



12-1-1994

Perceptions About Ethical Decision-Making Among North Dakota Elementary Principals

Isabel Patricia Hovel

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Hovel, Isabel Patricia, "Perceptions About Ethical Decision-Making Among North Dakota Elementary Principals" (1994). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3742.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3742>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

PERCEPTIONS ABOUT ETHICAL DECISION-MAKING AMONG
NORTH DAKOTA ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

by

Isabel Patricia Hovel
Bachelor of Science, Valley City State College, 1961
Master of Education, University of North Dakota, 1982
Specialist Diploma, University of North Dakota, 1985

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
University of North Dakota
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Education

Grand Forks, North Dakota
December
1994

This dissertation, submitted by Isabel Patricia Hovel in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education from the University of North Dakota, has been read by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done and is hereby approved.

Donald K. Lema
(Chairperson)

Richard L. Lutz

Richard J. Landry

John G. Focner

Donald E. Porter

This dissertation meets the standards for appearance, conforms to the style and format requirements of the Graduate School of the University of North Dakota, and is hereby approved.

Harvey Knell
Dean of the Graduate School 12-14-94

PERMISSION

Title Perceptions about Ethical Decision-making among North Dakota
Elementary Principals

Department Educational Administration

Degree Doctor of Education

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my doctoral research project or, in his absence, by the chairperson of the department or the dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this doctoral research project or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature Isahel Lovel

Date November 28, 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	vi
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xi
ABSTRACT	xii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Delimitations	3
Assumptions	4
Definitions	4
Research Question	6
II. AN OVERVIEW OF ETHICS IN LITERATURE	8
Great Ethical Debates	9
Why Be Ethical?	12
Ethical Assessment	20
The Meaning of Ethics and Ethical Decision-making	25
Impact of Ethics on Educational Practices	43
Ethics and Ethical Issues in Education	55
Summary	89
III. PROCEDURE	93
Instrumentation	93
Selection of the Population	95
Gathering the Data	96
Data Analysis	97

IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	98
Description and Analysis of Quantitative Data	99
Description and Analysis of Interview Data	173
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	198
Summary of Quantitative Data and Related Qualitative Input	200
Summary of Qualitative Data Gathered from Question Fifty-one on the Survey	211
Summary of Qualitative Information Gathered from Telephone Interviews	212
Conclusions	213
Recommendations	218
APPENDICES	220
REFERENCES	249

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. A Manner of Organizing Ethics	10
2. The Major Ethical Movements	13
3. The Major Ethical Concepts in Ethical Thought	14
4. Ethics Survey Results	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Description of the Population	100
2. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Employment in the School District of Relatives of School Board Members	119
3. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals in Situations Where Relatives of School Board Members Were Employed in the School District as to the Ethical Handling of Such Employment	120
4. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Employment in the School District of Relatives of the Principal	122
5. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals in Situations Where Relatives of Principals Were Employed as to the Ethical Handling of the Situation	123
6. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to the "Encouragement" to Hire a Teacher Who Was a Personal Friend or Relative of a School Board Member	124
7. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to the Degree of Bearing That "Encouragement" Influenced the Decision	125
8. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Whether the Principal Has Ever Hired a Friend or Relative of a School Board Member	127
9. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals When the Principal Had Hired a Friend or Relative of a School Board Member Whether That Employment Situation Was Handled Ethically	128
10. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Those Factors Considered to Be of the Greatest Importance by the Principal in Decision-making.	129
11. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Reliability and Accuracy of Information Released by Schools Related to Student Achievement Data	130
12. Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Reliability and Accuracy of Information Released by Schools Related to Student Attendance Records	131

13.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Reliability and Accuracy of Information Released by Schools Related to the Annual Report to the Department of Public Instruction (DPI)	132
14.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Reliability and Accuracy of Information Released by Schools Related to Public Relations Information	133
15.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Reliability and Accuracy of Information Released by Schools Related to Reports Concerning Student Use of Drugs and Alcohol	134
16.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Reliability and Accuracy of Information Released by Schools Related to Reports on Student Discipline Actions	135
17.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Reliability of Recommendation Letters Both Received and Written Related to the Reliability of Recommendation Letters Received	136
18.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Reliability of Recommendation Letters Both Received and Written Related to the Reliability of Recommendation Letters Written	137
19.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Affects of Court Decisions in Strengthening or Weakening Student Rights	138
20.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions about the Difficulty of Administering Schools Based on Student Human and Civil Rights	139
21.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors as to Whether It Is Preferable to Protect the Civil Rights of the Minority Even If the Good of the Many Is Compromised	140
22.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to the Initiation of Practices by the Principal or Administrative Team for Greater Parental Involvement	141
23.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to the Right of Parents to Have Choice of Schools Which Their Children Attend . . .	143
24.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Whether the Principal Has Received Offers of Gifts from Vendors Related to the Acceptance of All Gifts (Except Wining and Dining)	145
25.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Whether the Principal Has Received Offers of Gifts from Vendors Related to Wining and Dining	147

26.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Whether the Principal Has Received Offers of Gifts from Vendors Related to None of These	148
27.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to What Is Permissible in Regard to the Acceptance of Gifts	150
28.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors and Whether the Principal Has Ever Accepted a Gift of More Than \$10	151
29.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to Whether School Board Members Accept Gifts from Vendors.	152
30.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to Whether Other Administrators in Their District Accept Gifts from Vendors	153
31.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to How Often Other Administrators Accept Gifts	155
32.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Whether the Principal Has Ever "Fudged" an Expense Account	156
33.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Whether the Principal Has Put Valuable School Property to Personal Use	157
34.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Whether the Principal Has Ever Ended His or Her Contract before the Completion Date	158
35.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to the Acceptability of Leaving before the End of the Contract	160
36.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to the Hiring of a Consultant for a Paid Position Who Had Helped the Principals Obtain Their Current Position	161
37.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to the Importance of Ethical Training for Administrators	162
38.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to How Their Graduate Training Would Rate in Regard to Ethics	163
39.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to Copying Computer Software for Students	165

40.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to the Principal's Conception of Effective Computer Use Given Limited Numbers of Computers	166
41.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to the Course to Follow When a School Board Member Wants Information on a Child Not His or Her Own	167
42.	Frequency Data Comparing Principalship Factors to Perceptions of Principals as to the Course to Take When Obtaining VCR Films for the School	168

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are a number of people who provided assistance as work on this project progressed to completion. A special thank you is extended to Dr. Donald Lemon, my advisor. His encouragement, patience, guidance, and selfless dedication are greatly appreciated. The assistance and advice in statistics use and manner of reporting provided by Dr. Richard Landry were invaluable. Dr. Richard Hill, Dr. John Hoover, and Dr. Donald Porter, the other members of my committee, have contributed both helpful advice and time to the project, for which I extend heartfelt thanks.

The expertise of Sharon Fields is held in high regard. She provided assistance in assuring the format of the final document adhered to the guidelines and that the citations were complete and accurate. Her patience is also appreciated.

The assistance of Sandy Krom and her expertise also are held in high regard. Her computer skills and her willingness to work the hours necessary under the stress of limited time are much appreciated.

Very important to this study are the 132 North Dakota elementary principals who responded to the survey. Their participation and promptness were paramount to the success of the project. Their interest and assistance are appreciated.

A special thank you must go to my offspring, Elizabeth and Douglas, for their moral support, encouragement, and patience. Douglas, because of his age, also needed commitment to the project and the resulting need to forego quality family time. Yet, he did so with good will. Without this support, the project could not have reached completion.

ABSTRACT

The perceptions of North Dakota elementary principals about ethics and ethical decisions in the workplace were examined in the light of a similar national study. The purpose of the study was to analyze the perceptions of elementary principals of North Dakota to develop a clearer view of what would be considered ethical behaviors and ethical concerns among North Dakota elementary principals. The cumulative perceptions helped clarify the general consensus regarding ethical standards for principals in North Dakota schools. A secondary purpose was to disseminate the results of this analysis in order to help elementary principals in North Dakota in their decision-making.

The elementary principals of North Dakota were surveyed by means of both specific and open questions adapted from a national survey instrument (Keough 1992). Follow-up interviews were conducted by telephone with a randomly selected subset of respondents. Of 172 eligible elementary principals in North Dakota, 129 sent responses. The analysis, using Chi-square, compared responses of participants to fifty ethical questions about the amount of time spent as principal, length of time in their current position, rural-urban location, gender, age, and years of experience as principal.

Findings of the survey indicated perceived ethical standards in matters covered by the survey. Strong ethical standards existed in the following areas: opposing employment of friends and relatives of school board members and principals, permitting students to participate in decision-making about those things in the school that affected them, and accepting gifts or permitting gifts to influence decision-making.

Clear ethical standards did not exist in the following areas:
permitting parents to choose the school they desire their child to attend and using VCR tapes with school classes in which the payment was for personal use but not for public (including school) use.

In general, the findings of the survey were parallel to the findings from the national survey. Sometimes the weightings were a little different. Even in the two instances where the majority differed, the percentage differences were not substantial.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Ethics? Come on-n-n, now! Ethics has been a subject that one does not usually hear being discussed in the lounge or office. One does not see ethics as a conference topic. Why is it that we tend to neglect such an important subject? What is ethics, anyway?

Ethics is not a new topic of study; it has been a matter of concern for many centuries, dating from the times of ancient Greece. In Western society, much present-day philosophy is based upon ancient Greek thought. In recent years, there has been expressed interest in development of moral values and ethics in society, the student, and the educator (Egan 1990; Lieberman 1988; Rich 1984).

An overview of the literature suggested various basic reasons that society and educators particularly needed an awareness about the ethics education of students. The three encompassing reasons for the need for ethics in education are (1) human beings have moral agency, (2) ethics has a function in society, and (3) ethics is an ingredient in professionalism. A moral agent is anyone who can make moral decisions in a rational and reasonable manner.

Some specific secondary reasons interwoven through the overall reasons listed previously include the following:

1. Developing effective schools
2. Meeting the purposes of education
3. Recognizing education as a profession
4. Maintaining the well-being of persons within an organization

5. Perpetuating societal values

6. Continuing the very survival of humanity

It is difficult to divide these secondary reasons among the three primary reasons. The discussion of one secondary reason frequently overlaps with the other reasons thus involving the discussion of two or more reasons. For instance, when discussing effective schools and role models, one also touches upon morale and esprit of teachers and students. Attending to esprit and morale is attending to the well-being of persons within the organization. When talking about the well-being of students, especially in the areas of growth and development, esprit, motivation, and influence, one refers back to role models and moral agency. In this instance, one also refers to the perpetuation of societal values and the meeting of educational goals.

Need for the Study

Well known personages such as John Goodlad (1990), David Purpel (1989), Kevin Ryan (1986), M. Scott Peck (1990), and John Rich (1984) have become quite outspoken within the field of education regarding the importance of moral values and ethical standards in schools. They stated that this concern involves all of the behaviors and decisions that educators make, both minor and momentous. Purpel (1989) accents the need by declaring that society is in a cultural, political, and moral crisis and therefore an educational crisis. Two needs are suggested to be of paramount importance: (1) the perpetuation of democratic values and standards that result in an ethical society and (2) the effective work necessary to find solutions for the dangers that face society. Ryan (1986) said that societies, cultures, and nations must come to some sort of consensus on what is held to be of value in life, including life itself. There must be some sort of consensus reached on ethical standards to use as guidelines. The impact of this

consensus concerning ethical standards is of great importance if society, as a democracy, is to continue and if humanity is to survive (Goodlad 1990; Peck 1990; Purpel 1989; Purpel and Ryan 1976; Ryan 1986).

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to assist elementary principals to conceptualize the thought of other elementary principals about ethics in school settings. This conceptualization is intended to facilitate thinking about ethics in schools. Thinking about ethics is intended to facilitate thinking and decision-making among individual principals regarding the use of ethics in their school. Thus, principals collectively may arrive at a more closely aligned consensus as to what constitutes ethical standards in schools.

The secondary purpose of the study was to examine the perceptions of elementary school principals in North Dakota regarding what they deemed to be ethical behavior. The study was not intended to measure or evaluate the ethics of principals.

Delimitations

This study was delimited by the following factors:

1. The elementary principals surveyed were all located in North Dakota.
2. The principals surveyed were assigned to the elementary principalship for half-time or more of their work day.
3. The survey instrument contained questions only about professional ethics and other areas that would pertain to ethical decisions, issues, and dilemmas.

Assumptions

The following basic assumptions were made for the study:

1. The population would be representative of the population and the analysis of the data would be useful.
2. The persons who were interviewed were accurate and honest in their responses.
3. The principals were exposed to pressures that possibly would challenge personal ethics.

Definitions

Definitions, many paraphrased, were secured from the literature. References are provided when definitions were quoted or paraphrased from the literature. A more complete list of definitions pertinent to ethics may be found in the glossary (see appendix F).

Code of ethics. A code that communicates the purpose, values, and beliefs of an organization and its leadership (Blanchard and Peale 1988) and "a set of rules that established the standards or norms in matters of individual or institutional conduct" (Sockett 1990, p. 238).

Culture. The sum total of the attainments and activities of a specific group of people, with the emphasis on common beliefs and values. The cultures, in the context of this study, may be ethnic, vocational, geographic, gender related, religious affiliation related, political affiliation related, or any other commonality of which people may be members.

Decision-making. "A process in which one discovers what should be done" (Brown 1990, p. xi).

Ethical behavior. To behave in a manner congruent with the most basic principles in our lives (Lewis 1990, p. xi).

Ethical decisions. Those decisions which have taken ethical concerns into consideration in the decision-making process (Freitas 1991, pp. 89-90).

Ethical dilemma. "Being caught between two opposing reactions to situations such as anger and temptation" (Blanchard and Peale 1988, p. 3).

Ethical questions. Those questions that apply to specific situations (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, p. 4).

Ethicists/ethicians. People who study ethics (Brown 1990; Zeleny 1989, p. 374). Ethicists seems to be the term used more often.

Ethics. Ethics are the standards or principles of conduct by which behaviors are measured as to 'right' and 'wrong' (Terry and Rue 1982). Ethics assist people in their search for truth and wisdom (Pojman 1990; Terry and Rue 1982; Tsanoff 1955; Zeleny 1989).

Moral actions. "Interventions through the exercise of some form of power in accord with intentions, rules, and ends, which are subject to qualitative judgments of good or bad" (Gustafson 1978, p. 14).

