will not be demanded; what will be owned or will not be owned (Aydm 1998). Accordingly, ethics is a questioning field. Although it is morally agreed upon the question of “*What is correct action/behavior?*” which has been asked since ancient ages, questioning and discussing continue in ethics as the events, facts and objects change. Accordingly, it is seen that there are various definitions regarding ethics (Foucault, 2005; Tepe, 1998; Kuçuradi, 2000b).

The term ‘ethics’ (ethos: the way of existence and behaving) was previously used in the meanings of customs, traditions and habits. Even in Ancient Greece, people discussed their individual freedoms within the concept of ethical problem.

Different expressions regarding ethical concepts may be mentioned as follows:

- Aristotle, a philosopher in ancient age, sorts the sciences under three topics as “*theoretical, practical and poetical*”. Science is theoretical when it examines itself for “itself”; practical when it forms rules for behaviors; and poetical when it searches the useful, fine and good one. Ethics is included in practice; emphasizes on character analysis (Sonmez, 1998).
- Ethics is also defined as systems of value judgment or behavior norms which are applicable generally or in a certain period, taken as a basis in interpersonal relationships (Kucuradi, 2000a).
- Ethics is used in the meaning of morality, independently of a certain moral value (Tepe, 1998).
- Another way of comprehending ethics is Hartmann’s perspective “morals are many, ethics is single” (Diemer, Patzig, Feys, Heinemann, König, 1990).

The role of ethics as a discipline is not to develop a kind of moral and not to advise obeying this moral; but to discuss moral relations and to deliver an opinion regarding their nature. While moral describes what people do and believe in, ethics attributes a moral value to a reasonable behavior or belief (Jennings, 2003). In recent years, ethics is interpreted as “*a philosophical discipline presenting or expected to present verifiable – falsifiable information regarding ethic problems of human*” (Tepe, 1998; Gülenç, 2006). This comment on ethics is related to the “justification and grounding” of norms.

The basis we use in describing human relationships in society as true/false, good/bad is the *ethical values*. Generally, it is believed that all rules and principles of ethics are not universal and some varies according to the society and cultures. However, there are some circumstances regarding ethical values, which should be perceived same in all cultures. Although institutional values vary for each corporation, those values should not contradict with universal values. For example, if *honesty* is a behavior pattern ethically, it should be perceived same all over the world. But some circumstances compatible or incompatible with honesty may vary according to the cultures (Aras, 2001). Criteria determining ethical behaviors vary by the time in parallel with the change in social dynamics. Therefore, ethical behaviors are dynamic (Akdoğan, 2003). There is an interrelation between moral life and ethics. Human does not possess a moral structure in birth. Therefore it needs an education process. Education is essentially a moral activity; i.e. education may be regarded as an activity aiming to bring the individual to a maturity by presenting some values which are deemed important and aiming to approach to the perfection (Yayla, 2005). Thus, ethics has a special meaning in education since teachers and administrators are both surrounded by moral problems and undertook the responsibility of students, i.e. next generations for moral goodness (Haynes, 1998).

Teachers and school principals are liable to be a model in human relationships and to establish ethics referenced relationships within the school. In consideration of their significant roles in the society due to those functions, “how teachers and school principals define ‘professional ethics’ and comparison of those definitions with the concepts in philosophy literature” constitute the main purpose of this study. This study is included within the

borders of normative ethics¹ since it questions the rules which are acceptable in ethical terms. All definitions trying to explain the business ethics comprise the applied ethical knowledge including the rules, standards and ethical principles regarding what is “true and false” under a specific condition. Conformity of a special behavior to ethics is determined not only by personal ethics and values of individuals, but also by the society including mass communications, interest groups and organizations (Ferrel ve Fredrich, 1994; Uslu, 2001; Valesquez, Andre, Shanks, Meyer, 1988). Besides, while *business ethics* includes ethical principles and standards that lead and guide behaviors in business world, and the applied ethical knowledge, *professional ethics* includes the recognized approaches, rules, attitudes and behaviors which must be considered and internalized by the related persons in performing a profession and which are shared by the persons in business life. Professional ethics is formed by a profession group; the efficiency of ethical principles depends on the strong formation of this group and adaptation of fundamental rules and values within the group (Durkheim, 1949’cited in Özmen and Güngör, 2008; TDK, 2008). At this study, the responses of teachers and school principals regarding how they perceive the professional ethics in terms of general ethics are examined.

OBJECTIVES

Objective of this study is to determine “how teachers and school principals perceive and define professional ethics”.

Sub-objectives developed in accordance with this objective are as follows:

1. How do the teachers define ethical concepts?
2. How do the school principals define ethical concepts?
3. Is there any similarity and difference between ethical concepts of teachers and school principals?
4. Is there any similarity and difference between ethical concepts of teachers and school principals and the ethical concepts in philosophy literature?

METHOD

Qualitative method of research is preferred at this study. Although there is not a single definition for qualitative researches in the literature, those are the researches where qualitative data collection methods are used, such as observation, interview and document analysis, etc. and where a procedure is applied for presenting the perceptions and events as realistic and integrated in a natural environment (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2000). While introducing the perceptions and definitions for professional ethics of teachers and school principals, data is interpreted by inductive method in accordance with the nature of research objective. As Glaser and Strauss (1967, cited in Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2000) mentioned, this study aimed to reveal the existing perceptions regarding professional ethics of teachers and school principals, a social and dynamic fact, in order to avoid the mistake of observing the facts from the same point of view in traditional quantitative methods.

MEANS OF DATA COLLECTION

For the purpose of collecting data at the study, some open-ended questions were asked such as “*In your opinion, what does professional ethics of teacher include?*” to a focus group of public school teachers in various positions and branches in elementary and secondary school; and “*In your opinion, what does professional ethics of school principal include?*” to the school principals, and their written responses were requested.

METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Among methods of qualitative research, content analysis is preferred for data analysis, and frequency analysis and categorical analysis are preferred technically. Fox (1969) defines the content analysis as the classification, summarization of verbal or written data for a specific problem or purpose, measurement of specific variables or

¹ Since ethical behaviors are built on the value systems which would ground the individual and social life or easily destroyed because of not keeping up with the rate of speed at least, three separate types of ethics are mentioned, which are related to each other in terms of moral philosophy, nature of knowledge and history. Those

concepts and classification of those upon scanning in order to derive a specific meaning (cited in Tavşancıl and Aslan, 2001). Categorical analysis generally means sorting of a specific message into units first, then classifying these units under categories according to the criteria identified before. Determination of intensity and significance may be preferred for the categories, as it is in message items (Bilgin, 1988).

Research Unit

Research unit is built on decoding of written documents. Therefore, there is not any target population and sampling of the study since there is not any concern for generalization in accordance with the methods of qualitative research.

Some ethics-related “words” are based as research unit in order to analyze written documents. Sentences are reviewed by two separate coder groups for three times and the words mentioned in terms of ethics are listed.

Process

The problem of “the perception of professional ethic codes related to the profession of teaching and education administration and formation of codes particular to our country upon comparing the equivalents of those perceptions in various countries”, which is observed in SWOT analysis² within the strategic planning period of Marmara University applied prior to this research, is regarded as a problem which should be investigated.

Responses of teachers and school principals for research questions are listed by two separate coder groups and the concept or concepts representing the meaning of the sentence best are taken as “unit”. The categories obtained from written documents are classified by various groups for three times and general fields are formed in this way. Data obtained from the document presented by the respondents in writing as based on the method which is recommended under the title of “inductive analysis” in the literature are repeatedly reviewed in the manner of forming main themes (general fields) (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2000). Some specific sub-fields are formed within the general fields related to ethics and the concepts included in the general field categories are divided into specific sub-fields in order to enable the interpretation of data according to the meaning contained.