Moral agent. "All human beings being capable of making moral decisions in a reasonable and rational manner" (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, pp. 6, 12). "Persons who can consider alternative courses of action and can justify their choice with good reasons" (Brown 1990, p. 22).

Moral principles. Statements based on moral values which prescribe how the world ought to be. Moral principles are public and therefore debatable (open to debate) (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, pp. 36-37). In contrast, facts and personal values (preferences) are not open to debate.

Morals. Relates to the principles of right conduct in behavior and to the extent that behavior conforms to accepted principles of what

is considered to be right, virtuous, and just. Morals are closer to actual practice than to ethics (Pojman 1990, p. 2; Rich 1984, p. 122; Zeleny 1989, p. 374).

Professional. "Those who profess to know more than others in certain matters" (Cullen 1978, p. 6). "Engaged in one of the learned professions characterized by or conforming to the technical or ethical standards of the profession" (Woolf 1977, p. 919).

Research Question

The following question was identified for investigation.

1. What are the perceptions of North Dakota elementary principals about ethical standards and ethical practices in the workplace particularly as they apply to the following issues:
 - a. the employment of relatives and friends in the workplace?
 - b. the accuracy of written and received letters of recommendations?
 - c. the accuracy of reports and communications?
 - d. the student rights in school?
 - e. the parental involvement in decision-making?
 - f. the parent's choice of schools for their children?
 - g. the process of decision-making?
 - h. the practices concerning adherence to policies?
 - i. the acceptance of gifts and their influence on decisions?
 - j. the appropriate management of budgets and budgetary monies?
 - k. the use of school property for personal use?
 - l. the honoring of contract agreements?

- m. the hiring and firing practices in schools?
- n. the presence and influence of ethical training?
- o. the views on copyright laws, especially as they relate to computer software?
- p. the handling and use of student records?
- q. the use of VCR films?

An overview of the literature is presented in the following chapter. The literature review provides a background for the North Dakota study. The subsequent considerations are the procedures used in the study; the results of the survey and their analysis; and then a summary of the study with conclusions, discussion, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

AN OVERVIEW OF ETHICS IN LITERATURE

The literature review centered around several general topics. The first of these, the great ethical debates, shows an interesting, centuries-long development of moral and ethical thought in the Western world. Inspection of these ethical movements helps one realize that even people who make a concerted study of morals and ethics are not in complete agreement.

This realization leads to the question of why people should be ethical. Reasons for being ethical are the second general topic.

Once people and/or society determine they should be ethical, the question arises about how a person knows whether a given decision is ethical. The manner in which individuals assess decisions as to ethnicity is the third general topic.

In order for decisions to be ethical, there must be an understanding of the meaning of ethics. Ethics cannot be understood without an understanding of the meaning of the components that enter into the development of ethical standards such as facts, values, morals, and moral principles. This clarification comprises the fourth general topic.

Ethics impacts educational practice inside the classroom and in education related activities outside the classroom. The impact ranges from moral education to professionalism, with many other areas included. Principals are responsible for the education and well-being of students as well as the growth and well-being of staff members. In that role, the provision of an environment that would encourage ethical

decision-making in the school setting will raise the probability of the school being an effective school. A discussion of the importance and impact of ethics in schools is the fifth and last general topic.

Great Ethical Debates

Though there has been an upsurge in interest in ethics in recent years, this interest is not a new phenomenon. Thinkers in ancient Greece were interested in ethics. These thinkers have influenced present-day thought.

Ancient Ethical Thought

Much of the basis for present-day Western ethical movements is founded on the thinking of ancient Greek philosophers. Some of the philosophers of that time were Aristippus (435-366 B.C.), Epicurus (342-270 B.C.), Socrates (469-399 B.C.), Aristotle (384-322 B.C.), and Plato (428-348 B.C.) From these philosophers and their followers came the basic ideas of major philosophical movements of the present time such as utility, pleasure, right and wrong, responsibility, reasonable and rational decision-making, the importance of human life, and the importance of virtue (Banner 1968; Brown 1990; Pojman 1990; Tsanoff 1955; Zeleny 1989).

Two medieval philosophers impacted present-day ethical movements, St. Augustine (354-430 A.D.) and St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274 A.D.). From their teachings comes the idea of the importance of love for those around us and the search for happiness in the individual through reason (Banner 1968; Zeleny 1989).

Ethical Movements in Recent Times

Ethical movements/theories were sometimes discussed in terms of being cognitive or noncognitive. Figure 1 illustrates this contrast.

Cognitive-NoncognitiveCognitive

1. have truth value
2. possible to know truth value
3. tells how world is:
descriptivism

A. Naturalism

1. Naturalism
 - a. subjective or objective
 - b. based on physical sciences
 - c. based on fact
 - d. state two premises to reach a conclusion
 - e. Proponent:
David Hume

Noncognitive

1. not have truth value
2. not possible to know the truth
3. tells how the world ought to be--prescriptivism

A. Nonnaturalism

1. Emotivism
 - a. based on feelings and emotions
 - b. accents approval/disapproval
 - c. Proponents:
A. J. Ayer
C. L. Stevenson
2. Prescriptivism
 - a. logical thinking
 - b. prescriptive judgments
 - c. Proponent:
R. M. Hare
3. Intuitionism
 - a. beauty important
 - b. intuition rather than logic
 - c. Proponent:
G. E. Moore

Figure 1. A manner of organizing ethics

Ethical emotivism, prescriptivism, and intuitionism were reported to be in the process of development at the present time. All three are opposed to naturalism in both their basic concepts and manner of reaching conclusions (Hare 1952; Lewis 1990; Moore 1903; Pojman 1990; Tsanoff 1955).

G. E. Moore was credited with the change in manner of ethical thought. Prior to his time, philosophers tended to describe the correct moral theory. Moore and philosophers who followed tended to be more concerned with "the functions of ethical terms, status of moral judgments, and the relation of ethical judgments to nonethical factual statements" (Pojman 1990, p. 138). This manner of considering ethics was called "metaethics."

Categorization of ethics traditionally recognized in present times was deontological (from the Greek word "deon" meaning duty) and teleological (from the Greek word "telo" meaning end or goal) ethics. Virtue ethics (aretaic ethics), a third type, was not so much followed but was reported to be regaining recognition in present time (Pojman 1990; Strike and Soltis 1985).

Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), an Englishman, was the first to systematically describe utilitarianism (teleological). John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), a Scotsman and best known of the teleological ethicists, was greatly influenced by Bentham. In addition to the concepts listed in figure 3, he indicated there were two levels of pleasure. Lower level pleasures such as eating, drinking, sexuality, and resting were sensual, universal, and more intensely gratifying than were higher level pleasures. Higher level pleasures (spiritual or achievement pleasures) tended to be more protracted, continuous, and gradual than lower level pleasures (Banner 1968; Pojman 1990; Quinton 1973). The person at a higher level needed more to make him or her happy and were more open to greater pain. He believed that the person who did not attain higher level pleasure had the least quality of life and, conversely, those who attained higher level pleasure had the better quality of life (Banner 1968; Mill 1863; Pojman 1990).

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), from Germany, was the most influential deontological ethicist (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). The key to Kantian thought was the concept of intellectual and personal liberty (autonomy), equality, due process, and democracy (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988; Tsanoff 1955).

The basic differences between teleological and deontological ethics are illustrated in figures 2 and 3. Virtue and mixed ethics also are briefly described in figures 2 and 3 (Banner 1968; Brown 1990; Mill 1863; Pojman 1990; Quinton 1973; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988; Strike

and Soltis 1985). Combination ethics is not a specifically named movement, but the theory uses some concepts from both teleological and deontological thought. Presently, Frankena (1973) is the only well-known ethicist who has taken this approach.

Both teleological and deontological thought give consideration to the importance of the act (behavior) and the rule in ethics, though the emphasis and weighting differ. Proponents of these approaches are illustrated in figure 2. In figure 3, the contrast and description of teleological and deontological thought rely mostly on Mill and Kant since their theories are those most widely accepted in the present times.

Why Be Ethical?

Importance to Society

In answering the question, In general, why should people be ethical?, four basic reasons are proposed: (1) to keep society from falling apart--alleviate chaos, fear, insecurity which prevents peace and flourishing; (2) alleviate human suffering--eliminate conflict by using rules of justice; (3) promote human flourishing--enable people to pursue their goals in peace and freedom, friendship and fidelity, excellence and worthwhile life; and (4) to resolve conflicts of interest in just ways (Pojman 1990). These four purposes are interrelated. Society needs the basic moral code and/or value system to bring about a "general adherence" and protection of basic values. Unless there is a general adherence to moral values arrived at by some sort of consensus, society will break down (Peck 1990; Pojman 1990).

Teleological

Consequentialist
 Utilitarian
 Hedonist
 Base: Aristotle (384-322 B.C.)
 most teleological thought
 Epicurus (342-270 B.C.)
 hedonist thought
 Plato (428-348 B.C.)
 monist/hedonist
 St. Augustine (354-430)
 Neoplatonism (Plato)
 St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274)
 Scholasticism (Aristotle)

Modern types and proponents

1. Act
 - Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832)
 influenced by David Hume)
 - Kai Neilson
2. Rule
 - Richard Brandt
3. Combined act and rule
 - John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)
 (influenced by Jeremy Bentham)
 (most prevalent of type)
4. Egoism--(not in favor)
 - self all that is important

Virtue Ethics

Base: Plato and Aristotle, Stoic,
 Epicurus, early Christian
 Modern type and proponents
 1. only one type
 Elizabeth Anscombe
 Alstair McIntyre
 Richard Taylor

Deontological

Nonconsequentialist

Base: Socrates (469-399 B.C.)
 existentialists

Modern types and proponents

1. Act
 - Act intuitionist
 John Butler
 G. E. Moore
 - Act decisionists/existentialist
 Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980)
 Albert Camus
2. Rule
 - Objective rule intuitionist
 W. D. Ross
 - Absolute rule rationalist
 Immanuel Kant (1724-1804)
 (most prevalent of type)

Combined

Modern type and proponent
 1. only one type
 William Frankena

Figure 2. The major ethical movements

Teleological (mostly Mill)

1. ultimate good:
happiness/pleasure with some adding satisfaction
2. society more important than individual
3. assessment of the act based on utility, consequence, and intent of the act
4. law may be disobeyed in given circumstance
5. end justifies the means
6. Principle of Maximization: greatest good for the greatest number
7. Principle of Autonomy: free choice - necessary for happiness (not heteronomy)
8. extrinsic good
9. consequence important in decision

Virtue (aretaic ethics)

1. emphasis on the inner self
- character, personality, and disposition
2. goal: seek excellence in people - spontaneous goodness and inspiration of others
3. emphasizes moral virtues (honesty, benevolence, fairness, kindness, conscientiousness, gratitude) and nonmoral virtues (courage, optimism, rationality, patience, self-control, cleanliness, endurance, industry, musical talent, wit)

Deontological (mostly Kant)

1. ultimate good: respect
2. individual more important than society
3. assessment of the act based on quality of the act along with duty
4. laws and rules always obeyed
- universal laws, consistent
5. ends does not justify the means
6. Principle of Equal Respect: treat persons as having intrinsic worth

Principle of Equal Treatment: persons who are the same in circumstance should be treated the same
7. Principle of Autonomy: free choice - necessary for self-respect
8. intrinsic
9. consequence to apply principle
- not to justify or apply principle
10. justice important to respect

Existentialism(Act Deontological)

1. morality is personal
2. moral existence is a life of decision, action, and moral debate on moral questions
3. not choosing was an act
4. duty of love and forgiveness

Combined (Frankena)

1. Principle of Beneficence: people are to strive to do good, and not inflict harm

Figure 3. The major ethical concepts in ethical thought

A related, yet different question is, Why would individuals want to be ethical? Aspects of this question include important subquestions such as "Why would anyone accept the moral point of view at

all?"; "Why would anyone want to adhere to moral codes/values, even if it would be more pragmatic and profitable not to do so?"; "Why should a person not appear to be moral and thus profit by the resultant docility of the public?" (Pojman 1990, p. 167; Taylor 1978, p. 483).

A very practical subquestion arising from these questions addresses the occasional departure from moral behaviors when gain is possible. Pojman (1990) believed that to behave in an unethical manner on selected occasions would be very difficult if not impossible. If persons were acting against their principles, that would be alienating; and if they succeeded in this endeavor, the result would be guilt and lowering of self-esteem (Branden 1981; Pojman 1990). Pojman (1990) noted that life may not be worth living should a commitment to morality not be present.

There are also pragmatic reasons for being ethical. For instance, it (1) frees people from prejudice and dogmatism, (2) sets forth "comprehensive systems from which to orient individual judgments" (Pojman 1990, p. x), (3) helps people categorize and organize issues so that they may be seen more clearly, and (4) helps people see how values and principles interrelate, and gives guidelines by which to live (Pojman 1990).

Peck (1990) and Purpel (1989) observed that the dangers and challenges presented in today's society indicated a need for change. In the past, moral/ethical decisions were an individual matter as people sought to make their lives "good." In the present time, it is necessary for a more collective search for what is "good" as people seek to make the life of their organizations and society "good" (Purpel 1989).

Importance to Schools

This brings us to the question, Why should school administrators and their policies be ethical? Since society is in a

cultural, political, and moral crisis, and, therefore, an educational crisis, school practices, in present times, are of grave importance (Purpel 1989). Sergiovanni (1992) indicated that a virtuous school is an effective school. Recognizing schools as organizations, discussion of school ethics must include theory and knowledge concerning ethics, organization, change, communication, conflict management, professionalism (especially the profession of education), and leadership. Some factors determining why schools and their personnel should be ethical included moral agency, professionalism, the place of schools in society, and what happens in organizations and schools as related to ethical decisions.

Teachers and administrators are moral agents. With moral agency comes responsibility and accountability for the educator (Fenstermacher 1990; Goodlad 1990). As moral agents, teachers serve to impart moral values in several ways: (1) teach morality in a direct and didactic manner, though this runs the risk of indoctrination, (2) teach about morality, and (3) model morality. Of these, the latter was deemed to be the most effective. This did not mean the teaching of ethics in a more formal manner is not helpful, only not quite as effective. In the schools, both teachers and administrators must model exemplary ethical behavior--there can be no double standard (Egan 1990; Fenstermacher 1990; Raspberry 1991).

Group process for decision-making exists within organizations. Individual persons within organizations may decide to do things that they would not do if given a personal choice. Individuals may have supported decisions that they did personally believe were the best action, based on the desires of the majority. These desires are based upon what was deemed best for the attainment of organizational goals or the fulfillment of the espoused mission of the corporation/organization. Brown (1990) proposed that there must be moral reflection, which

involved people. Without this reflection, integrity could be lost and the decision-making would be a "vehicle for a number of purposes" (Hodgkinson 1991, p. 23) which would not necessarily be in the best ethical interests of the organization and its clients.

Education seems to be pre-requisite, co-requisite, and post-requisite to all of the other affairs, interests, and occupations of culture. No other subset of human activity and organization possesses quite the same degree of commitment to the totality of purposes of mankind (Hodgkinson 1991, p. 23).

Schools are different than other organizations in that the rank and file members of the organizations are also clientele. The we-they relationships of business are not present in education. In business, the client is the customer. There is an immediate return in a finished product or service. In schools, the client is the student. The product is not immediately returned in a complete form, nor can success be immediately recognized. The moral aspects of the ethical decision-making process are thus more difficult (Hodgkinson 1991).

A second difference between schools and other organizations was that the product (education, development of student learning ability and skill) is not easily assessed since it took place in the mind of the client (student). This difference is observable only in future behaviors and experiences of the client (Hodgkinson 1991).

In the preceding discussion, ways in which schools differ from other organizations were described. In some ways, schools are similar to other organizations. This is especially true at the upper administrative level (superintendent in schools, president in business, and other). Decision-making processes, problem-solving skills, conflict management, and conflict resolution are similar in all organizations with only the factors differing (Hodgkinson 1991).

The purpose of schools changed over time to include liberal education, pragmatism and practicality, religious indoctrination and moral conditioning, salvation, political promotion (democracy, Naziism,

Fascism, Socialism), economic concern, integration of immigrants into society, patriotism, sociological sorting (selecting who would be allowed into the professions), and promotion of various social concerns. Since World War II, there has been emphasis brought on by a global economy and ecology, technical advances, communication, and adult education programs (Hodgkinson 1991). Throughout the centuries, a "strong current of idealism was present among professional educators" (Hodgkinson 1991, p. 22).

There are identifiable basic purposes for organizations, among them being humane, spiritual, secure, and economic. Most organizations serve at least one or two of these purposes. Examples would be hospitals (humane), ministry (spiritual), and law enforcement (security). Only schools serve all of these aspects of human life. Within these basic purposes, there were three "constellations of purposes": (1) aesthetic education--what is learned for self-fulfillment, (2) economic education--what is learned to earn money, and (3) ideological education--what is learned to transmit culture (Hodgkinson 1991). Most organizations exist for a purpose. Many organizations espouse one of the preceding purposes. Education is the only organization that encompassed all three of these purposes (Hodgkinson 1991).

In addition to professional behavior, educators have long striven for professional recognition. The major elements and first considerations when determining professionalism are licensing, long formal training (Cullen 1978), high income, altruistic service (Soder 1990), and a code of ethics (Cullen 1978; Rich 1984; Soder 1990).

In order to meet the criteria necessary to be considered a profession, there must be a consensus as to what is ethical in the profession. Most people outwardly, verbally, espouse perceived universal values (do not cheat others, do not deceive others, do not

exploit others, do not harm others, do not steal from others, respect the rights of others--including freedom and well-being, help those in need of help, seek common good, and strive for a world that is more humane). Unfortunately, verbal agreement on general moral principles will not assure moral behavior or change the world for the better (Cavazos 1990; Lewis 1990; Paul 1988). "Moral principles mean something only when manifested in behavior" (Paul 1988, p. 11).

Many people, including educators, believe that people in education were more honest and ethical than most. However, most professions have 10 percent to 20 percent of their membership in noncompliance with ethical guidelines and that the field of education was no exception (Rich 1984).

Increasingly, the public has viewed professionals with distrust. In order that trust in education and educators be developed and the trend toward distrust be reversed, there must be a fully developed ethical code that is both universal and enforced (Rich 1984). Known unethical behaviors or perception of unethical behaviors by professional people leads to distrust (Henry 1984).

Cannon (1981) expressed the thought that "a free political system can only function effectively if there existed widespread ethical commitment and responsibility, a willingness to sacrifice for long-term gain, and a respect for the law among the citizenry" (p. 76). That thought was then extended to include the notion that today's students will be tomorrow's decision-makers. Therefore, the importance of schooling in strengthening the value systems and decision-making skills of students was deemed to be extremely important to the future of society.

So what is the perceived place of educators in society? For the most part, educators are seen as nonprofessionals or semiprofessionals valued at the level of labor (Cullen 1978; Purpel

1989). In addition to the historical perceptions of education is the current lack of trust (Purpel 1989).

Historically there has been no widely agreed overt recognition of the importance of education to society; however, the recognition may have been subconscious. Present-day practices reflect some of this recognition through issues such as school segregation, tracking, grading, and selective admissions. These issues are usually called educational but are often cultural. People sometimes claim an issue is educational when it is cultural and the claim is used to disguise the cultural value. When this is intentional, it is hypocritical. Such practices have some negative effects, but the major concern is for the goals that these practices consciously or unconsciously fulfill (Purpel 1989).

Ethical Assessment

So, how does a person decide what is the more ethical? How does a person assess a decision to determine if it is ethical? Listed were "four domains of ethical assessment" (Gustafson 1970, p. 13): (1) actions, (2) consequences, (3) character, and (4) motive or intent. Moral life was reported to encompass action and reaction. The persons involved were either initiators or responders. Moral action occurs whenever two or more people interact (ASCD Panel on Moral Education 1988; Blumberg 1989; Gustafson 1978; Lewis 1990; Purpel and Ryan 1976; Sergiovanni 1992; Sizer and Sizer 1978; Watkins 1976).

Actions are viewed by ethicists as right, wrong, or permissible. Permissible actions referred to those things that were neither right nor wrong or highly altruistic acts that go above the call of duty (Pojman 1990). Moral values and obligations (perceived obligations to self, others, and God) are the main ingredients which determine decisions. Decisions, in turn, lead to the actions needed to

maintain existing values of either the individual or the community/society in which the individual resides (Gustafson 1978). Action and inaction are both decisions. Inaction, being defined as doing nothing about the question at hand, is an action based on a decision to do nothing (Greenfield 1990; Hodgkinson 1991).

Consequences, the second domain, may be seen as good, bad, or indifferent (Pojman 1990; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). Both good and bad consequences are considered to be of importance in decision-making--that is, decisions that would have a positive consequence, that would have a negative consequence, and that would make no difference one way or another (Freitas 1991). A good consequence would be one leading to pleasure or fulfillment of ethical beliefs (Banner 1968; Pojman 1990; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988).

Character, the third domain, may be seen as virtuous or vicious. "A man's character is the sum of the principles and values that guide his actions in the face of moral choice" (Branden 1981, p. 113). Every person judges himself or herself by some sort of standards. The sense of personal self-worth, self-respect, and self-esteem was influenced based upon the degree of success or failure in meeting those standards (Branden 1981). The character of the leader is of utmost importance. It is often assumed that all educational leaders are of good character, but there is no real substantiation for that assumption (Hodgkinson 1991).

Branden (1981) noted that self-esteem did not determine thinking. However, having a positive self-esteem did have impact on the emotions which encourage or discourage thinking, helped develop a view of reality, and guided the power to produce an effect. Guilt tends to block self-assertiveness. The most crucial step in developing self-acceptance is to assume responsibility for one's self. It must be

recognized that people only do what they give themselves permission to do.

What makes a purposeful or voluntary act good or evil is, at least in part, dependent upon the intention of the doer. If the coping strategy is not intended to further self-interest at the expense of another, is not sneaky or underhanded, and is intended to balance power in order to further mutual interests, then this action is ethical. To not meet these criteria would be considered unethical (Bramson 1981). Motive or intent, the fourth domain, was viewed as good will or evil will. Therefore, the same act might be judged differently due to differences in intent (Pojman 1990). Motives were the source of values (Hodgkinson 1991; Kant 1956; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). Motive is in all ethical systems but was given greater emphasis in Kantian theory.

Blanchard and Peale (1988), when discussing ethical assessment, noted that there are five principles for organizations: purpose, pride, patience, persistence, and perspective. The purpose can be the mission of the organization or it can be the mission of the individual. In any case, it is conceptually a larger framework than a goal. Pride is the satisfaction a person feels if he or she meets his or her personal purpose, has faith in himself or herself, and has strength to do what he or she believes to be right. It is important to balance pride with humility. "People with humility don't think less of themselves, they just think about themselves less" (Blanchard and Peale 1988, p. 49).

Patience refers to the faith and self-confidence that one can handle a problem with attention to universal time (meaning the big picture). Persistence means to follow up principles with actions and remain committed to that end--doing rather than trying. Perspective refers to understanding and prioritizing in such a manner that one can see what is really important. Perspective is likened to the hub of the

wheel with the other four Ps revolving around it. People have an exterior self that is goal oriented and an inner self that reflects on matters. The latter is often neglected and needs to be given more time and attention (Blanchard and Peale 1988).

Blanchard and Peale (1988) further indicated that the characteristics for making ethical decisions are integrity and a sense of fair play. A three-question test was suggested for determining the ethics of an action: (1) Is it legal?--civil and criminal law; (2) Is it balanced?--fairness to all, win-win solutions, recognized that an individual cannot win equally in all situations, but that there be no great imbalance; (3) How does it make the individual feel about himself or herself?--coincides with his or her innate feelings about what is right. When it does not feel right it erodes your self-esteem. If there is a congruence between decision and feelings of what is right, then the individual would be proud to have it published publicly for his or her family to see (Blanchard and Peale 1988).

People are sometimes tempted to make unethical decisions to "gain the competitive edge" (Berney 1987, p. 19; Blanchard and Peale 1988, p. 4). Many, in the name of competition, follow the adage "Do unto others what they would do unto you if the roles were reversed" (Blanchard and Peale 1988, p. 28). Deciding what is right isn't nearly so difficult as doing what is right (Berney 1987; Blanchard and Peale 1988).

"Nice guys may appear to finish last, but usually they're running in a different race" (Blanchard and Peale 1988, p. 60). Business research has shown that (1) though a business initially may gain a big account and/or make great financial gain by engaging in unethical practices, business is often lost over the long term; and (2) businesses that initially lose big accounts and/or make a smaller financial gain due to adhering to ethical practices (and refusing to

participate in unethical ones) often gain much more business over the long term. Customers who desire ethical treatment gravitate to firms that operate ethically. Overall, ethical businesses serve more customers and have greater financial success than unethical firms, even though they may lose some seemingly lucrative accounts (Berney 1987; Blanchard and Peale 1988).

Honesty is considered by many to be one of the prime moral values whether it be in transmission between individuals or organizations. For the supervisor, knowing how to manage dishonesty is difficult. When the dishonest person is a subordinate, the supervisor must observe and document behaviors and facts. This would be followed by discussion with that person and consideration of consequences. If the person is a peer, a fellow supervisor, the problem is more difficult because the relationships are different and there is less opportunity for documentation. A person can only be very cautious when working around a peer suspected of dishonesty. A person needs to be quite sure before notifying the boss (Terry and Rue 1982). Blanchard and Peale (1988) enlarged honesty to include integrity, truth, and sincerity.

There needs to be leadership to promote and/or create a positive, productive, and ethical environment (Blanchard and Peale 1988). People in the organization need to feel appreciated. They need to feel good about what they do both for themselves and their company. To that end, leaders must learn to "catch people doing things right" (Blanchard and Peale 1988, p. 99) instead of always looking for what is wrong; they need to develop a positive climate. Some of the activities to help achieve this are recognition of what is done well, knowing employees by name and something about them, performance planning that includes coaching along with evaluation (again with emphasis and recognition on what is done well), helping everyone win, fitting job assignment to capability, and attention not only to product (profit) but

also to process (how things were done and how people were treated) (Blanchard and Peale 1988).

The most appropriate and effective manner of assessing whether the decision was ethical was to apply the "mirror test" (Blanchard and Peale 1988, p. 45)--that is, can the individual look the person in the mirror in the eye? To be able to do so would only be possible if the individual was meeting his or her own standard of behavior and so be able to act without guilt.

The Meaning of Ethics and Ethical Decision-making

Facts, Values, and Moral Principles

Ethics is not "carved in stone"--the standards may vary with time, place, and occupation. Though the ethical principles may be the same, the emphasis and importance of a given principle may vary. Thus, practices that may be acceptable in one vocation may not be acceptable in another. Ethical rules must have as components (1) purpose, (2) operating principles, and (3) examples of these principles in action (Berney 1987).

In any endeavor involving more than one person, there are likely to be moral dimensions or issues that involve some aspect of moral/ethical consideration. This is true in the life of every person. However, the greatest concern about morals and ethics is most evident in those situations where there is greatest public impact.

Part of the difficulty in discussing ethics is that many people confuse the terms values, morals, and ethics. Many think of these terms as being synonymous. There are slight differences in meanings, as viewed by authors such as Brown (1990), Collins (Zeleny 1989), Pojman (1990), and Strike, Haller, and Soltis (1988). Though the terms are different, the concepts they represent are interdependent. In order to

discuss ethics, an individual must also take into consideration and have some understanding of values and morals.

The terms "moral" and "ethical" are especially confusing in their meanings--and indeed the dividing line is very fine. An addition to the confusion is that many writers use them interchangeably. Morals are actions and principles of conduct while ethics are the standards by which behaviors are determined to be right or wrong. Morals result in actions, in having moral people who behave morally. Ethics engages people in the decision-making process that helps determine what should be done. Ethics assists people in their search for truth and wisdom (Berney 1987; Brown 1990; Pojman 1990; Rich 1984; Terry and Rue 1982; Tsanoff 1955; Zeleny 1989).

Brown (1990) subdivides ethics into positive ethics and negative ethics. Negative ethics tells us what not to do, such as "do not steal." Positive ethics tells us what to do, such as "respect others." All human beings capable of making decisions in a reasonable and rational manner are moral agents (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). With moral agency and ethics comes an implied responsibility.

Three types of information enter into ethical decision-making: facts, preferences, and moral principles. Facts are information that is absolute and provable. Facts are a description of the world as it "is" and are, therefore, not debatable (open to debate) (Hodgkinson 1991; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988).