It is paid attention to evaluate the concepts included in the responses given by the participants in terms of case and to ensure they were in parallel with ethical concepts in philosophy literature during formation of general field categories. Then, frequencies and percentages are taken from the concepts included in general, specific sub-field categories of teachers and school principals separately, and shown as tables. Ethical concepts shown in those tables are compared with the concepts related to ethics included in philosophy literature.

Reliability

As the comments pertaining to the categories do not differ among the researchers or times, thus provide reliability which is a must for objectivity (Tavşancıl and Aslan, 2001), it is paid attention to the determination and definition of research categories clearly. Written documents are independently reviewed by two separate research groups and then discussed and classified according to the agreed general fields. Thereby, consistency is tried to be established between coders.

In creation of codes, an independent jury is preferred, consisting of various professions other than the research group of general fields (Research Techniques, Educational Sociology, Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Assessment and Evaluation, Training Programs, Educational Administration and Inspection, etc.) as another reliability condition. Role of this jury is to deliver opinion regarding compatibility of general fields in two separate meanings. First; is to deliver opinion regarding compatibility of general professional ethics fields and whether other fields are needed or not and the second is to arrange those codes according to the order of importance. Thirtyeight general fields derived from philosophy literature are reviewed again in accordance with

² SWOT analysis is a strategic planning tool used to evaluate the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats involved in a project or in a business venture strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threat.

the jury feedbacks and conceptual discrepancies not corresponding to practical data are determined. For example; some concepts such as “task-duty, hedonism, utilitarianism, communicative ethics, confidentiality, will” included in philosophy literature and the responses given by teachers and school principals and evaluated within the scope of specific sub-fields were not corresponding to each other or not related in any way. Thus, it is studied on total 11 categories consisting of 10 general fields and 1 non-code.

Validity

Three techniques were used during research in order to meet the validity condition of qualitative research:

- (a) General fields basing on philosophy literature and the responses of the participants were subjected to the evaluation of jury.
- (b) The extent of correspondence between the concepts which were estimated to be included in general field and ethic concepts included in philosophy literature were examined as external criteria.
- (c) Teachers and school principals were coded by two independent jury consisting of research team and the results were compared accordingly.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Eighthundredtwentysix ($N_{\text{sentence}}=826$) “ethic related sentences” were observed among the expressions of 117 teachers and 167 “ethics related sentences” were observed among the expressions of 38 school principals participating to the research. Ethic relates sentences were analyzed as “unit” in consideration of the context and total 11 categories consisting of 10 separate general fields and 1 non-code were determined and shown as tables for both groups.

Findings and Interpretation Regarding Responses of Teachers

General Fields Consisting of Teachers’ Expressions Regarding Professional Ethics and Interpretation. Eleven general fields derived upon review of written responses given by teachers regarding the concept of “*professional ethics*” are given in Table 1.

Table 1.
General Fields of Professional Ethics of Teachers

	Teachers /General field	f	%
1	Sense of Duty	410	49,64
2	Human Sensitivity	120	14,53
3	Social Responsibility	81	9,81
4	Honesty	46	5,57
5	Virtuousness	43	5,21
6	Equality	34	4,12
7	Non-Code Expressions	31	3,75
8	Tolerance	23	2,78
9	Objectivity	22	2,66
10	Justice	12	1,45
11	Believing in Supremacy of Law	4	0,48
	Total	826	100,00

Note: Brief descriptions for the concepts included in Table 1 are given in Annex 1.

“*Sense of duty*” (f=410, 49,64%), “*human sensitivity*” (f=120, 14,53%) and “*social responsibility*” (f=81, 9,81%) were observed at maximum listed under general fields among the responses given by teachers regarding professional ethics. The expressions included in general field at minimum were “*believing in supremacy of law*” (f=4, 0,48%), “*justice*” (f=12, 1,45%) and “*objectivity*” (f=22, 2,66%).

According to the deontological perspective; “*duty*” is included within the major moral categories (Castell, 1964, cited in Luthans, Hodgets and Thompson, 1987). The reason why the concept of “*sense of duty*” is mostly mentioned may be attributed to the fact that there is a “duty-oriented” business perception in professional

branches affiliated to the state in Turkey. This situation may be evaluated as an approach created in consequence of centralist management structure, state guarantee or authority.

On the other hand, it is seen that “*believing in supremacy of law*” is an ethical value which is mentioned at minimum. This result may be evaluated in parallel with any of the following factors:

- The existence of “*mistrust and skepticism*” environment created by the recent law arguments in our country and the need for long period of time for attaining legal results complicate to perceive the relation between law concept and ethical values.
- Amendments frequently made in law and regulations during the period of all governments could have prevented conceiving of law and ethics concept together.
- Due to that the dominance of religious or moral components in our country precludes legal basis in perceiving the ethic codes, it is possible to consider that “*law*” is not included within ethical references.

Specific Sub-Fields Consisting of Teachers’ Expressions Regarding Professional Ethics and Interpretation.

Specific sub-fields created upon categorization of ethical expressions included in the general fields in first table are given and interpreted in Table 2 in detail.

Table 2.
Frequencies and Percentages of Specific Sub-Fields Within the Scope of Itself and General Field Regarding Perceptions of Teachers for Professional Ethics

	Specific Sub-Fields Included in General Fields Created According to the Teachers’ Expressions	Ethical Contents Sentence (f)	General Field %	Specific Sub-Field %
1	Max. Sense of Duty			
	Professional Attitude and Practice	199	24,09	48,54
	Continuous Professional Development	63	7,63	15,37
	Personal Development, Professional Skill	47	5,69	11,46
	Communication with Student	44	5,33	10,73
	Professional Moral	39	4,72	9,51
	National Value	17	2,06	4,15
Min. Self-Confidence	1	0,12	0,24	
	Total	410	49,64	100
2	Max. Human Sensitivity			
	Love / Respect	26	3,15	21,67
	Being Opposed to Violence	18	2,18	15,00
	Guidance	16	1,94	13,33
	Being Emphatic	11	1,33	9,17
	Human Rights	10	1,21	8,33
	Appreciation of Student	9	1,09	7,50
	Respecting Differences	7	0,85	5,83
	Understanding	6	0,73	5,00
	Style of Communication	6	0,73	5,00
	Awareness	5	0,61	4,17
	Ego-Language	2	0,24	1,67
	Self-Esteem	2	0,24	1,67
Min. Solidarity	1	0,12	0,83	
Environmental Conscious	1	0,12	0,83	
	Total	120	14,53	100
3	Max. Social Responsibility			
	Being Social Leader	38	4,60	46,91

		Social Development	8	0,97	9,88
		Patriotism	8	0,97	9,88
		Social Cohesion	7	0,85	8,64
		Social Status	5	0,61	6,17
		Responsibility For Parents	4	0,48	4,94
		Instructiveness	4	0,48	4,94
		Not Being Self-Seeker	4	0,48	4,94
	Min.	Social Interaction	3	0,36	3,70
		Total	81	9,80	100
		Honesty			
	Max.	Sincerity	21	2,54	45,65
		Consistency	8	0,97	17,38
		Truthfulness	4	0,48	8,70
4		Trust	4	0,48	8,70
		Openness	4	0,48	8,70
		Equability	2	0,24	4,35
		Having Principles	2	0,24	4,35
	Min.	Not Gossiping	1	0,12	2,17
		Total	46	5,57	100
		Virtuousness			
	Max.	Appreciation	11	1,33	25,58
		Having Distinctive Personality	7	0,85	16,28
		Commitment to Profession	6	0,73	13,94
		Self-Devotion	5	0,61	11,63
5		Self-Confidence	5	0,61	11,63
	Min.	Consciousness	3	0,36	6,98
		Reputability	3	0,36	6,98
		Optimism	3	0,36	6,98
		Total	43	5,21	100
		Equality			
	Max.	Legal Equality	16	1,94	47,06
		Not Discriminating Between Students	12	1,45	35,29
6	Min.	Social Equality	6	0,73	17,65
		Total	34	4,12	100
		Non-Code Expressions			
	Max.	National Values	6	0,73	19,35
		Social Activities	4	0,48	12,95
		Joy of Living	2	0,24	6,45
		Kemalism	2	0,24	6,45
		Crowded Classes	2	0,24	6,45
	Min.	Criticism	1	0,12	3,23
		Specialization	1	0,12	3,23
		High Wage	1	0,12	3,23
		Hobby	1	0,12	3,23
7		Conceptual Knowledge	1	0,12	3,23
		Quality	1	0,12	3,23
		Reason Seeking	1	0,12	3,23
		Not Being Boring	1	0,12	3,23
		Confidentiality	1	0,12	3,23
		Exploitation	1	0,12	3,23
		Questioning	1	0,12	3,23
		Being grateful	1	0,12	3,23
		Follow-up	1	0,12	3,23
		Common Sense	1	0,12	3,23