Values are those life components that we hold in high favor. Values are derived from the culture and from the beliefs of people in that culture. Beliefs are those things a person considers to be true. Beliefs are usually derived from observation and may or may not be true or rational (Weaver 1981).

There are two types of values: personal values (Strike, Haller, and Soltis, 1988, called them preferences) and moral values.

Personal values, such as favored foods and any activity that affects only the person making the decision, are a private matter and therefore not debatable (open to debate).

Rationality is important in any bureaucracy since the claim to superiority lies with reason in decision-making (Hodgkinson 1991). There was tendency to favor quantity. Organizations are valued according to how big they were. There is a depersonalization that took place that Hodgkinson viewed as being dangerous or sinister. There is a tendency to either be "ethically neutral" (engaged only in rational quantitative analysis) or "ethically equitable" (each person treated exactly the same/equally). There is also more room for the administrator to pursue his or her own ends with the rationality of the bureaucratic structure to provide an acceptable facade (Hodgkinson 1991).

Most values are a mixture of the rational and irrational, often bringing on both satisfaction and frustration due to inner conflict. People often unconsciously or consciously carry contradictions in beliefs and values (Branden 1981, p. 98). Some of the more basic moral values are justice, honesty, freedom of choice, equal respect, truth, loyalty, fairness, integrity (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988), impartiality, and consideration of interest (Peters 1978).

Moral values are those with moral implications. They contribute to the development of moral principles. Moral values and principles are involved any time two or more people interact, in that every interaction involves some level of decision-making beginning with whether to treat that person with respect and caring and to what degree. The decision that is recognized by the decision-maker, the receiver of the action, or both affects both the person making the decision and the person or persons with whom that person is interacting. Moral principles, because of their impact on others, are a public matter and,

therefore, debatable. Public does not mean that the decision is a matter of public information. Rather, public means that the decision is subject to public standards and therefore open to debate among the decision-makers should the situation warrant discussion. Moral principles describe behaviors as they "ought" to be (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988; Strike and Soltis 1985).

In discussion, each type of value system seemed to stand apart. In reality, the different systems tend to interact, resulting in "multidimensional" human beings with many faceted value systems. Everyone is influenced in varying degrees by each of the six basic ways of knowing. Lewis believed all should be used equally. Some people interlaced these six ways of knowing artfully, and others do not (Lewis 1990).

The discussion of values is further complicated by the fact that not all spoken values are the actual values. The real value and real motivation may remain unspoken--what was often called hidden values and hidden motivation or hidden agenda (Lewis 1990). Another complication is that the alliances based on values sometimes are what could be called makeshift alliances even when the actual values are revealed.

The morally mature person, according to the ASCD Panel on Moral Education (1988), is governed by the following characteristics:

- (1) respects human dignity, (2) cares about the welfare of others,
- (3) integrates individual interests and social responsibilities,
- (4) demonstrates integrity, (5) reflects on moral choices, and (6) seeks peaceful resolution of conflict.

In general, the morally mature person understands moral principles and accepts responsibility for applying them (ASCD Panel on Moral Education 1988).

DeBruyn (1989) indicated that though knowing right from wrong is important, what is more important is to act in congruence with what

the individual knows to be right. Honor and integrity could only be attained in this manner. People, as individuals or collectively, are only as good as their ethics. DeBruyn (1989) recommended six actions that one must take to "hold a steady course": (1) discover right and wrong rather than let them find us; (2) act out of our consciences rather than self-designated desires; (3) face issues squarely; (4) refuse to deflect responsibilities, including offering deceptive or controversial statements in order to explain our positions; (5) refuse to excuse themselves because of the misdeed of others; and (6) resolve to follow the spirit as well as the letter of the rules, principles, and laws that govern our profession and society in which the individual holds membership.

Some of the more commonly held moral principles include the following:

1. The Principle of Benefit of Maximization
2. The Principle of Equal Respect
3. The Principle of Equal Treatment
4. The Principle of Noninterference
5. The Principle of Autonomy
6. The Principle of Ends

The Principle of Benefit of Maximization holds that "the best action is the one with the best overall results" which will yield the "greatest happiness for the greatest number" (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, p. 16). This principle receives the greatest emphasis by followers of John Stuart Mill.

The Principle of Equal Respect "requires that we act in ways that respect the equal worth of moral agents. It requires that we regard human beings as having intrinsic worth and treat them accordingly" (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, p. 17). The Principle of Equal Respect encompasses three subprinciples: (1) all people must be

treated as an ends rather than the means, (2) all people are free and rational moral agents, and (3) all moral agents are of real value even though they may be different (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988; Tsanoff 1955). This principle receives the greatest emphasis by followers of Immanuel Kant.

The Principle of Equal Treatment holds that "in any given circumstances, people who are the same in those respects relevant to how they are treated in those circumstances should receive the same treatment" (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, p. 54). Quota-counts in hiring as a means of assuring justice and fairness to minorities is an attempt to assure the application of ethical standards based on this principle.

The Principle of Noninterference alludes to the right for people to choose and determine their own ends without interference (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). This does not mean people are free to do as they wish, but rather that they rationally and reasonably decide and at the same time distinguish between what is public and what is private.

The Principle of Autonomy holds that "every rational being is able to regard himself or herself as a maker of universal law" (Pojman 1990, p. 105). Both John Stuart Mill and Immanuel Kant subscribed to this principle, though for different reasons.

The Principle of Ends requires that people "so act as to treat humanity, whether your own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end and never merely as a means only" (Pojman 1990, p. 103). A well-known example of this principle is the "Golden Rule" (Matthew 7:12). The proponent of the Principle of Ends was Immanuel Kant.

Not all of these principles are accepted by all people; nor do those that are accepted by a given body of people receive equal

emphasis. This list of moral principles is intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive.

Facts, values, and moral principles all contribute to the development of a sense of what is ethical (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988; Strike and Soltis 1985). Changes in values, moral principles, and ethical standards occur within a culture with varying ease. Values are the more easily and more often changed of the three. Ethical standards are the least easily and least often changed of the three. Some ethical standards never change. An example of an ethical standard that has withstood change for thousands of years and does not seem likely to change in the near future is the revulsion for intentional, premeditated murder.

Ethical standards may vary with events in historical time, place, and culture. Cultures, for the purpose of this study, are groups of people in settings with like values and goals. Those settings may be ethnic, racial, vocational, geographical, gender-based, religious affiliation related, or associated with political affiliations. Individuals may be influenced by a number of different cultures in which they have membership through official membership, associations, or affiliations. Ethical standards for every culture are derived through a consensus of values, especially moral values and accepted behaviors, within that culture (Egan 1990; Greenfield 1985; Lewis 1990; Pojman 1990; Rich 1984; Tsanoff 1955). The most common, though not the only, influence on culture is economics. Schools may be thought of as cultures. Students, teachers, principals, superintendents, and school board members represent subcultures within the school culture.

Ethicists are interested in the moral values and moral principles of decisions. They want to know whether these principles and decisions involve questions, issues, or dilemmas, which are public and therefore debatable, and whether or not they are acted upon voluntarily

by moral agents (capable of making reasonable and rational decisions) (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988).

Meaning of Ethics

Ethics is the search for wisdom and truth through rational investigation with the desired result being moral and intellectual integrity (Pojman 1990). Any discussion about values, morals, and ethics is also about wisdom. Everyone needs wisdom, especially those in leadership positions (Hodgkinson 1991).

Responsibility reaches beyond family, friendship, and occupation into community and society (Banner 1968). There are three types of responsibility: legal responsibility, formal responsibility, and moral responsibility. Responsibility is doing something for someone, that someone being yourself or others. Legal responsibility is obeying the laws. Formal responsibility refers to adhering to the accountability aspects of organization. Moral responsibility, involving the individual only, is adherence to individual values. A person can only be rational within the limits set by values (Hodgkinson 1991).

Ethics is related to religion, law, and etiquette. All are of importance, but all have limitations. Religion tends to base the ethical system on revelation and divine authority (vertical dimensions). Most philosophical ethical systems are based on reason (horizontal dimension). The two systems often result in the formulation of different moral principles.

Ethics is often considered to be a part of religion. Religion and ethics are seldom completely separate since religions strongly effect the ethical beliefs of members (Gustafson 1978; Tivnan 1992; Zeleny 1989) and is a "driving force" for most Americans (ASCD Panel on Moral Education 1988). However, religion is not deemed absolutely necessary for moral development to take place (Pojman 1990). Religious

training does not guarantee moral behavior (Gustafson 1978). Ethics may transcend religions (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). Pojman (1990) wrote that we must work out a moral system that will reflect both systems, satisfying both the religious and rational thinking approaches.

Laws generally have been adopted for two reasons: (1) to promote the well-being of members of a society/community and (2) to resolve conflicts between people for the purpose of peace and harmony. Law and morality are differentiated in implementation in that law is enforced through physical means while morality is enforced through conscience and reputation (Pojman 1990). The law defines only the minimal guide to ethical standards (Strike 1990). At present, society has a tendency to make more and more laws. As the number of laws increase, they are often in conflict with each other resulting in selective enforcement based upon the selection of those most desired to be enforced. The responsibility for enforcement is often passed down to levels where making effective decisions is less likely and rewards outweigh the cost. When there are so many rules, it is very difficult to not be in violation of some law--all individuals have to do is dig to find which one (Foster 1981; Henry 1984).

Etiquette is likened to morality in that implementation was largely through conscience, social censure, and reputation. Many aspects of etiquette do not have moral grounds, though errors in etiquette are often treated as though they are a matter of morality (Pojman 1990).

Religion, law, and etiquette often serve as the basis for individual values. Every person is unique. Each person views the world from a different angle. Therefore, the same observation may yield different values for different people (Hodgkinson 1991). For this reason, values in human interaction always are, to some degree, in conflict. Values become the basis for ethical systems.

In most ethical systems, the individual's values are a matter of individual choice. However, Lewis (1990) noted that very few people are able to make those choices without exterior influences such as family, friends, and the media. However, everyone should examine his or her values, think about them, and decide for himself or herself.

Misunderstandings concerning that which is ethical occurred for a number of reasons: (1) the difficulty for many people of differentiating between moral values/moral principles and personal value/preferences, (2) the differences in definition of morals, (3) the "is"- "ought" fallacy, and (4) the lack of differentiation between public and private behaviors.

A person cannot reach "ought conclusions" or ethical judgments from "is premises" or facts. This fallacy has been known by different names such as the "is-ought fallacy," "the naturalistic fallacy," or "Hume's Fork" (first developed by David Hume) (Pojman 1990; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988; Strike and Soltis 1985). From this notion comes the belief that a person can reach moral judgment only by beginning with ethical assumptions. Since not all may agree with the initial assumption, an individual would have a difficult time persuading some people of the rightness of the conclusion (Strike and Soltis 1985). Whenever people operate under different and opposing values or ethical standards, issues and/or dilemmas develop. The essential moral virtues, according to Paul (1988), were (1) moral humility, (2) moral courage, (3) moral empathy, (4) moral integrity, (5) moral perseverance, and (6) moral fair-mindedness.

Some of the more basic concepts considered when individuals are engaged in ethical decision-making are freedom of expression, personal liberty and autonomy, intellectual liberty, equality, due process, and democracy (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). Life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness are rights provided in the Declaration of Independence.

Freedom or liberty encompasses freedom of speech, freedom of expression, intellectual freedom, and freedom of choice. Since people are unique and the United States is pluralistic, happiness and its pursuit would be different for each individual. The choices of some may be and often are an obstacle to others. Therefore, there must be limits to liberty or freedom. Those limitations should not interfere with the happiness of others (no harm, respect for property of others, and other considerations). The moral responsibility to adhere to these limitations is an obligation of every moral agent. Freedom of expression is necessary if an individual is to search for truth since ideas can only be tested through challenge and debate. Rational thinking, necessary for ethical decision-making, could only develop and flourish when there was freedom of expression. Personal growth is dependent on the ability to develop rational thought and make choices. Making rational choices is seen as a responsibility of moral agents (Bull 1990; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988).

There is a paradox between morality and self-interest. It is possible that the decision in a specific instance would not fulfill both moral and self-interest requirements. The paradox is that when persons adhere to the code because they must, it is not the same as adhering to the moral code as a way of life (Gauthier 1967; Pojman 1990). This gives rise in many instances to personal dilemmas and sometimes to choices that are not in adherence to the commonly accepted code. The proposed solution is to sometimes act in a manner that is not self-serving (Pojman 1990).

There is a critical difference between what is just and what is expedient, between doing things right and doing the right thing . . . Some decisions announce themselves as blatantly wrong, but you recognized that in other situations, the answers seem less certain (Boothe et al. 1992, p. 17).

"To behave ethically was to behave with integrity" (Peck 1990, p. x).
To sort things through, administrators are asking more and more for

training in ethics as part of their professional training (Boothe et al. 1992).

"Ethics requires commitment in advance" (Hodgkinson 1991, p. 50). In order for this commitment to occur, there must be a common language, an agreement on definitions. In the case of educational administration, the terms most needing agreement are administration, management, and leadership (Hodgkinson 1991). Administration was considered to be an art involving policy, values, strategy, philosophy, qualitative concerns, reflection, working with human concerns, and deliberation. Management was considered to be a science involving the execution of policies, dealing with facts, specializing, using tactics, taking action, dealing with ranks, attending to quantitative factors, working with materials, using middle management, and attending to detail (Hodgkinson 1991). Management and administration exist each in codependency with the other (Hodgkinson 1991). Administration and management are an integral part of every aspect of the organization (Hodgkinson 1991). The more an individual works toward the ends (education) the more one is administering. Leadership encompasses both management and administration (Hodgkinson 1991).

How does a person know what is truth--what a person should value? Aristotle proposed that there were three ways of knowing: (1) *theoria* (theory)--abstract reflection based upon induction, deduction, and hypothesis; (2) *techne* (technics or craft)--dealing with techniques of doing things and the technology involved; and (3) *praxis* (practice)--the reflection and action of the situation (Hodgkinson 1991). This "trichotomy" suggested that administration was not a science or an art but a combination of science, art, and philosophy (Hodgkinson 1991).

Sergiovanni (1992) noted three modes by which a person comes to know and believe: official values, semiofficial values, and unofficial

values. All three were considered to have a place in management. The official values mode includes secular authority (faith in authority of law or the bureaucratic system such as regulations and codes), science (faith in empirical research), and deductive logic. The semiofficial values mode includes a sense of experience (faith in experiences) and intuition (insight). The unofficial values mode includes sacred authority (faith in authority of community, professional norms, school norms, and ideals) and emotion (faith in one's feelings). The authority is followed with blind reliance, without question, as if the values of that authority are sacred. He believed all modes should be given attention in equal balance. Official modes tended to put the system above the individual, using people to serve institutional ends. The semiofficial, in the past, has often been neglected but now is coming to be more and more recognized. The unofficial mode would suggest that the official modes be used but as tools to inform rather than prescribe.

Lewis (1990) proposed six ways of knowing: (1) authority, (2) deductive logic, (3) sense experience, (4) emotion, (5) intuition, and (6) science. Knowing based upon authority is taking someone else's word as to what was right and what was wrong--the word of someone considered to be an expert. This expert may be a parent, teacher, religious leader, friend, a book (such as the Holy Bible or the Koran), and/or professional experts. With children, the faith in the expert tends to be unconditional. With adults, faith is more conditional and provisional and sometimes somewhat skeptical. In America, citizens tend to view leaders conditionally and without excessive respect, especially when they start telling people what to do (Lewis 1990).

DeBruyn (1989) postulated there are three things individuals must do to be ethical: (1) they must drop a do-your-own-thing attitude toward rules and regulations, (2) they must shed an easy tolerance of

hypocrisy, and (3) they cannot be cynics when it comes to the value of ethics since cynicism encourages unethical behavior.

People owe it to themselves to decide on a code of personal ethics, adopt it, reconsider it from time to time, and strive to uphold it. People do not always win friends by action in accordance with their code and they may antagonize people from time to time. This approach is advocated, not for the development of self-esteem or for the afterlife. Rather, there are effects upon the psyche that cannot be attained in any other manner. Self-esteem does play a part in adherence to codes. When persons do not perceive themselves to be important as the proponents of a given value, they may not feel a need to adhere to that value (Weinberg 1969).

The belief in the "ought of justice" is very important to the overall well-being of a person. The dignity of a person is viewed as a part of justice. If there is no justice, then there was no dignity (Weinberg 1969). Some ethical questions are more easily justified than others. Some people think that happiness and self-esteem came from approval and high appraisals from others. People who placed such an emphasis on approval of others then often do not stand up for what was ethical for fear of losing the approval and thus their own self-esteem. Weinberg (1969) believed that there is no better way to live than having a well-defined personal code that is reconsidered now and then. A well-thought-out personal code frees a person from having his or her self-esteem tied to and dependent on the opinion of others (Weinberg 1969).

Ethical Decision-making

Ethical decisions become necessary anytime there are interactions between two or more people. Ethical considerations deal with ethical questions, issues, or dilemmas involved in decision-making.

Decisions are a prelude to action or behavior. Decision-making processes do not guarantee the best decisions were made, but practice in using the process increases the probability that the best decisions will be made (Brown 1990). Ethical decision-making involves expertise in decision-making that adds moral/ethical awareness to the process. With this awareness, decision-makers may become proficient in deciding what is more appropriate in given and changing situations (Brown 1990).

In searching for solutions to moral and ethical questions, issues and dilemmas emerged. Issues have an element of solution. That is, there is a possibility that a solution may be reached that is acceptable to most people. There are a number of possible solutions that could be agreed upon by the majority. Issues reach solution after debate and application of such conflict resolution actions as persuasion, concession, and reaching consensus. Dilemmas are questions in society where a great many people become committed to each side of the question, making solution difficult. In questions of dilemma the participation in debate, conflict resolution, persuasion, and consensus activities would not be as effective, the vast majority opinion would not be reached, and consensus could not occur. Individuals may also have dilemmas when they can see both sides equally, making personal commitment to either side difficult (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). There is a potential for issue or dilemma development in any decision that involved public behavior (open to debate) such as those based on moral values and principles. There is not a potential for issues and dilemma development in private behaviors such as those based on fact or personal values/preferences (Hodgkinson 1991; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988; Strike and Soltis 1985).

Several criteria help identify a moral dilemma. One criterion is a conflict of moral principles. Some of the more common conflicts develop between rights and fairness (what is most right versus what is

most fair) (Pojman 1990; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). A second criterion is in weighing the public interest against the private interest (Peters 1978; Purpel 1989; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). The third criterion is confusion between moral principles and preferences/personal values (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). A further criterion is the conflict between two positive values (Peters 1978). The fifth criterion is the conflict between obligation and duty (Peters 1978).

Solutions based upon rights are often derived from laws, rules, or policies. Solutions based upon people's rights may or may not be right or fair. Solutions based upon fairness take all people into consideration. Solutions based upon fairness may or may not be entirely right and may or may not adhere to the rights of some.

In order to solve these dilemmas, individuals must apply moral principles to the facts and assumptions involved in the situation, consider the justification of the options, and attempt to make a decision on that basis (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). In this manner an ethical dimension is added to a consideration of consequence for each option when making decisions. Lewis (1990) views this to be one of the greater challenges of humankind at the present time.

When the search for the solution to a dilemma or answer to a question is sought, too often people shut off debate. Those persons most apt to shut off debate are those who hold positions at the extreme ends of the continuum. When debate is terminated, several consequences accrue: (1) reasonable and rational choices cannot be made, (2) freedom of choice is eliminated, (3) personal growth is retarded, and (4) the maintenance of the democratic process is hindered (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988).

Self-interest is observed to be in all of us. Self-interest can be a problem for schools, collective groups (cultures), and

communities. Self-interest that affects schools may be internal or external to the organization. Hodgkinson described what he called "circles of interest." All of these circles of interest intersected. Because of the differences in the circles of interest, value conflicts were bound to occur (Hodgkinson 1991).

Psychologists have begun to recognize that intrapersonal conflicts are a source of many personal problems. When a person is not satisfied, he or she often becomes "antagonistic" toward himself or herself and these feelings of discontent impact others (Branden 1981). Self-punishment (feelings of guilt, self-chastisement) result in a negative impact upon the feelings of ability, worth, and self-esteem.

The ASCD Panel on Moral Education (1988), describing the pluralistic society in the United States, identified many factors which hindered the development of a universal set of moral values. Some of the more common factors include fragmentation of the family, decline of trust in public institutions, increased public concern about ethics in business and industry, influence of mass media, gradually increasing affluence, and ethnic and social diversity (causing more diverse values which cause conflicts).

In the larger societal context of this country, there has not been a clear perception of what was considered to be the accepted moral values important to education. This confusion exists in such areas as equality, equal opportunity for an education, freedom of speech, freedom of expression, and autonomy. Since perceptions of acceptable moral values in the educational culture are unclear, the resultant ethical standards that are best suited to the attainment of educational goals are also unclear (Egan 1990; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988). Ethical standards in the field of education do not appear to be clearly perceived unless they are also illegal. The codes of ethics for administration associations such as the American Association of School

Administrators, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals clearly indicate that the primary ethical standard consists of obeying regulations, policies, and laws (Egan 1990).

Strike (1990) noted that it was easier to decide what is unethical if it is also illegal, since what is illegal is clearly unethical. The law, however, provides only a minimal guide to ethical standards in areas such as taking a bribe or dealing with drugs according to legally outlined procedures. In a pluralistic society, the decisions in areas not covered by the law are more difficult as complexities such as political pressures enter into the decision-making procedure (Freitas 1991; Natale 1990; Strike 1990).

Pojman (1990) noted that some laws were valid in that they reflected the will of the community and yet were immoral. An example of this would have been slavery in the pre-Civil War years. On the other hand, some aspects of morality are not covered by law. An example of this would be the fact that such moral values as loyalty and lesser degrees of lying (that which does not commit libel, serve fraudulent purpose, or deter criminal investigation) are not covered by law. Therefore, it would be very possible to be following the law and yet be unethical. Another limitation pertaining to the use of laws is that one could not possibly make a law or rule for every possible contingency that would call for an ethical decision; nor could one possibly legally enforce every infraction of ethical rule through legal action (Pojman 1990). Also, there is an attitude among many educators that anything that is legal is ethical and, therefore, permissible and proper. This attitude excuses those holding this view from the responsibility of thinking and making decisions concerning complex problems, thus allowing legislatures to do this for them (Natale 1990).

Freitas (1991) outlined a four-step process for making ethical decisions:

1. Obtain and analyze the facts
2. Outline potential responses
3. Assess the ramifications of each response . . . eliminat[e] those responses that are illegal, unethical, or unrealistic
4. Make the decision (pp. 89-90).

The final decision should be publicized. Accompanying the decision should be the rationale used. Decisions are influenced by individual perceptions of the circumstances, experience, insight, and ethical integrity. The process involves thoughtful, intellectual processes rather than emotional reactions (Freitas 1991). Other writers indicate three ingredients necessary for ethical decision-making: (1) intelligent consideration (Tsanoff 1955; Watkins 1976), (2) rational thinking, and (3) reasonableness (Brown 1990; Gustafson 1978; Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988).

Impact of Ethics on Educational Practices

In America, a dominant value is standing up for one's principles. When two positive principles conflict, the question becomes which principle would dominate. Ethicists and the courts do not always agree (Rich 1984; Tivnan 1992) (examples: euthanasia seen as mercy killing or murder, slavery in the pre-Civil War era, and some voting laws in the South). Issues have been aired in the media and precepts enforced in the fields of medicine (Tifft 1991; Tivnan 1992; Weiss 1985), business (Berney 1987; Tifft 1991), law and law enforcement (Tifft 1991), journalism (Kronenwetter 1988; Swain 1979; Tifft 1991), politics (Donahue 1989; Duffy 1991; Tifft 1991), and science (Newton 1987; Tifft 1991). Though specific issues may have been viewed differently, concerns are basically the same.

Currently there is a limited amount of media concentration on ethical issues in the fields of religion and education. The exception

is when a practice is illegal. Recent education coverage cited the inappropriate use of Federal grant monies by Stanford University (Tifft 1991). Occasionally a person hears of an administrator being charged with using school funds for private use, a school official keeping premiums offered by companies for personal use (when premiums have real value), or a teacher having his or her life style questioned regarding whether it is a good model for students.

The public is increasing its attention to ethics in education. Many people had a "naive faith" in the ability of the schools to "liberate the mind and serve the cause of human progress" (Purpel and Ryan 1976, p. 7). Education can be (and has been) used for good and/or bad. An example of a bad use was the acculturation to Naziism which took place in Hitler's Germany (Purpel and Ryan 1976; Shane 1976).

Problems and questions identified by the ASCD Panel on Moral Education (1988) while searching for the solution to concerns in the school setting were (1) deciding the proper method of moral education, (2) deciding how to balance common values with pluralistic beliefs, (3) deciding what should be the relationship between religion and moral education in public schools, (4) identifying the relationship between public and private morality, and (5) determining whether moral emphasis should be taught via indoctrination or reasoning. There are also implementation questions such as (1) what should be the place of moral education in the already full curriculum, (2) how should the moral education curriculum be organized, as a separate subject or infused across the curriculum, (3) how should this curriculum be delivered, in different forms for different ages, (4) who should teach morality, (5) how does one evaluate moral growth, and (6) how do schools gain community support for such a curriculum?

Purpel (1989) notes that two assumptions form the ends of a continuum related to the degree of success in the education of students:

(1) the faith that only a very small number of people can be expected either to be well educated or deal with education in a responsible manner

(2) all people are capable and desirous of living a life of meaning and that all can be educated to be free and responsible (p. 10).

The first of these assumptions indicates that most people would use their knowledge for personal advantage without concern for society. People who would use their knowledge thus would tend to favor selective education for the favored few and only a minimum general education. The latter assumption seems to indicate that all persons should be educated to their "full human potential" (Purpel 1989, p. 10).

It has been recognized, since 1920, that the school is a part of the community and society in which it operates; therefore, communication between school officials and the public is necessary to the operation of schools (Kindred, Bagin, and Gallagher 1984). Not all educators agree on the degree and extent of communication that is essential. However, Kindred, Bagin, and Gallagher (1984) indicated that not just communication, but two-way communication, is imperative. The rationale for this position is based on ownership, effective achievement and related accountability, and the importance of obtaining public support.

Parents and patrons of the community feel ownership based upon the public monies (taxes) paid to support schools. This financial support implies a responsibility of the public to monitor the school's effective use of resources. This type of ownership is called external ownership. Students and teachers feel more satisfaction if they are involved in decision-making. This involvement helps teachers and students feel so-called "internal ownership" (Hodgkinson 1991; Kindred, Bagin, and Gallagher 1984).

Parents expect effectiveness, competence, and sincere dedication to quality education. School personnel are held accountable. Parents accept programs they understand and care about. Parents are

much more likely to understand and accept programs, especially new programs, if there is a trust in those programs and the persons who carry out those programs. When parents understand the programs and their expectations are being met, then confidence in the school is strong. Trust is increased through open and honest communication concerning programs and activities. This communication should include the advantages as well as disadvantages of the program (Kindred, Bagin, and Gallagher 1984; Sockett 1990). Sockett (1990) indicated that trust was not easy to build. Building trust rested upon (1) being able to predict such matters as attitudes, reactions, and competence with a degree of accuracy and (2) having a perceived agreement on the required end product or level of achievement.

Thomas (1990) suggested a fourth reason for communication with and involvement of the public: the educational and moral responsibility of parents. Parents exercise a legal and moral responsibility to protect, provide for, and oversee the well-being of their children. The law mandates that children attend school. Children are entrusted by parents to school personnel, believing that the well-being of their children will be guarded and provided (Thomas 1990).

Parental pressures regarding grading often cause teachers to lower their standards in order to satisfy parents or students who believe the standards are too tough. Factors important in gaining trust are honesty, fidelity (faith and commitment to the organization), friendliness (not necessarily friendship), and integrity (fairness, justice), with the first of these being the most important. Accountability is based upon integrity, but not vice versa (Sockett 1990).

School funding is tax supported, usually conservative in amount and ideas of how to spend it. The goals of the school district and the best methods for reaching these goals are not always agreed upon. This

leaves room for potentially self-serving behaviors on the part of individuals or groups who participate in the decision-making. In large organizations, bureaucracies tend to allow unethical behaviors because the complexity of decision-making defuses or absolves individual responsibility (Hodgkinson 1991).