		Determining Problem	1	0,12	3,23
		Total	31	3,75	100
		Tolerance			
	Max.	Being Tolerant	12	1,45	52,17
8	Min.	Patience	11	1,33	47,83
		Total	23	2,78	100
		Objectivity			
	Max.	Neutrality	10	1,21	45,45
		Objectivity Against Students	7	0,85	31,82
		Objectivity In Teaching	3	0,36	13,64
9	Min.	Objectivity In Assessment	2	0,24	9,09
		Total	22	2,66	100
		Justice			
	Max.	Legal Justice	10	1,21	83,33
10	Min.	Student-Oriented Justice	2	0,24	16,67
		Total	12	1,45	100
		Believing in Supremacy of Law			
	Max.	Being Democratic	2	0,24	50,00
	Min.	Independency	1	0,12	25,00
11		Modernity	1	0,12	25,00
		Total	4	0,48	100
	Total		N=826	100,00	

As it is mentioned in Table 2, responses given by teachers regarding general field category of “*sense of duty*” is repeated for 410 (49,64%) times in 826 expressions. “*sense of duty*” may be defined as feeling the necessity of performing a duty. At this study, “*sense of duty*” is a concept related by approximately one of every two teachers with “*professional ethics*”. Under the general field of “*sense of duty*”, “*professional attitude and practice*” (f=199, 48,54%) at maximum and “*self-confidence*” (f=1, 0,24%) at minimum is collected as specific sub-field. This finding proves that teachers give importance to the attitude and practices for performing their professions and consider those as an ethical principal. One of its reason may be the perception that the said role is intensively expected by the society. Besides, it is resulted from the fact that teachers attribute an important function to their professional attitudes and practices in determining the future of a child or human.

Expressions of teachers regarding general field of “*human sensitivity*” are repeated for 120 times (14,53%) and the specific sub-field of “*love-respect*” (f=26, 21,67%) is included in these general field expressions at maximum and “*environmental consciousness*” and “*solidarity*” (f=1, 0,83%) at minimum. The sub-field of “*love-respect*” which is mostly related to “*human sensitivity*” shows that teachers value human relationships and perceive this as an ethical attitude. The specific sub-field which is mentioned in the general field of “*human sensitivity*” at minimum is “*environmental consciousness*” and “*solidarity*”. It is a remarkable fact that environmental consciousness is related to the professional ethics at minimum level in today’s world where environmental pollution, global warming issues remain on the agenda. It is possible to regard that mentioning of environmental consciousness at minimum within the scope of values reflect the condition of insensitivity. Another specific sub-field which is mentioned at minimum is “*solidarity*”. Then, it is possible to conclude that the solidarity fact is not adopted as an ethical principle. This may be caused by rapid technological progress, that the economical and political changes as a result of globalization push people to loneliness and accordingly teachers do not consider traditional values such as “*solidarity*”, “*cooperation*”, etc. as related to the ethics.

The general field of “*social responsibility*” is repeated by teachers for 81 times (9,80%) and the specific sub-field of “*being social leader*” (f=38, 46,91%) is included therein at maximum and “*social interaction*” (f=3, 3,70%) at minimum. Being prominent of “*being social leader*” role within the general field of “*social responsibility*” covering a sense of society-oriented duty may be caused by the fact that teachers consider themselves as a leader within their social environment. That the teacher having an important role in developing

the sense of democracy mentions “*social interaction*” at minimum within the general field of social responsibility calls to mind the question of how much the teacher is aware of its mission apart from the sense of duty.

The general field of “*honesty*” is repeated for 46 times (5,57%). “*Sincerity*” is emphasized in this general field at maximum (f=21, 45,65%) and “*not gossiping*” (f=1, 2,17%) at minimum. This finding shows that teachers do not relate gossiping both with honesty and professional ethics directly although they relate the honesty concept with professional ethics in its general meaning; which means the “normalization” of an inappropriate attitude.

Expressions regarding “*virtuousness*” are repeated for 43 times (5,21%). Teachers mentioned the expressions including the concepts of “*appreciation*” (f=11, 25,58%) at maximum and the concepts of “*consciousness*”, “*reputability*” and “*optimism*” (f=3, 6,98%) at minimum in the general field of “*virtuousness*”. It is remarkable that the teachers do not use the word of “*virtue*” directly although the responses given by the teachers against the research question are collected under the general field of “*virtuousness*” by the researches basing on the philosophy literature. However, the concepts of ethics and virtue are often used together from different points of view according to the philosophy literature. For example, it is seen that the most fundamental and permanent response given in western discourse for the question of “what is good for person?” is related to the concept of “*virtue*” (Balanuye, 2001). The concept mostly mentioned by teachers within the context of “*virtuousness*” is *appreciation*, and followed by the expressions of “moral values must be paid attention, must have moral values, must be moral, well-behaved”, etc., this may be caused by the need for demonstration of behaviors related to these concepts.

The general field of “*equality*” is repeated for 34 times (4,12%). Teachers mentioned the expressions of “*legal equality*” at maximum (f=16, 47,06%) and “*social equality*” at minimum (f=6, 17,65%) within the general field of “*equality*”. The rate given in “*legal equality*” which is related by teachers with the concept of “*equality*” at maximum gives rise to the thought that they do not consider unequal and discriminatory behaviors as conflicting with ethics. However, the concept of equality must be thoroughly handled by teachers in order to be converted into a behavior practically (Gözütok,1995).

Thirtyone (3,75%) expressions which are included in 826 expressions given by teachers and not included in 10 categories are defined as “*non-code*”. The expression mostly repeated in non-code concepts is “*national values*” (f=26, 19,35%). The concepts which are mentioned at minimum in non-code expressions are “*criticism*”, “*specialization*”, “*high wage*”, “*hobby*”, “*conceptual knowledge*”, “*quality*”, “*reason seeking*”, “*not being boring*”, “*confidentiality*”, “*exploitation*”, “*questioning*”, “*being grateful*”, “*follow-up*”, “*common sense*” and “*problem determination*” (f=1, 3,23%). Responding to a question regarding professional ethics within the scope of national values is remarkable. This situation may be interpreted as particular to the agenda in our country and caused by the concerns regarding local/national values.

The general field of “*tolerance*” is repeated for 23 times (2,78%). The specific sub-field of “*being tolerant*” (f=12, %52,17) is mentioned at maximum and “*patience*” at minimum (f=11, 47,83%) in this general field. “*Tolerance*” concept is correlated by teachers with ethics at minimum. This fact may bring the question of “does tolerance decrease nowadays?” up for discussion. On the other hand, tolerance is an important attitude for preventing violation of rights in relationships of profession members and a must for democracy.