Concerns about student well-being in schools usually fell into three categories: (1) school personnel must not do bad things to children; (2) school personnel must not act in ways disruptive to the performance of their job or to the school's performance, or must not act to make themselves notorious or otherwise incapacitate themselves in dealing effectively with students, teachers, or administrators; and (3) school personnel must provide desirable role models for their students (Strike 1990). In the past, the doctrine of *in loco parentis* served to fix moral responsibility and accountability. However, in recent years, trust in the schools has declined, replacing *in loco parentis* with procedures such as due process to ensure responsibility and accountability. There has been an increase in "interventive bureaucracies, needs to cap public expenditure, and political attacks on teacher competency" (Sockett 1990, p. 227).

Ethical problems in education exist whenever there is a possibility of using power inappropriately (Kalish and Perry 1992). Recommendations for avoiding ethical problems include (1) developing a code of ethics, (2) implementing ethics training, (3) establishing special offices to provide ethical advice and counsel, and (4) searching through the literature and other sources to determine the manner in which ethical codes could be developed.

Self-policing and Professionalism

An ethics code that is both justified and enforced is the most prominent indicator of a profession. When this is perceived to be in

place, public trust is high. When it is perceived that there are frequent transgressions or that enforcement is lax, then public trust declines. When this happens, the profession loses the right to monitor itself and the status of the profession is greatly reduced (Rich 1984).

There were certain commonalities in perceptions of what was meant by professionalism as indicated by Cullen (1978). Cullen (1978) and Rich (1984) developed the lists of commonly recognized characteristics of a profession: a complex occupation, self-employed, person oriented, altruistic service, organized, competency tested, licensed, high income, high prestige, long formal training, enforced code of ethics, high degree of generalized and systematized knowledge, and practice that is intellectual in character. Professions also were observed to provide a unique social service, control standards of entrance and exclusion, and grant a broad range of autonomy.

The foundation for professionalism is based upon three principles: (1) knowledge as requisite permission to practice and make decisions with respect to the unique needs of the clients; (2) pledged first concern by the practitioner to the welfare of the client; and (3) an assumed collective responsibility by the profession for the definition, transmission, and enforcement of professional standards of practice and ethics. This viewpoint is called "client oriented and knowledge based." In schools, the client is the student (Darling-Hammond 1989, pp. 15-19).

The purpose of ethical codes is often "occupational control." It was noted by Cullen (1978) and Rich (1984) that lawyers are the profession with the best self-enforcement. However, self-enforcement in the field of education was observed to be very weak and charges of malpractice were seldom investigated. Self-regulation appears to be inadequate in education (Cullen 1978; Rich 1984). Another extreme is that professionals dealing with occupational control may come to rely on

written codes to the point where they omit reflective thinking from the process and eliminate conversation or debate (Brown 1990).

An opposing opinion was represented in the statement made by Rich (1984) indicating that when a code of ethics is not upheld by the profession itself, an attempt is often generated to gain control of the profession from the outside in the public interest. When this happens, the occupation loses prestige and autonomy. This, in turn, has an adverse affect on the public perception of the occupation/vocation which ultimately affects the probability of gaining credibility and professional status in regard to public acceptance.

Codes of ethics in the education world were examined by Rich (1984). He reported that the National Education Association had an ethics code and the American Federation of Teachers did not. He reported that the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the American Association of School Administrators, the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, and the American School Boards Association share a common code of ethics. However, Rich (1984) has a perception that there is little degree of adherence to the codes or the presence of a mode of enforcement unless the behavior is also illegal or immoral. There also is not much writing or publicity to provide a conceptualization of what constitutes ethical or unethical behaviors in the field of education (Egan 1990; Rich 1984).

Professional codes of ethics are considered to be helpful and necessary but not sufficient. Acting ethically and being ethical are considered to be synonymous. Individuals can do the right thing but for the wrong reasons, giving an appearance of being ethical. Authenticity or internalized belief is not present when this discrepancy occurs. Where ethical behavior is done for the wrong reasons, the "ethical" behavior may change in situations where one might disobey common ethical

tenets without discovery. When ethical behavior is being followed but there is not total commitment, matters such as communication suffer which in turn cause other matters such as teamwork and acceptance to be undermined. In all of this, administrators have a special responsibility since they were teachers first (Sergiovanni 1992).

Educators can clarify thinking about their ethical responsibility by gathering personal stories or literary stories from everyone involved in the educational process--students, teachers, parents, administrators, school board members--determining what happens in schools that is good and right and what things cannot be condoned in school activities (Egan 1990). When views conflict, professionals are obligated to discuss them. Change takes time and probably never is completely finished. However, discussion and working toward change would bring about an awareness of or sensitivity to the moral responsibilities of school decision-making. For this attempt at raising awareness to be most effective, the approach must be to unite rather than separate everyone involved in the educational process. Egan (1990) called for a mutually shared feeling of right and good, with mutual adherence.

The code, once established, needs to be "administered and cared for" (Sockett 1990, p. 240). The code would serve as a guide and a starting point for monitoring behaviors (Egan 1990; Smith, Travers, and Yard 1990). There must be a process by which grievances would be handled; the code must be made public via open display. In order to attain public access, there must be (1) parental and public input, (2) moral equity, and (3) public accessibility. The content of the code should include (1) formal and informal settings with students, (2) collegial relations within the school, (3) formal and informal relations with parents and other clients, (4) management relations, and (5) matters within their discipline (Sockett 1990).

One of the purposes for having codes is to bring about reform. Insofar as education is concerned, Purpel (1989) indicated that part of the problem with code development involved the fact that societies are increasingly fragmented. The separation of education from culture is virtually impossible. Educational change and reform implies dialogue about cultural change and reform (Purpel 1989).

Reform is recognized as a need when practices do not meet professional/ethical standards. In organizations, including schools, nonethical practices occur. To understand why these occurrences continue, people within these organizations need to examine what happens when someone protests the practice. Most of the code enforcement, most of the whistleblowing, and most of the literature deal with organizations in general.

In education, teachers are supervised more closely than workers in most professions. However, they are more likely to be reported by nonprofessionals such as parents, students, and community members than by peers (Rich 1984).

Conflict and Dilemma in Organizations

Dealing with dishonesty can be difficult for educators and other professionals. If a dishonest person is a peer, the situation is especially difficult. Working relationships and friendships are put in jeopardy. If a dishonest person is the boss, that situation is more difficult. If the incompetent boss just has not had time to learn, the subordinate helps him or her to grow. If a dishonest boss is mean, the best plan is to stay out of his or her way as much as possible--such a boss will usually "self-destruct." The lazy boss may be forced into working harder by going to subordinates and asking for input, taking problems to them, and scheduling regular conferences with them so as to review progress. The laissez faire boss does not care (makes that type

of dishonest boss the most difficult of all) and so usually "self-destructs," if given enough time (Terry and Rue 1982).

The causes of problems or dilemmas for the decision-maker in an organization sometimes arises when the public ethics and/or organizational ethics are in conflict with an individual's personal ethics, especially if that person is in an executive position. Sometimes the solution is compromise. At other times, compromise is not possible. Hirschman (1978) listed the following choices: (1) exit the organization (ends loyalty); (2) loyalty--remain silent for the sake of the organization, adhere to the organizational dictate regardless; or (3) voice--speak out, perhaps to the extent of whistleblowing. Blanchard and Peale (1988) indicated that the individual faces these choices: (1) leave, (2) isolate himself or herself, or (3) try to change the situation.

Changing a situation positively involved many factors. One of these factors is the development of a professional code. Having a code does not assure its enforcement, as this is a difficult proposition. In most professions, the unspoken rule is not to evaluate and/or report your peers for unethical behavior. Most professional associations have unwritten rules about reporting fellow members for unethical behavior. Therefore, even those who would not agree with the behavior would not state this in meetings, leaving the enforcement of the rule to the persons on the next level of authority, thus making the supervisor the person seen as responsible for reporting subordinate misconduct. Subordinates are also perceived as being responsible, even if carrying out an order from the supervisor, but the supervisor is considered to be more responsible. Persons who disobey this edict will, on occasion, report misconduct of their peers or call attention to misconduct from those over whom they have no authority. These persons were called

"whistleblowers" or "ethical resisters" (Cullen 1978; Glazer and Glazer 1989; Rich 1984).

Whistleblowing

Rich (1984) wrote about whistleblowing in education.

Recognizing that schools are organizations, only the degree of impact would differ from that in other organizations. Whistleblowing in education would more probably entail facts that would impact the local community. In business, whistleblowing quite often entails facts that would impact a region of the country. Some whistleblowing, in national companies, may impact the whole nation. Some organizational whistleblowing, such as takes place in companies with overseas plants and national government agencies, may have international impact. Very little official whistleblowing has been recorded in the field of education. This does not mean that there are not unethical behaviors in education. Nor does it mean that the consequences of whistleblowing do not occur in schools. It means that not many protests have gone through official channels (or unofficial channels such as newspapers), not many consequences have been recorded, and/or not much adverse publicity has occurred.

Why are there so few whistleblowers in education, given the importance of the code of ethics? The answer may be in the consequence of such action. Consequences that sometimes occur in other organizations include suspension; censure; ostracism/isolation; boycott; expulsion from membership; charges of malpractice; suspension or revocation of license to practice; spying as an active attempt to "get something on them;" and reprisals such as blacklisting (greatest potential for harm), dismissal (most common), transfers/demotion (used when dismissal is difficult), personal harassment, shifting blame to the ethical resister, undermining the ethical resister's credibility and

effectiveness as a future witness, using the whistleblower as an example so as to intimidate others, and occasionally death (Glazer and Glazer 1989; Rich 1984).

The aftermath for whistleblowers may vary. Some retain their jobs, some rebuild successful careers in other fields, some find other dissatisfying work, some find work that is not commensurate with their training, some are never able to find gainful employment, and some suffer from stress-related health problems (Glazer and Glazer 1989). Many whistleblowers appear to have paid a "high price" for their integrity (Glazer and Glazer 1989).

The consequences imposed against whistleblowers are intended to intimidate and/or silence them and others. Strangely enough, due to their personal characteristics, they tended to react the opposite of what is expected--they become even less intimidated, less silent, more determined, and more convinced of the need to break the silence (Glazer and Glazer 1989).

The ultimate rewards for whistleblowing were a clear conscience, self-pride, and occasional public recognition (Glazer and Glazer 1989). Another reward is that legislation has been passed as a direct or indirect result of their efforts. Purposes of this legislation were (1) to protect the whistleblower/ethical resister and (2) to correct the protested actions/behaviors.

So, what does whistleblowing have to do with the field of education? There have not been many whistleblowers in education (Rich 1984). People cannot depend on the laws and the courts exclusively to settle ethical matters. One way to get a commitment to ethical behaviors is to begin with students in school, educating them about the importance of maintaining high ethical standards (Glazer and Glazer 1989). Kohlberg (1978) noted that "the effective moral educator is something of a revolutionary rather than an instiller of virtues"

(p. 65). He indicated that the persons who espouse power and hate do not get assassinated, for they are no threat--rather, it is those who espouse good, question the standards as they are, are "too good" for others to accept who represent a threat and who get assassinated (examples: Socrates, Jesus, and Martin Luther King). With that thought, he concluded that there is a certain danger in being a social educator.

A thought that permeated the book by Glazer and Glazer (1989) was that some people act unethically, safe in the knowledge that they can do so since others would fear to oppose their behavior to avoid the stress and consequence. Also permeating the book was the thought that this tactic often works. Whistleblowers, though increasing in numbers, are people of rare courage. In some cases they have other alternatives for earning a living or have income other than their jobs. Ideals, alone, are not enough, especially in large organizations. Some teachers and principals realize that immoral things happen in schools. Some of the identified immoralities common in schools are repression and shrinking from positions of authority. However, even those who realize that there is a need for change do not make the needed changes due to fear of the consequence of such action or the lack of patience needed. Educational personnel in this position often drop out physically, mentally, or both. The resulting effect is that they are disappointed in themselves, which infects the climate of the school (Sizer and Sizer 1978).

Ethics and Ethical Issues in Education

Education is not the art of training and subjugating people to serve the profit of others. It is the art of helping people to know themselves, to develop the resources of judgment and skills of learning and the sense of values needed on facing a future of unpredictable change, to understand the rights and responsibilities of adults in a democratic society and to exercise the greatest possible degree of control over their own fate (Hodgkinson 1991, p. 16).

Hodgkinson (1991) advises that administrators should always remember that "education is conservative." There have been movements, at times, toward the liberalization of education, but these movements tended to be temporary. These movements return to practices, somewhat modified, that were in place before the more liberal movement began. Hodgkinson advised educators to be very cautious about espousing or making commitments to "radical enthusiasms" because the probability would be that they would be short-lived.

Issues in Education

What are some of the ethical issues/dilemmas in the field of education? The literature revealed many issues and dilemmas including academic freedom; ethical use of tests and testing; student dishonesty; student freedom to learn; student right to privacy; censorship; segregation/integration; grading practices/policies; teacher burnout; student's rights versus parent rights; budget management versus effective education; student possession of weapons; student-teacher social relationships; copyright laws/plagiarism; curriculum concerns; teaching techniques (coercive, manipulative, or rote); bias; absence of consistent standards; and professionalism versus democratic control (Leo 1988; Lewis 1990; Purpel 1989; Purpel and Ryan 1976; Rich 1984; Strike 1990; Strike and Soltis 1985; Watkins 1976).

Personal relations in any organization are important. The educational organizations are no exception. Some of the areas cited where there may be concern were recruitment, faculty advancement, faculty dissent, dismissal decisions and procedures, tenure, retrenchment, and retirement. The ethical concepts involved are honesty, integrity, probity (adherence to highest principles and ideals), trustworthiness, veracity, discretion, and reliability (Rich 1984).

One ethical issue concerns the role of women in educational administration. Male teachers tend to be paid more; unions and professional associations tend to be dominated by male leadership (local, state, and national levels). The trend for more women in administration has gradually been improving but not to the point of achieving equity (Greenfield 1990; Thomas 1986). Administrators, especially female administrators, must be aware of needed balance between "freedom of opportunity and affirmative action" (Greenfield 1990, p. 90).