Expressions regarding “*objectivity*” are repeated for 22 times (2,66%). “*Neutrality*” is mentioned at maximum (f=10, 45,45%) and “*objectivity in assessment*” at minimum (f=2, 9,09%) in this general field. Neutrality is perceived as accepting as it is and acting unbiased. This way of perception may be related with the sub-field of “*legal equality*” included in the general field of “*equality*”.

Expressions regarding “*justice*” are repeated for 12 times (1,45%). The expression of “*legal justice*” is mentioned at maximum (f=10, 83,33%) and “*student-oriented justice*” at minimum (f=2, 16,67%) in this general field. It is observed that teachers do not relate the concept of justice with student-oriented ethical behaviors although they regard it as a legal principle.

Expressions regarding the general field of “*believing in supremacy of law*” are repeated for 4 times (0,48%) and the specific sub-field of “*being democratic*” is mentioned at maximum (f=2, 50,00%) and “*independency*” and “*modernity*” are mentioned at minimum (f=1, 25,00%) within this scope. This result shows that the specific sub-field of “*believing in supremacy of law*” is related with professional ethics at minimum level.

Findings and Interpretation Regarding Responses of School principals

General Fields Consisting of School principals' Expressions Regarding Professional Ethics and Interpretation. Results regarding frequency and percentage distribution of general fields which are formed on the basis of school principals' expressions regarding "professional ethics" (N=167) are given in Table 3.

Table 3.
General Fields Regarding Professional Ethics of School principals

School principals/ General Field	f	%
1 Sense of Duty	51	30,54
2 Human Sensitivity	37	21,16
3 Objectivity	18	10,78
4 Equality	16	9,58
5 Believing in Supremacy of Law	9	5,39
6 Non-Code Expressions	9	5,39
7 Justice	8	4,79
8 Virtuousness	6	3,59
9 Social Responsibility	5	2,99
10 Honesty	4	2,40
11 Tolerance	4	2,40
Total	167	100,00

As it is seen in Table 3, general field consisting of written responses of school principals regarding professional ethics are classified in 11 categories. Expressions regarding professional ethics are categorized in "general field" as "sense of duty" (f=51, 30,54%), "human sensitivity" (f=37, 21,16%) and "objectivity" (f=18, 10,78%) at maximum. The expressions which are emphasized at minimum are "social responsibility" (f=5, 2,99%), "honesty" and "tolerance" (f=4, 2,40%). This result shows that school principals believe that they should pay attention to objectivity and human sensitivity as a sense of duty for their task, primarily for managerial purposes. When considered from this point of view, a school principal behaving in accordance with ethics is expected to make a decision by looking after others' interests, to delegate others, acting in solidarity with students, to be a responsible person for all issues at the school.

On the other hand, it is observed that school principals do not correlate between professional ethics and the concepts of "social responsibility", "honesty" and "tolerance". It is remarkable that the concept of honesty is emphasized by school principals at minimum level although it is one of the major concepts for professional ethics.

Specific Sub-Fields Consisting of School principals' Expressions Regarding Professional Ethics and Interpretation. Specific sub-fields created upon categorization of ethical expressions included in the general fields in third table are given and interpreted in Table 4 in detail.

Table 4.
Frequencies and Percentages of Specific Sub-Fields Within the Scope of Itself and General Field Regarding
Perceptions of School principals for Professional Ethics

Specific Sub-Fields Included in General Fields Created According to the School principals' Expressions		Ethical Contents Sentence (f)	General Field %	Specific Sub- Field %	
1	Max.	Sense of Duty			
		Professional Competence	10	5,99	
		Professional Responsibility	10	5,99	
		Democratic Participation	8	4,79	
		Education-Oriented	7	4,19	
		Problem-Solving	6	3,59	
		Professional Discipline	6	3,59	
Min.	Professionalism	4	2,40		
	Total	51	30,54	100	
2	Max.	Human Sensitivity			
		Considering Differences	12	7,19	
		Regarding Human as a Value and Attaching			
		Importance	9		
				5,39	
		Showing Love and Respect	6	3,59	
		Being Optimist	4	2,40	
Min.		Attaching Priority To Student	4	2,40	
		Adaptability	2	1,98	
		Total	37	22,16	
				100	
3	Max.	Objectivity			
		Neutrality	10	5,99	
		Acting Unbiased	4	2,40	
		Acting According to the Fact	2	1,20	
	Min.	Neutrality in Practice	1	0,60	
		Neutrality in Planning	1	0,60	
		Total	18	10,78	100
4	Max.	Equality			
		Legal equality	8	4,79	
		Personnel-Oriented Equality	3	1,80	
		Managerial Equality	3	1,80	
	Min.	Equality in Task Distribution	1	0,60	
		Parents-Oriented Equality	1	0,60	
		Total	16	9,58	100
5	Max.	Believing in Supremacy of Law			
		Commitment to Law	4	2,40	
		Commitment to Government	3	1,80	
	Min.	Respecting Human Rights	1	0,60	
		Respecting Labor Rights	1	0,60	
		Total	9	5,39	100
	6	Max.	Non-Code Expressions		
		Kemalism	4	2,40	
		Calmness	2	1,20	
Min.		Extravagance	1	0,60	
		Being Talented	1	0,60	
		Total	8	4,80	100

		Justice			
7	Max.	Legal Justice	5	2,99	62,50
		Managerial Justice	2	1,20	25,00
	Min.	Personnel-Oriented Justice	1	0,60	12,50
		Total	8	4,79	100
		Virtuousness			
8	Max.	Being Reliable	2	1,20	28,57
		Reputability	1	0,60	14,28
		Being a Model	1	0,60	14,28
	Min.	Self-Devotion	1	0,60	14,28
		Having Distinctive Personality	1	0,60	14,28
		Being Hardworking	1	0,60	14,28
Total	7	4,20	100		
		Social Responsibility			
9	Max.	Conformity to Society	2	1,20	40,00
		Conformity to Education	1	0,60	20,00
		Being Model to Environment	1	0,60	20,00
	Min.	Social Association	1	0,60	20,00
		Total	5	2,99	100
		Honesty			
10	Max.	Sincerity	2	1,20	50,00
		Openness	1	0,60	25,00
	Min.	Defending Truthfulness	1	0,60	25,00
		Total	4	2,39	100
		Tolerance			
11	Max.	Tolerance	3	1,80	75,00
		Min.	Constructiveness	1	0,60
	Total		4	2,39	100
Total			167	100,00	

Expressions regarding “*sense of duty*” is repeated for 51 times (30,54%) within 167 expressions given by the school principals and the expressions of “*professional competence*” and “*professional responsibility*” (f=10, 19,60%) pertaining to specific sub-fields are mentioned at maximum and “*professionalism*” (f=4, 7,84%) is mentioned at minimum in this general field.

Expressions regarding “*human sensitivity*” are repeated for 37 times (22,16%). “*Considering differences*” is mentioned at maximum (f=12, 32,43%) and “*conformity*” is mentioned at minimum (f=2, 5,41%) in this general field. Human sensitivity is a concept including protection of all items vital for human. This concept is mentioned by approximately a quarter of school principals. Especially, being prominent of “*considering differences*” sub-field may be regarded as a tendency expected from administrators. The fact that the “*compatibility*” is the sub-field which is mentioned by school principals at minimum in the general field of “*human sensitivity*” gives rise to the thought that the behaviors covered by the concept in terms of social relationships are not related with ethics.

Expressions regarding “*objectivity*” are repeated for 18 times (10,78%). The specific sub-field of “*neutrality*” is mentioned at maximum (f=10, 55,55%) and “*neutrality in planning and practice*” at minimum (f=1, 5,56%) in the general field of objectivity. That the school principals frequently mention the concept of “*objectivity*” shows that they attach importance to behaving everybody at an equal distance as a principle in organizational management. However, the fact that they mention the specific sub-field expressions of “*neutrality in planning*” and “*neutrality in practice*” at minimum level gives rise to the thought that they regard the objectivity with the meaning of “*neutrality*” and disregard the meaning of “*object-, fact-, event-oriented*”.

Griffiths (1959, cited in Starratt, 2003) emphasizes the importance of fulfilling the objectivity and rationality duties by the administrator. Rationality and objectivity ensures that the administrator makes professional

decisions in following the targets of organization. It will create a strong ethical reference point for the school principals during decision-making process.

Expressions regarding “*equality*” is repeated for 16 times (9,58%). “*Legal equality*” is mentioned at maximum (f=8, 50,00%) and “*parents-oriented equality*” and “*equality in task distribution*” are mentioned at minimum (f=1, 6,25%). It is possible to state that “*equality*” perceptions of school principals are close to their “*objectivity*” perceptions.

The characteristics of school principals such as respecting to all individuals, communicating correctly and honestly basically require being aware of all individuals’ values and respecting those values accordingly (Akbaba and Altun, 2003).

Expressions regarding “*believing in supremacy of law*” are mentioned for 9 times (5,39%). The sentences categorized as “*commitment to law*” is mentioned at maximum (f=4, 44,44%) and “*respecting human rights*” and “*respecting labor rights*” are mentioned at minimum (f=1, 11,11%) in this general field. The concept of “supremacy of law” includes showing respect to all individuals by all organizations and elements affiliated to the government in accordance with the laws and norms previously set forth and guarantees the course of laws and norms. This is a democracy principle preventing “arbitrary” attitudes and treatments of both individuals and government.

When considered from general point of view, school principals mentioned the expression of believing in supremacy of law at minimum level within professional ethics since they regard it as a part of their fundamental duty.

The expressions, belonging school principals regarding professional ethics, not conforming to any general field topic are defined as “*non-code*” (f=8, 4,80%). It is estimated that the relation between those concepts and ethic codes would be controversial. Under the general field of “*non-code*”, “*Kemalism*” is mentioned at maximum (f=4, 50,00%) and “*extravagance*” and “*being talented*” sentences are mentioned at minimum (f=1, 12,50%).

Expressions regarding “*justice*” are repeated for 8 times (4,79%). Among those specific sub-fields, “*legal justice*” is mentioned at maximum (f=5, 62,50%) and “*personnel-oriented justice*” is mentioned at minimum (f=1, 12,50%) in this general field. These values give rise to the thought that school principal hold himself responsible for being “*fair*”.

Among the expressions under the general field of “*virtuousness*”, “*being reliable*” is mentioned at maximum (f=2, 28,57%), and “*reputability*”, “*being a model*”, “*self-devotion*”, “*trust*”, “*having distinctive personality*” and “*hardworking*” specific sub-fields are mentioned at minimum (f=1, 14,28%). It is observed that school principals do not use the word of “*virtue*” directly and instead of this, relate it with the concepts included in specific sub-fields indirectly, although virtue is an important concept within the scope of ethics.

Expressions regarding “*social responsibility*” is repeated for 5 times (2,99%) by the school principals. Within the scope of this general field, the specific sub-fields of “*conformity to society*” is mentioned at maximum (f=2, 40,00%) and “*social association*”, “*being model to environment*” and “*conformity to education*” are mentioned at minimum (f=1, 20,00%). It is understood by the concept of “*social responsibility*” that “socio-economic, cultural and ecological concerns are regarded by the organizations, companies and individuals as a part of their own fields of activity”. Accordingly, it is remarkable that the school principals mention the expressions regarding “*social responsibility*” at minimum level. This finding gives rise to the thought that administrators are not willing to fulfill their social responsibilities in educational organizations which are established as an open system.

School principals repeated the expressions regarding “*honesty*” for 4 times (2,39%). Under this general field, “*sincerity*” is mentioned at maximum (f=2, 50,00%), and “*openness*” and “*defending truthfulness*” are mentioned at minimum (f=1, 25,00%) as specific sub-fields. According to TDK (2008) glossary; “*honesty*” is defined as “*truthfulness*”, “*being straight as a die*”, “*reflecting the events as it is*”, “*not hiding the facts*”. It is remarkable at the study that only four of 167 school principals relate the “*honesty*” with ethics and the remaining 163 administrators did not relate so. This finding is consistent with the results obtained from the general field of “*virtuousness*”.

School principals repeated the expressions regarding the general field of “*tolerance*” for 4 times (2,39%). “*Tolerance*” is mentioned at maximum (f=3, 75,00%) and “*constructiveness*” is mentioned at minimum (f=1,

25,00%) as expressions belonging to specific sub-fields. “*Tolerance*” is defined as not restricting others in their acts, actions and decisions; showing patience to the opinions which are contrary to the opinions of us and the majority (TDK, 2008). It may be thought that school principals do not make a general relation between “tolerance” and “ethics” due to their obligation in enforcing the regulations “correctly”. This finding also corresponds to the fact that school principals mostly emphasized the “sense of duty” expression among their responses given regarding professional ethics.

Comparison of the Professional Ethics Concepts Expressed by Teachers and School principals and the Ethics Concepts Expressed in Philosophy Literature

When the philosophy literature is examined; 38 ethics related concepts are deemed to be related to the objectives of this research. In this context, the concepts taken as the basis to compare the ethics perceptions of teachers and school principals is given in Table 5.

Table 5.
Ethics concepts in Philosophy Literature

Row No		Row No		Row No		Row No	
1	Good	11	Sense of Moral	21	Egoism	31	Character
2	Bad	12	Moral Judgment	22	Personal Morals	32	Moral Person
3	Optimism	13	Moral Act	23	Social Morals	33	Altruism
4	Pessimisms	14	Moral Law	24	Value Judgment	34	Common Sense
5	Freedom	15	Universal Moral Law	25	Deontology	35	Respect
6	Responsibility	16	Eudemonism	26	Mental Ethics	36	Intuitionism
7	Virtue	17	Eudemonia	27	Hedonism	37	Solipsism
8	Conscience	18	Justice	28	Nihilism	38	Utilitarianism
9	Duty	19	Determinism	29	Will		
10	Morals	20	Indeterminism	30	Voluntarism		

Source: B. Akarsu, (1979). *Philosophy Glossary*. Ankara: Turkish Language Institute Publications; S. H. Bolay, (1997). *Philosophy Text Book*. Istanbul: Yuva Publications.

Whereas in Table 6; 11 general fields (10 general fields and 1 non-code) concepts defined by the teachers and school principals in the context of professional ethics are compared and matched up with the ethics concepts taking place in the philosophy literature.

Table 6.
Comparison of Professional Ethics Concepts of Teachers and School principals with the Ethics Concepts in Philosophy Literature.