Teaching Morals and Ethics in School

One of the more volatile of the ethical issues in education was whether moral education should be taught and, if so, in what manner. Most people, especially parents and teachers, are engaged in the process of teaching children/students, both formally and informally (Goodlad 1990; Lewis 1990). Moral education, traditionally, had come from home, churches, community, and school. There is evidence that due to social changes (such as changes in family organizational patterns--more single-parent families--of various types, more couples not married; less church involvement; more two-income families so that less time to devote to teaching children exists; some parents not espousing the more accepted values; and some parents not capable) these traditional sources of ethical/moral values have unevenly transmitted these values to the youth (Bettleheim 1978; Calabrese 1990; Cannon 1981; Goodlad 1990; Purpel and Ryan 1976; Raspberry 1991). For these reasons, many believed that schools are the logical place to provide moral training for students, both for the sake of the individual students and for the survival of society in the future (Calabrese 1990; Cannon 1981; Goodlad 1990; Purpel and Ryan 1976). Honig (1990) indicated that the

home was the primary source of moral information, but that schools need to be involved.

Children get their impressions of what is moral and begin to develop their ethical standards at a very young age (Gustafson 1978; Paul 1988). Children learn by direct instruction and by observation. Educators, parents, and others with whom the student comes in contact were instructing by modeling, even when not voicing their values (ASCD Panel on Moral Education 1988; Lewis 1990; Purpel and Ryan 1976; Sizer and Sizer 1978; Watkins 1976). Purpel and Ryan (1976) stated, "It goes with the territory" (p. 9) ("It" meaning moral education). Therefore, moral education is inevitable in schools (ASCD Panel on Moral Education 1988; Purpel and Ryan 1976, pp. 45-48). The only subject for debate is how moral education should take place--what teaching approach should be used. Calabrese (1990) and Doggett (1988) agreed on the importance of teaching students ethical values.

A school cannot teach students ethical values and the meaning of participation in a democratic society through the teaching of civic and ethical principles alone. The school community must live these principles and infuse them into the school's culture (Calabrese 1990, p. 12).

The principal must communicate this belief to students, teachers, and parents through practice, indicating the importance of ethics in the school culture (Calabrese 1990).

It is often stated that the purpose of education is the transmission of the culture and preservation of its values (Kohlberg 1978; Purpel 1989). Kohlberg added that the most basic of those values are moral values, with the most important one being justice. Individuals must have just schools if justice was to be taught. This is difficult in a pluralistic and complex society where values come into conflict (Cannon 1981; Purpel 1989).

Moral education should not be considered to be a "thing apart" but rather would be a part of every activity occurring in the school,

both in the classroom and in extracurricular activities. Students need to learn to engage in critical thought (Scheffler 1976).

Over the past several decades, some teaching has attempted to be "value neutral" (Cavazos 1990; Purpel 1989), meaning that no values were consciously taught at all in order to avoid charges of indoctrination of "white middle-class values" of students who did not fit the descriptors. Cavazos questioned this practice, noting that such values as honesty, justice, equality, and courage are common across all peoples. Some schools taught decision-making skills alone, assuming that the students would then make the right decisions, especially when applied to sex education and drug prevention. This practice made the teacher a facilitator rather than a guide for students who, it was assumed, had the ability and moral maturity to make decisions based on high ethical standards and stick to them. Cavazos considers this approach ineffectual, making the teacher and text valueless. The decision to use this approach did not always lie with the teacher. Furthermore, the value neutral approach will result in a generation of students who were value neutral, with no moral/ethical convictions and no knowledge of their "ethical heritage." America's heritage reflects values such as sanctity of the individual, justice, equality, civic virtue, toleration (Cavazos 1990). However, in the perception of Cavazos, these values have been eroded. To support this assertion, Cavazos reports that the United States has the highest rate of incidence in the world in the areas of juvenile crime, teenage pregnancy, and drug abuse.

What are some of the approaches to teaching ethics/values being used in the public schools? Approaches, noted in the literature, included the following:

1. Ignore it completely (done in order that one would avoid indoctrination) (Purpel and Ryan 1976; Watkins 1976).

2. Teach value clarification (leads students to understand themselves and their own personal values, not espousing any set absolute values) (O'Reilly 1991; Purpel and Ryan 1976; Strike 1990; Watkins 1976).
3. Teach the cognitive-developmental approach (a process for determining the best value so students will not treat others emotionally, irrationally, or be a mere follower of others). In the cognitive-developmental approach, absolute values are not taught; instead students are taught how to think so that they may think about values objectively and rationally based on their own values (Kohlberg 1978; Power, Higgens, and Kohlberg 1989; Purpel and Ryan 1976; Strike 1990; Watkins 1976).
4. Teach the cognitive approach (teach students absolute values) (Purpel and Ryan 1976; Watkins 1976).
5. Teach the caring approach (centers on relationships and caring) (Strike 1990).
6. Follow the "Great Books" approach (uses literary classics and similar sources to raise questions upon which students may reflect and determine the values present in the source and possible alternatives with the intent for the value system development in the students) (Calabrese 1990; Gustafson 1978).
7. Teach character development approach (a systematic program for teaching ethics in grades K-8) (Cannon 1981).

It is noted by Watkins (1976) that any method/approach to moral education was arbitrary unless it was based on some sort of philosophical and metaethical basis.

Neither Watkins (1976) nor Purpel and Ryan (1976) recommended a given approach to teaching ethics/morals in the schools. Purpel and

Ryan (1976) suggested that rather than using one method exclusively, perhaps one could use a combination. Each approach was seen to have strengths and weaknesses if used exclusively (Strike 1990).

It was questioned whether moral instruction was effective. "No one becomes good through instruction" (Gustafson 1978, p. 19). It was suggested that morals/ethics can be taught through social studies, drama, literature, and action projects. It is the belief of many that ethics education would lead to less crime, less drug addiction, less alcoholism, less violence in the classroom, less cheating, less inflation caused by theft, more productivity, and more happiness. Not all of the educational experts agreed that the plan to teach moral/ethical values in school was feasible or possible (Purpel and Ryan 1976).

Clearly, there is not universal agreement that schools should be actively teaching moral values and ethics. It has been widely publicized that members of the John Birch Society, many fundamentalist and evangelical Christian groups, and some other conservatives very strongly believe that schools should stay out of the arena of moral education. They believe no values should be taught in school; therefore, ethics should not be taught. The "New Right," represented by leaders such as Pat Robertson, and consisting of ultra conservatives, is opposing moral education in schools and, at the same time, calling for reform in schools (Lewis 1990; Purpel and Ryan 1976).

In order to help educators determine how to progress with the process of moral education, Ryan (1986) developed what he called the "Five Es": (1) example (modeling behaviors), (2) explanation (explain or answer questions about why), (3) exhortation (motivation and insistence), (4) environment (climate conducive to learning), and (5) experience (adding to positive experiences that departs from

self-interest). It was proposed that all of the five Es should be used equally, none being used more or less than the others (Ryan 1986).

The Ethical School

Rich (1984) noted that there were three types of injustice: (1) "invidious discrimination"--civil rights, (2) judgmental injustice--unfair judgments based on undue influence of others, and (3) exploitation--manipulation, which may take the form of a violation of trust, deliberately placing disadvantaged persons in a competitive activity, and sexual harassment. Schools should assure injustice does not occur within the school setting.

Sergiovanni (1992) described what he believed would be a virtuous school (and therefore an effective school): (1) determine that the school would function as a learning community; (2) believe that every student can learn; (3) provide for the whole student, attending to the academic, physical, and social growth; (4) honor respect; and (5) insist that the school, parents, teachers, and community are partners with "reciprocal and interdependent rights to participate and benefit and with obligations to support and assist" (p. 113). The key word is parity, which shows a mutual trust and good will as well as mutual benefits (Sergiovanni 1992).

Application of these descriptions would include policies of nonviolence (no fighting, not even play fighting), rules that are accepted and enforced in the entire school, practices that teach students to use their minds, school climate where there is trust (Hechinger 1990; Sergiovanni 1992), rules seen as a constitution with the rationale shared (Sarason 1990; Sergiovanni 1992), and learning is the greatest importance (Lockwood 1990; Sergiovanni 1992). The sum total effect of this is that the leader would act and be seen as a servant (Greenleaf 1977; Sergiovanni 1992). Respect is a form of

empowerment as it invites people to reach higher levels of responsibility (Sergiovanni 1992). Enablement and empowerment are equally important and interdependent (Sergiovanni 1992). Problems come from disconnectedness in schools as individual memberships and different sources of meaning take hold. Students find meaning in their subculture, teachers in union membership and friends, principals in management ideologies, superintendents dreaming of finding meaning in a larger district, and parents in family and work. There is lacking a "glue" to hold them together (Sergiovanni 1992).

Characteristics of ethical democratic schools are (1) places where justice prevails, (2) places where equity is cherished, (3) places of integrity, (4) places that expect full participation, (5) places where inclusion is practiced, (6) places that distribute resources equitably, and (7) places that allow members recourse to redress grievances. Justice implies equality, respect, humanity, and dignity for all persons. In schools, principals failing to respect teachers leads to teachers failing to respect students and students failing to respect teachers (Calabrese 1990).

Equity implies that everyone has equal access to rewards. In schools, rewards include "promotions, travel, membership in athletic teams, participation in honor societies, encouragement to enter selected courses, equal access to career information" (Calabrese 1990, p. 12). There is also an understanding that "some members need additional nurturing to participate" (p. 12). Principals model and enhance equity by encouraging qualified teachers to apply for administrative positions, discussing equity with staff, enforcing standards that protect equity, searching out those who are commonly omitted from participation, and serving as advocates for those who are treated unequally (Calabrese 1990).

Integrity implies that members think reflectively and make decisions based upon the interests of the community, that ends never justify the means, and honesty in relationships is a paramount virtue. In schools, the leaders make decision after an honest appraisal of the facts, move slowly so as to understand all perspectives and interests, do not cover up unethical behaviors, admit errors, and move to correct the error (thus serving as a model for teachers and students) (Calabrese 1990).

Full participation implies the goal that members participate in governance which prevents abuses. Participation in governance is essential for a democratic society to exist. The consolidation of power by one group or person creates an environment where abuse is likely to occur. Members of minority groups may have their rightful concerns overlooked. Schools are microcosms of society and, as such, socialize students to participate in society. Full participation means that school leaders, including principals, must consult with teachers, parents, students, and other interest groups. It requires a concerted effort to gain consensus and the finding of common ground. Research on participation in decision-making is in agreement with the research on effective schools. Principals should have full participation as a major goal of running the school (Calabrese 1990).

Inclusion implies a step beyond participation in that it relates to feelings of belonging. In a pluralistic society, the diversity of peoples should be valued.

School organizations that fail to value inclusion become fractionalized into special interest groups who continuously vie for power. Once in power, these special interest groups set a standard for membership that requires individuals or groups to accept the values and traditions of the dominant group (Calabrese 1990, p. 15).

America is becoming more and more culturally diverse, so this concept is increasingly important. Inclusion does not mean that everyone must

accept traditional values. Traditional values are considered, but value is recognized in cultural differences and these differences are integrated into the community culture. In ethical and democratic schools, principals "disenfranchise" groups and bring them into the school community. Teachers and school leaders model inclusion--stressing common ground rather than differences. Differences are not treated as weaknesses; the school exists to protect the rights of all [emphasis added] members (Calabrese 1990).

Equitable distribution of supplies implies that in democratic schools, materials, resources, and human resources are distributed equitably--not based on social status, power, or any other such criteria. Principals and teachers must model strong ethical and democratic values, with materials, attention, concern, and advocacy being distributed equitably based upon what is fair and educationally effective within budgetary limitations. None of these should be used as means of controlling behavior--this practice is dehumanizing. When materials and resources are allowed to be used as a means of controlling behavior, manipulation becomes the norm (Calabrese 1990).

Course of redress of grievances implies that the form of the petition must be fair and the judgments impartial. Principals should listen to grievances and seek to find a common ground--searching for truth rather than what is "right." In some schools, it has become necessary for principals always to make decisions based upon the wishes of the teachers in order to gain allegiance from the teachers (Corwin 1967). Such action puts the principal in an unethical position that compromises the search for "truth" in order to maintain allegiance. If a principal is to ensure integrity, a principal must sometimes make "uncomfortable" decisions. Challenging and confronting an alleged wrong takes an inordinate amount of courage and energy. School organizations must allow challenges in order to seek truth, justice, fairness, and

equity to the benefit of students and community (Calabrese 1990; Sergiovanni 1992).

To assure that the school fulfills the ideals of truth, justice, fairness, and equity, a plan or approach must be in place. This plan involves students, parents, school personnel, school board, and community in the preparation. With this in mind, the ASCD Panel on Moral Education (1988) recommends the following practices for schools:

1. We urge all members involved in American education--from school board members to district and building administrators to teachers--to renew their commitment to promoting moral education in schools.

2. We recommend that educators form partnerships with parents.

3. We recommend that schools define and teach a morality of justice, altruism, diligence, and respect for human dignity.

4. We urge schools and school systems to make sure their moral education efforts extend beyond the cognitive domain to include the affective and behavioral . . . go beyond knowing what is good; it must also involve prizing what is good and doing what is good.

5. We recommend that moral education include, especially for younger children, socialization into appropriate patterns of conduct and, especially for older students, education for the critical thinking and decision making that are part of adult moral maturity.

6. We recommend that educators continually examine the institutional features of school life to ensure that climate and instructional practices contribute to the same moral growth.

7. We urge further research on what works in moral education.

8. We recommend that educators regularly assess the moral climate of schools and the conduct of students and communicate the results of these assessments to their communities.

9. We recommend that schools establish and convey clear expectations for teachers and administrators regarding their role as moral educators.

10. We recommend that teacher educators, both preservice and inservice, give major attention to moral education to ensure that teachers have the necessary knowledge, attitudes, and skills to fulfill their moral education responsibilities (pp. 7-8).

Other recommendations appear in the writings about ethics.

Fenstermacher (1990) believed students must be given a degree of autonomy, with latitude and flexibility, to practice behaviors based on new ideas, to consider right and wrong, and to evaluate the consequence of such action. Gustafson (1978) noted that no one becomes good due to instruction. The teachers in the student's life could only bring about an awareness of factors involved in making moral decisions. Gustafson

believed that this could be done in schools via social studies, drama, literature, and action projects. Peters (1978) noted that paramount to effective moral development in students is the internalization of the principles involved. Students who follow principles only because they must (because it is a rule, to avoid punishment, or to get good grades) will not necessarily always be good. In order for internalization (the principle becoming a part of who they are) to take place, there must be rational understanding of the principle.

There was noted a concern for the development of common values. Social diversity would also be present in the teaching staff. The same universal, societal beliefs would be present in the teaching staff as well (Cavazos 1990).