	Professional Ethics Concepts of Teachers	Ethics Concepts in Philosophy Literature		Professional Ethics Concepts of School principals	Ethics Concepts in Philosophy Literature
1	Sense of Duty (6), (9), (38)	Responsibility (6) Duty (9) Utilitarianism (38)	1	Sense of Duty (6), (9), (38)	Responsibility (6) Duty (9) Utilitarianism (38)
2	Human Sensitivity (1), (6), (8), (33), (35), (38)	Good (1) Responsibility (6) Conscience (8) Altruism(33) Respect (35) Utilitarianism (38)	2	Human Sensitivity (1), (6), (8), (33), (35), (38)	Good (1) Responsibility (6) Conscience (8) Altruism (33) Respect (35) Utilitarianism (38)
3	Social Responsibility (6), (23)	Responsibility (6) Social Morals (23)	3	Objectivity (1), (7), (18), (26)	Good (1) Virtue (7) Justice (18) Mental Ethics (26)
4	Honesty (1), (7), (18), (26)	Good (1) Virtue (7) Justice (18) Mental Ethics (26)	4	Equality (1), (7), (18), (26)	Good (1) Virtue (7) Justice (18) Mental Ethics (26)
5	Virtuousness (1), (7), (18), (26)	Good (1) Virtue (7) Justice (18) Mental Ethics (26)	5	Believing in Supremacy of Law (6), (23)	Responsibility (6) Social Morals (23)
6	Equality (1), (7), (18), (26)	Good (1) Virtue (7) Justice (18) Mental Ethics (26)	6	Non-Code Expressions (-)	-
7	Non-Code Expressions (-)	-	7	Justice (1), (7), (18), (26)	Good (1) Virtue (7) Justice (18) Mental Ethics (26)
8	Tolerance (1), (3)	Good (1) Optimism (3)	8	Virtuousness (1), (7), (18), (26)	Good (1) Virtue (7) Justice (18) Mental Ethics (26)
9	Objectivity (1), (7), (18), (26)	Good (1) Virtue (7) Justice (18) Mental Ethics (26)	9	Social Responsibility (6), (23)	Responsibility (6) Social Morals (23)
10	Justice (1), (7), (18), (26)	Good (1) Virtue (7) Justice (18) Mental Ethics (26)	10	Honesty (1), (7), (18), (26)	Good (1) Virtue (7) Justice (18) Mentality (26)
11	Believing in Supremacy of Law (6), (23)	Responsibility (6) Social Morals (23)	11	Tolerance (1), (3)	Good (1) Optimism (3)

Explanation: The notations inside brackets (...) in the columns of professional ethics concepts of teachers and school principals are written in tandem with the row numbers of “Ethics Concepts in Philosophy Literature “ in Table 5.

As seen in Table 6, the definitions of teachers under the “sense of duty” general field correspond to the “Responsibility”, “Duty” and “Utilitarianism” ethics concepts in philosophy literature. This shows that teachers allow expressions fundamentally orientated towards practice and application to take place rather than concepts based on theory and principles. When considered cognitively, responsibility is anticipation and intentional acceptance of the possible results of each step taken (Dewey, 1996). This conclusion seems also valid for “social responsibility” and “human sensitivity” general fields. Because, “social responsibility”, as professional ethics code, is associated with “responsibility” and “social morals” in the context of ethics concepts in philosophy literature. Whereas “Human Sensitivity” general field is used by teachers in a manner to cover “good”, “virtue”, “altruism” and “respect” apart from “responsibility” and “utilitarianism”. This finding shows that while executing their duties, teachers attaching value to human beings is application oriented and a concrete result, and bear tendency towards applying the theoretical concepts such as basic human rights and human value. Also, according to a research carried out by Can (2002); teachers rank the “sense of duty” in the first place as an ethical value.

On the other hand, “honesty”, “virtuousness”, “equality”, “objectivity” and “justice” general fields show projection with the ethics concepts in the philosophy literature such as “good”, “virtue”, “justice” and “mentality ethics”. In accordance with the level expressed as “traditional period” by Kohlberg (1970); this finding may be interpreted as being equivalent to the concept of acting in accordance with the criteria of having morals is important and necessary, otherwise may be outcasted from the society.

Also in the responses given, “tolerance” general field is discussed in the context of “good” and “optimism”, and whereas the “believing in supremacy of law” general field, having the lowest frequency, is handled in the context of “responsibility” and “social morals”.

As it is seen in Table 6, the expressions of school principals included in the scope of “sense of duty” general field, correspond to “responsibility”, “duty” and “utilitarianism” concepts in the philosophy literature. While there are lots of concepts to be touched upon in “Sense of Duty” general field, the responses given by the administrators under this heading being limited to “responsibility”, “duty” and “utilitarianism” concepts indicate that the professional ethics conception of the school principals is oriented towards job and application.

“Human sensitivity” is the general field emphasized in second degree by the school principals. The expressions within this scope correspond to “good”, “conscience”, “altruism”, “respect” and “utilitarianism” concepts. “responsibility” and “utilitarianism” ethics concepts included in “sense of duty” general field found equivalence in “human sensitivity” general field. This result shows that the school principals, performing a profession occupation oriented towards the management of human and material resources, are inclined towards application – by also giving importance to the theoretical concepts and principles such as ‘basic human rights’, “human value”.

In the direction of the responses given by school principals, the expressions in “objectivity”, “equality”, “justice”, “virtuousness” and “honesty” general fields may be recouped with the ethics concepts in philosophy literature such as “good”, “virtue”, “justice” and “mentality”. These four philosophical concepts may also be the subject matter of the debates ongoing in theoretical level. If we think about the scarcity of the debates in theoretical, scientific and academic level in our society, it is not possible for the school principals not being affected from this as they are a member of this community. In other words, some of the concepts related to ethics strongly emphasized in philosophy literature being moderately emphasized by the school principals give rise to thought that the school principals do not have adequate command over the contents of the concepts.

The expressions of the school principals taking place in “believing in supremacy of law” and “social responsibility” general fields overlap with “responsibility” and “social morals” concepts in the philosophy literature. When it is also considered that the “sense of duty” general field has the highest percentage, this situation shows that school principals are more focused on carrying out the work by the rules and do not take into account the social role responsibility while passing a judgment relating to a specific event or case.

“Tolerance”, having the least frequency among the professional ethics concepts of the school principals, is matched with “good” and “optimism” in the philosophy literature. “Tolerance” being the least referred area may be stemming from their belief that acting tolerantly reduces the sense of duty and slows down the works. Although “tolerance” being the least emphasized one among the general fields, whereas reference being made to concepts relating to “human sensitivity” ranking in second place shows that school principals handle the terms relating to human sensitivity with stereotype judgments and try to define it without really pondering over it.

Comparison of the Professional Ethics Concepts of Teachers and School principals

This research put forward the similar and distinct inclinations of teachers and school principals in terms of ethical principals and attitudes. The frequency and percentage values of these inclinations are shown comparatively in Table 7.

Table 7.
Comparison of Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Professional Ethics Perceptions of Teachers and School principals

General fields relating to expressions of Teachers				General fields relating to expressions of School principals			
		f	%			f	%
1	Sense of Duty	410	49,64	1	Sense of Duty	51	30,54
2	Human Sensitivity	120	14,53	2	Human Sensitivity	37	22,16
3	Social Responsibility	81	9,80	3	Objectivity	18	10,78
4	Honesty	46	5,57	4	Equality	16	9,58
5	Virtuousness	43	5,21	5	Believing in Supremacy of Law	9	5,39
6	Equality	34	4,12	6	Non-Code Expressions	9	5,39
7	Non-Code Expressions	31	3,75	7	Justice	8	4,79
8	Tolerance	23	2,78	8	Virtuousness	6	3,59
9	Objectivity	22	2,66	9	Social Responsibility	5	2,99
10	Justice	12	1,45	10	Honesty	4	2,39
11	Believing in Supremacy of Law	4	0,48	11	Tolerance	4	2,39
	Total	826	100		Total	167	100

Contents that may be defined as “sense of duty” have the highest frequency and percentage value both among teachers (49,64%) and also among school principals (30,54%). This finding shows that although the meaning attributed by them to ‘duty’ differs, the teachers and school principals associate “sense of duty” with professional ethics at the highest level.

“Human sensitivity” general field is emphasized as the second general field both by the teachers (14,53%) and the school principals(22,16%). This finding indicates that teachers and school principals are aware of their primary role of serving people while carrying out their duties.

The expressions of teachers under the general field of “*social responsibility*” (9,80%) and the expressions of the school principals under the general field of “objectivity” (10,78%) rank in the third place. This research shows that “objectivity” is regarded as a neutrality perception. Ranking of the objectivity in an upper place among the professional ethics concepts by the School principals may be interpreted as they are aware of the necessity for the events to be evaluated sophisticatedly and rationally.

As seen in Table 7, the general field with the lowest value emerged as “believing in supremacy of law” from the point of view of teachers (%0,48), and as “tolerance” (2.39%) from the point of view of school principals. Although taking place among the basic concepts relating to ethics in literature, “*believing in supremacy of law*” being ranked in lower place among the professional ethics concepts by the teachers shows that the law and professional ethics could not be collocated.

CONCLUSION

It is observed that concepts such as ethics, morality, and moral philosophy are occasionally used in place of the other by the public, which gives rise to various discussions. As Kuçuradi (2000) indicated, (...) ‘ethics’ word is used in the meaning of morals, in other words evaluation and behavior norm systems in relations of people with each other in a specific group, and within a specific time period. These are unwritten norm systems or are the norms relating to what is good, what is bad in a specific culture and within a specific time period. Hence, they are the distinct and variable norm systems put into words what should and should not people do in general. These morals norms should not be confused with ethical values. Unwritten norm systems may be called as “moral norms” but not as ethical norms (...).

Being a dynamic case, professional ethics necessitate the ethical problems to internalize the ethical norms and to behave in appropriate manner in professional life both for teachers and school principals.

“Sense of duty” and “human sensitivity” general fields are ranked in the first places both by the teachers and school principals. Both groups emphasize the concepts such as professional competency, responsibility, democratic participation, being oriented towards education and solution inside the sense of duty general field. This outcome put forward that neither group completely conceive the essence relating to ethics and professional ethics. Because professional ethics in philosophical sense can be defined as the general heading of attitudes such as person assuming the consequences of his/her behavior (responsibility); internalization of tasks and duties (sense of duty) (Barış, 1973) ; benefit of the community from the works done (utilitarianism); showing sensitivity towards social events and feeling responsible as the member of intelligentsia (social responsibility) and having virtues; being fair and just; and morality in thoughts.

Teachers and school principals ranked the expressions relating to “justice” and “believing in supremacy of law” in lower places within the professional ethics. While making judgments, which may form the basis for the decisions and implementations relating to ethics, it is necessary to think about the current situation in philosophical terms and in more than one dimension. For example, it is necessary to think about whether there is a reason like protecting the person’s right to live as the justification of the act done within the current situation. Ethics and professional ethics subjects must be known in broad sense by the person passing this judgment. Although justice and supremacy of law are two concepts relating to ethics, teachers and school principals not touching upon these and instead relating the sense of duty with the professional ethics in the first degree gives rise to thought that they do not have knowledge about the concept and the situation assessments are made superficially.

On the other hand, sections relating to ethics or concepts pertaining to ethics are not included in the reference books at the current Education Faculties; and the philosophy classes are inadequate in the primary, secondary and higher education curriculum. As the philosophy course is one of the basic courses developing thinking skills, its absence leads to adverse outcomes in subjects requiring transformation of abstract thought into behavior and in academic success. For this reason, it shall be appropriate to add an independent course under the heading of “ethics” both to the programs of the faculties educating teachers and also to the philosophy group courses in the curriculum of the secondary education. According to the findings obtained by Pass and Willingham (2009) at the end of a course where ethics dilemma had been discussed, the university students indicated that (a) they are in need of sense of ethics development, and (b) such a course should be included among the optional courses. Whereas the teachers emphasized that the students need ethics courses and the discussion of the ethics dilemma supports the development of sense of ethics of the students. Hudson and Miller (2005), Yu Lin and Hui Ho (2008) especially emphasized the importance of previously received ethics education among the series of factors (Cultural knowledge, sexuality, religiousness and ethical dilemma type) affecting the ethical decision making behavior of the students.

School principals and teachers rank the “human sensitivity” successively after “sense of duty” among professional ethics concepts. Sense of duty, as defined by the teachers and school principals, also shows the

existence of a stereotype thinking that the works should be carried out in accordance with law and regulations. However, human sensitivity, as explained in the “Theory of Moral Development in Human” of Kohlberg (1970), he especially emphasized the necessity of taking the human rights and human factors into consideration while passing judgment relating to the events leaving us in the midst of ethical dilemma. Above outcomes give hints of two inclinations opposite to each other. If the teachers and school principals are making decisions in the direction of Kohlberg’s (1970) theory of moral development, it is not surprising that they emphasize human sensitivity. However, if they are carrying out the work only in sense of duty with the stereotype judgments and emphasizing this in the context of professional ethics, it means that these two thinking contradict each other. It is worth to examine how this could happen in the same mind.

The expressions within all the general and specific sub-fields mentioned above are the concepts associated with the professional ethics among the teachers and school principals. In order to understand the mental schemes of the people relating to professional ethics, the necessity of analysis such as ‘deep interview’ and examination of these results of the analysis from philosophical, sociological, psychological, economical and political angles should be born in mind.

The general field categories obtained with this research are not the ethical codes included in the literature and required to be acquired by the teachers and school principals but are the superior codes determined by the researchers by setting out from the expressions of the teachers and school principals relating to ethics. For this reason, the obtained codes must be comparatively analyzed with their examples in the contemporary countries and applied.

REFERENCES

- Akarsu, B. (1979). *Glossary of Philosophy Terms*. Ankara: Turkish Language Institute Publications.
- Akbaba-Altun, S. (2003). Education management and values. *Değerler Eğitimi Journal*,1 (1), s.7-18.
- Akdoğan, H. (2003). *Approaches of Profession Members to Importance of Accounting Profession Ethics in Enlightening of Public*. Anadolu University Publications No: 1470.
- Akyıldız, H. (1992). Interaction of school-society in terms of teachers. *Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education Journal*, 8. Access: 04 May 2009, from <http://www.egitimdergisi.hacettepe.edu.tr>.
- Aras, G. (2001). Issues not Agreed and Approaches . *Meeting Result Reports – Economic Forum. Business ethics: Old Problems in New Concepts, New Approaches*. Istanbul: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Publications Series.
- Aydın, İ. P. (1998). *Managerial Professional and Organizational Ethics*. (Issue 1). Ankara: PegemA Publications.
- Balanuye, Ç. (2001). What does ethics tell? Or what is the ethic of what we tell? *Virgöl Journal*, 42, s.26-27.
- Bilgin, N. (1988). *Content Analysis*. İzmir: Ege University, Faculty of Literature.
- Bolay, S.H. (1997). *Philosophy Text Book*. Istanbul: Yuva Publications.
- Can, N. (2002). Education administration in process of change. *Milli Eğitim Journal*, 155-156, s.89-98.
- Cevizci, A. (1996). *Glossary of Philosophy*. Ankara: Ekin Publications.
- Cevizci, A. (2002). *Introduction to Ethics*. Istanbul: Paradigma Publications.
- Dewey, J. (1996). *Democracy and Education*. (Interp. M. S. Otaran). Istanbul: Başarı Kültür Publication Series.
- Diemer, A. and Patzig, G., Feys, R., Heinemann, F., König, G. (1990). *Philosophy Disciplines Today*. (Interp. D. Özlem). Istanbul: Ara Publications. Access: 03 April 2009, from <http://www.felsefekibi.com/site/default.asp?PG=1117>.

- Ferrel, O. C. and Frederich, J. (1994). *Business Ethics, Ethical Decision Making and Cases*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Comp.
- Foucault, M. (2005). *The Subject and Power- Selections-2*. (Interp. O. Akinhay). Istanbul: Ayrıntı Publications.
- Fralov, I. (1997). *Glossary of Philosophy*. (Interp. Aziz Çalışlar). Istanbul: Cem Publications.
- Gözütok, D. (1995). *Democratic Attitudes of Teachers*. Ankara: TDV Publication.
- Güçlü, A., Uzun, E., Uzun, S., Yoksal, H. (2002). *Glossary of Philosophy*. Istanbul: Bilim ve Sanat Publications.
- Gülenç, K. (2006). Ethics: A Conceptual evaluations. *Felsefe Ekibi Journal*, Issue. 5. Access: 21 November 2008, from <http://www.felsefeekibi.com/dergi5/>.
- Günay, M. (2006). Human in terms of Values. *Felsefe Ekibi Journal*, Issue. 5. Access: 18 April 2007, from http://www.felsefeekibi.com/dergi5/s5_y1.htm.
- Haynes, F. (1998). *Ethics in Education*. (Interp.S.K. Akbaş,). Istanbul: Ayrıntı Publications.
- Jennings, B. (2003). A strategy for discussing ethical issues in public health. *Ethics and Public Health*; (Ed) A. Mastroianni, B.Jennings M.D. Access: 04 May 2008, from www.asph.org.
- Kohlberg, L. (1970). Education for Justice: A modern statement of the platonic view. T. Sezar and N. Sezar (Ed.), *In Moral Education* (s.57-83). Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press.
- Kuçuradi, I. (1998). *Human and Values*. Ankara: Turkish Philosophy Institute Publications.
- Kuçuradi, I. (2000a). Ethic and ethics. *Laws–Ethics–Earthquake: Non-governmental Organizations*, Istanbul: Turkish Economic and Social History Foundation Publication.
- Kuçuradi, I. (2000b). Philosophic ethics and professional ethics. *Ethics and Professional Ethics: Medicine, Environment, Business, Press, Law and Politics*, Ankara: Turkish Philosophy Institute Publications.
- Luthans, F. and Hodgets, M.R., Thompson, K.R. (1987). *In Social Issues in Business: Strategic and Public Policy Perspectives*. USA: MacMillian Pub.Co.
- Özmen, F. and Güngör, A. (2008). Ethics in education supervision. *İnönü University Faculty of Education Journal*, 9 (15):137-155.
- Pass, S. and Willingham, W. (2009). *Teaching ethics to high school students*. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. EJ822557).
- Rebore, R. W. (2001). *The Ethics of Educational Leadership*. New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.
- Rosenthal, M. and Yudin, P. (1997). *Glossary of Philosophy*. (Interp. A. Çalışlar,). Istanbul: Sosyal Publications.
- Sönmez, V. (1998). *Philosophy of Education*. Ankara: Anı Publications.
- Starratt, R. J. (2003). *Centering Educational Administration Cultivating Meaning, Community, Responsibility* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Tavşancıl, E. and Aslan, E.A. (2001). *Content Analysis and Practice Examples*. Istanbul: Epsilon Yayınevi.
- Tepe, H. (1998). Ethics as a philosophy branch: Concept of ‘Ethics’, its history and ethics today. *Doğu Batı Journal*, 4, s.11-27.
- Timuçin, A. (1998). *Glossary of Philosophy*. Istanbul: İnsancıl Publications.
- Eren; H. and others. (1988). *Turkish Glossary*. Ankara: Turkish Language Institute Publications, Volume: 1.
- Turkish Language Institute. (2008). *Big Turkish Glossary*. Access: 29 October 2008, from <http://tdkterim.gov.tr>.

- Uslu, S. (2001). *Blending Traditions and Novels in Business Ethics*. Istanbul: TÜSİAD Publications.
- Variş, F. (1973). A few problems encountered in educating teachers in Turkey in its 50th Anniversary, Gift for 50th Anniversary. Ankara: Ankara University, Faculty of Education Publications.
- Valesquez, M. and Andre, C., Shanks, T.J., Meyer, M.J. (1988). Ethics and Virtue. *Issues in Ethics*, 1(3),. Access: 02 August 2007, from <http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/decision/ethicsandvirtue.html>.
- Yayla, A. (2005). Ethical analysis of education concept. *Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education Journal*, 1. Access: 19 April 2007, from <http://efdergi.yyu.edu.tr>.
- Yıldırım, A. and Şimşek, H. (2000). *Qualitative Research Methods*. Ankara: Seçkin Publications.
- Yu Lin, C. and Hui Ho, Y. (2008). An examination of cultural differences in ethical decision making using the multidimensional ethics scale. From *Social Behavior and Personality*, 36(9), s.1213-1222 .

ANNEX I.

Terms

Honesty, Truthful / Honest: honest, honorable, not deviating from honesty in his/her words and behavior. (Eren ve diğ.,1988).

Virtue: the power of the human will to make a great sacrifices and to act in the direction of good deed, with good intentions to overcome great obstacles when necessary (Cevizci, 1996). According to another explanation, virtue is moral competence, orientation towards good and spiritual strength brought by escapism from evil. It is the moral maturity originating from the combination of good attributes in thoughts and behavior. In its most general term, virtue is the inclination to desire the good, as a matter of fact it is the habit of effectuating the good.. Its becoming habit shall mean its acquirement. Whatever may be their moral perceptions, all moralists comprehend the virtue as human-being making himself to listen to himself and to keep a tight rein on his/her passions by using his mind. (Timuçin, 1998).

A moral philosophy approaching to “How should I live?” question by taking the “virtue” concept as the basis is in contradiction with moral teaching based on “duty” or “responsibility” setting off from moral codes and laws. The advocates of this perception argue that all other concepts relating to morals can be reduced down to virtue or the foundation these concepts can only be laid through virtue. This teaching, emphasizing the share of virtue in a good living fit for human-being, underlines intensely that what’s needed for a human to mature in terms of morals or to have a good character is knowing exactly what “moral good” or “virtue” correspond to rather than “sense of duty” (Güçlü; Uzun; Uzun; Yoksal, 2002).

Sense of Duty / Duty Ethics: is the ethics conception, first put forward by Kant, one of the greatest theoretician of the moral philosophy; disclaiming all teleological, utilitarian or consequentialist ethics conceptions by placing the “duty” on the foundation of morals; directly basing the moral value of an action solely and only on the sense of duty itself by keeping its rightness or wrongness exempt from the consequences of the action, and arguing that this action bears a moral value if only there is no other determinant or collimator apart from the sense of duty in the consciousness of the actor performing the act. Duty based ethics perception is only interested in predetermined rules, principles and codes (Güçlü; Uzun; Uzun; Yoksal, 2002).

Tolerance: the attitude of understanding the way of thinking and life style of the others which is different than ours. Conception based on making it possible to freely express to others the opinions, ideas and feelings we do not share with others. (Cevizci, 1996).

Equality: a conception indicating the identical conditions of the people in the community but having distinct contents in different historical periods and in social classes. As a moral and social ideal, the state of people being in the same position and having the same value in terms of having the same human nature. The principle indicating people being equal to each other, and hence no discrimination should be made between the people (Cevizci, 1996; Fralov, 1997; Rosenthal and Yudin, 1997).

Justice: The state of values, principles, ideals and virtues in a society being materialized, concretized, put into practice. The state of everybody coming across with the award or punishment they deserve. Justice; as the expression of the most supreme, objective and absolute value; confronts us in the form of a thought examining and criticizing the behavior of human in moral terms, a moral principle taking the respect for the justice and rightfulness as the basis, rightfulness, honesty, neutrality, proper and correct conduct (Cevizci, 1996).

Objectivity / Objective: The ability of assessing a situation, event, creature without being affected from the feelings and prejudice. The state of supporting a thought, knowledge, judgment, decision or argument with the data and evidences based on current events (Cevizci, 1996).

Social Responsibility: Education, in a specific sense school, attempts to develop the culture while trying to protect the social structure and values (Akyıldız, 1992). In this context, the responsibilities of schools oriented towards social surrounding and society are in question.

Supremacy of Law: Supremacy of law is the functioning of all institutions and organizations within the state within the framework of law, regulations and rules; non-existence of individual, arbitrary attitudes and applications.

Human sensitivity: refers to an attitude oriented towards protection of values originating from a person merely being a human.