In addition to concern for common values is a concern for academic freedom in the schools. The question of academic freedom, in the field of education, included the right to investigate, the right to publish, and the right to communicate knowledge throughout the academic community without administrative interference. This freedom is seen to apply both in controversial (at issue) and safe (not at issue) topics. Within academic freedom, there is seen to be privileges such as classroom autonomy (academic freedom for the teacher), freedom of inquiry for the scholar, extramural freedom for staff members, tenure protection for the qualified, and academic due process for the accused (Rich 1984).

The purpose of academic freedom is not to protect incompetence and the persons exhibiting it. The educator must be competent insofar as academic knowledge and scholarship are concerned. Furthermore, the teacher may not use the classroom to promote particular interests (indoctrination) such as a particular religious view, a particular political view, or other pet causes (Rich 1984). This freedom thus is not without qualifications. Freedom is limited to that which does no

harm to others (Rich 1984). In schools, the main concern would be that it not be harmful to students.

Students and Their Rights and Responsibilities

The student's most basic right is seen as the freedom to learn. Freedom of choice and freedom of expression, which included freedom of speech, were integral parts of the freedom to learn. Decisions that get involved or intertwined with the freedom to learn were decisions relating to suspension and expulsion, rights to privacy (including the content of their records and inappropriate disclosure), and right to due process. Teachers must uphold these student rights. Student freedoms are limited by that which does no harm to others. Student freedoms, when the student has not reached maturity, are also limited to that which does no harm to themselves; the degree of this limitation varies dependent on the level of maturity or ability to reach viable decisions (Rich 1984).

Student honesty is an important factor in their ability to make ethical decisions. In the question of student dishonesty, students' decisions about whether or not to cheat are based on the urgency of the situation and the likelihood of being caught. Also of importance is the stage of development of the student. Teachers must teach in such a manner as to promote the ethical development of students by such practices as changing tests each semester, spaced seating, and other methods (Rich 1984).

Testing is a special concern when writers discuss students' rights. Purposes for testing were listed by Rich (1984) as (1) selection, classification, and appraisal of educational and instructional objectives; (2) determination and reporting of achievement; and (3) planning, directing, and improving the educational experiences. Factors which are involved in these purposes are questions

of procedures for honesty, procedures for fairness, respect for students, avoidance of labeling, respect for student privacy, procedures that are proper when administering the test, and procedures for judicious use of results (Rich 1984).

Societal Affect upon Schools

Schools are affected by the complex, highly structured society in which they exist. This complexity raises certain ethical dilemmas. Some of the paradoxes and conflicts that existed in the United States and schools, as noted by Purpel (1989), were individual interests versus community interests, worth versus achievement, equality versus competition, caring versus compassion versus sentimentality, responsibility versus guilt, authority versus power versus coercion, control versus democracy, ethnocentrism versus universalism, humility versus arrogance, alienation versus commitment, faith versus reason, and self-deception versus professional responsibility.

Peck (1990) indicated that there is increased voicing of public concern about ethics. He noted that a contributing factor was the change in dangers to society that has occurred over time. In times previous to the past century, the greatest dangers were "microbes, floods, famine, and 'wolves at the door'" (Peck 1990, p. ix). In this past century, greed and hostility, carelessness and arrogance, narcissism, nationalism, dangers of nuclear war, totalitarianism, hunger/starvation, ecological disaster, peace, energy crisis, equality, resource depletion, overpopulation, increased violence and crime, civil rights movements, technolization of life, and/or automatic affluence appear to be the greater dangers (Keniston 1978; Peck 1990; Purpel and Ryan 1976; Ryan 1986; Shane 1976). Recent history has been characterized by affluence. People have become so accustomed to

affluence that they react with outrage when they discover that affluence is not automatic for all (Keniston 1978).

The spotlight from the media has focused mostly on other vocational fields such as law, law enforcement, politics, business, journalism, medicine, and science (Rich 1984). There has been a growing unrest among the nation's citizens. As a result, the citizens have exhibited an increase of interest, concern, consternation, dissatisfaction, and feelings of betrayal--especially since the mid 1970s--as an aftermath of disclosure of activities that in the public perception have been deemed unethical, such as Watergate, Abscam, various instances of malpractice (Rich 1984), and the Sununu misuse of Air Force travel (Goodgame 1991b). More current examples have been dubbed "Rubbergate" (the House Bank scandal) and "Irangate" (Oliver North).

Whether media concern resulted from a greater preponderance of unethical behavior or whether there has been a greater awareness and mounting consternation becomes a moot point. The one aspect of this change in attitude has been an ever increasing call for change in the schools, including a call for a greater emphasis on values, morals, and, therefore, ethics.

There has been a perceived decrease in trust in schools and increased attention about decisions and activities taking place in schools. This concern has been expressed from external sources as well as from within. One of the more publicized incidents which pointed out perceived unethical behavior in the world of education was the alleged misuse of Federal grant funds by officials at Stanford University (Tifft 1991).

There is a perceived need for the teaching of values to the young people in society. In the past, students received this training from home, church, and school. Events such as World War II (Goodlad

1990) and the Vietnam War (Keniston 1978) have precipitated social changes with the result that students have not received the training of the past in the area of values. As a result, values, morals, and ethics, characteristic of an earlier time, seem to have declined. Schools are seen as the means of reversing that trend so that the youth of today and the society of tomorrow will be better equipped to deal with the problems and decisions they face (Bettleheim 1978; Goodlad 1990; Purpel and Ryan 1976; Raspberry 1991).

Due to perceived need for change, there has been a great deal of energy and thought put into educational change. However, the emphasis has been on such issues as merit pay, competence tests, prayer in schools, the teaching of creationism versus the teaching of evolution, public aid to private schools, and other legal or reform concerns rather than focusing on the social, political, and ethical questions that need to be addressed (Purpel 1989). Ryan (1976) called this "trivialization of education." A change of emphasis in school improvement efforts, in Purpel's belief system, is crucial (Purpel 1989).

Expectations by parents of what should occur in schools are a factor in decision-making. Schools are, as part of this role, expected to solve social problems. In the case of political ethics of the future, schools must be teaching more about the structure and soul of government. Many teachers neglect to do so for fear of causing conflict (Edgar 1988).

Professional authority was the crafting or interlacing of knowledge and personal expertise. Teachers could be expected to respond to common socialization, accepted tenets of practice, and internalized expertise. Moral authority was obligations or duties derived from widely shared values, ideas, and ideals. Teachers could be expected to respond to shared commitments and felt interdependence. Professional

authority and moral authority promoted a feeling of followership. Both created responses from within, rather than imposed. Neither was management or leadership intensive (Sergiovanni 1992).

The professional ideal involves a commitment to exemplary practice, keeping himself or herself informed of new developments, researching, and trying out new approaches. Professionalism meant to accept the responsibility for his or her own professional development. The individual must be committed to caring. The key to the professional ideals is the concern for the practice of teaching (as opposed to concern for teaching practice). It involves people helping people, teacher helping teacher, working cooperatively rather than as individual entities. Sergiovanni (1992) noted that when professionalism gets attention, it is usually in the form of a code of ethics. Codes are typically presented in the form of rules for the purpose of controlling behavior. An example would be rules stating that teachers must be in their rooms one half hour before school starts. Students must put trust in the education professionals, so these professionals have little choice but to refrain from behaviors that would violate that trust since students are their primary clientele. Therefore, it is important to develop a code that defines the duties and moral responsibilities of teachers. If this code is not in place on a national level, then one must put one in place, at least, at the local level. Such a code should include relationships with students, parents, and colleagues along with provision of service. There should be provision for self-regulation. Self-regulation should be handled in a way that will help build confidence in the integrity of teaching in the eyes of the public.

Sergiovanni (1992) suggested what he calls "purposing" as a means of leadership that would encourage followership instead of subordinate feelings. Purposing involves a development of common purpose or goals through the establishment of common values, norms,

visions, direction, and framework. The common values, norms, visions, direction, and framework were generated by cooperative policies, forecasts, objectives, and blueprints. For this to happen successfully there must be a climate characterized by trust, knowledge, commitment, and integrity. The leader has a responsibility to establish a climate of trust, a sense of integrity and collegiality (Sergiovanni 1992).

An important factor in the form of leadership proposed by Sergiovanni (1992) was collegiality. Collegiality is important for promoting better working conditions. Sergiovanni noted that true collegiality is rare in schools. There is a dimension of moral virtue in collegiality in that a member has a right to expect help and support from other members and to give members these things as well. Collegiality is not so much proper behavior as it is a professional attitude. What exists in schools is more likely to be congeniality. Congeniality is good, but not as complete as collegiality. Congeniality involves the respect for others, a conception of a good person, a regard for the value of congeniality for its own sake, and a connectedness to the community (Sergiovanni 1992).

Moral Imperatives in School

For congeniality to become the overall school climate, the moral imperatives related to schooling needed examination. Sergiovanni (1992) compared the moral imperative, that which is good, to the managerial imperative, that which works. For action to be of moral worth, it must be motivated by good will. A moral community is one with a component of shared values (Frankena 1973; Sergiovanni 1992).

Sometimes rights such as being treated with respect and not infringing on the rights of others come into conflict with responsibilities such as getting maximum work done with a minimum of time expended and at a minimum of expense and one or both have to be

compromised. Four working principles to be used in regard to these conflicting responsibilities were (1) relationships between people--formal and informal, contracts and agreements, family membership, friendship, employee peers, business, professional obligations--create obligations of various kinds; (2) certain ideals--tolerance, compassion, loyalty, forgiveness, peace, brotherhood, justice, fairness--enhance life and assist people in fulfilling their obligations; (3) consequences of some actions--physical or emotional, momentary or long lasting, and subtle or obvious--benefit people; and (4) circumstances alter cases (Ruggiero 1988; Sergiovanni 1992).

Goodlad (1990) listed what he called the moral dimensions in teaching: enculturation, access to knowledge, and how to teach/what to teach. Enculturation refers to the responsibilities of people as citizens, parents, and workers. The most common deficiency in schools is in the treatment of minority groups. He urges that teachers must "assume the moral burden that goes into developing humane individuals within a context of political democracy, with teacher training institutions sharing that responsibility" (Goodlad 1990, p. 20).

Schools are a part of society and influenced by society. Society consists of free people who are concerned for others (Calabrese 1990; Cavazos 1990). Those who were committed to the democratic ideal follow given beliefs, such as freely given consent (which implies critical inspection of policies in institutions), common task of all (as opposed to only the elite), and the right for everyone to have input and votes. "Choice of the democratic ideal rests upon the hope that this ideal will be sustained and strengthened by critical and responsible inquiry into the truth about social matters"--not just dogma but reasonable trust, unfettered inquiry, and free choice by informed people (Scheffler 1976, p. 21). The ASCD Panel on Moral Education (1988) reported that democracy can only be maintained if the citizens are

morally mature. Therefore, schools must help to develop morally mature people in order to lead to the future citizens who will be just and caring.

The attempts to fulfill the educational goals of students--attaining to the best of their ability and fulfilling of their needs--have led to practices in schools ranging from the authoritarianism to the laissez faire. An alternative to either of these management practices is the formation of a consenting society which promotes at the same time both freedom and responsibility--the freedom for each to choose and pursue that which makes them happy (assumes the right to pursue attainment of the goals and fulfillment of the needs of the individual)--and at the same time be responsible in such a manner as to enable others to do likewise (Bull 1990).

Moral Questions Related to Teaching Practices

What to teach and how to teach it also was considered to be of major importance. Goodlad (1990) pointed out that this concern was usually recognized in elementary teaching, not so much in secondary and higher education. It was noted that there is intrinsic learning (things learned on a voluntary basis) and extrinsic learning (things learned because they are required).

In deciding what to teach and how to teach it, moral questions common to schools needed be considered. Some of the moral questions centered around practices that are common in schools. Some examples noted by Goodlad (1990) were (1) denying a student who was kept out of school by the parent the right to make up work, even though a child who had been ill was given that right; (2) denying a child the privilege of engaging in an interest, such as drawing, unless he or she first had done something he or she did not have an interest in such as math; and (3) raising grades required for attainment of a job desired by a student

when the student had earned a low grade. The latter presents a moral dilemma for many educators. Goodlad noted that motivation for some subjects relied on needing those subjects for college. If the student was not motivated to attend college, the motivation for learning those subjects was not as likely to be strong. This in turn may have been tied to family background and economic status.

Some authors listed changes in social behaviors in the United States that would seem to indicate a decline in values within the society. These authors believe there was potential danger for society should this trend continue. In an effort to alleviate the potential dangers to society due to the perceived decline in values, Cannon (1981) recommended the following:

teach values in our schools; promote law-related education so young people understand both the rights and responsibilities of our Constitution and legal system, increase youth activities by constructive organizations, guide children to quality media productions; increase the number of potential bonds or attachments citizens have with prosocial institutions; strengthen families and communities; and educate and constructively counsel delinquents (p. 86).

In addition to enforcement, he also indicated a need to put forth effort to prevent crime through a concerted effort to teach values. Cannon (1981) noted that smaller schools do better than larger ones in teaching values, especially when the principal is committed to the need for basic learning.

Ethics and School Boards

Critical conflicts are "those that put the superintendent and school board in conflict with specifics as to time and place, that would threaten the governance of the school" (Bryant and Grady 1990, p. 20). There are two questions that would arise: (1) does it bother the superintendent? and (2) does the problem or proposed solution involve such questions whether decisions were educationally sound, unethical, or illegal? What most often troubles the superintendent is when the intent

of the board/board member's agenda does not include what is best for the students. It is also bothersome if the board does not take the time to think about the problem rationally. Bryant and Grady (1990) noted there were two other common practices that involve not following proper procedure: (1) there is a tendency of some board members to suspend their own rules to meet their own needs or wishes, and (2) some board members believed that they were a "court of last resort" and can overrule the superintendent when he or she made a decision that was questioned by teachers or parents.

Bryant and Grady (1990) offered suggestions for effective means of working with school boards:

1. Make sure all school board members have a minimal knowledge of the educational system and the role of the school board in that system. (It was noted that this worked best when this communication was from the state level rather than the local level.)
2. Alter election laws to control turnovers, with staggered terms being the suggested pattern.
3. Establish procedures for conflict resolution, best done before a conflict occurs. (It was noted that superintendents have nowhere to turn except their state association which can do little but give moral support and counseling.)
4. Develop clear policies governing the relationship between the state governing body and the local board developing policy.

Ethics and School Administrators

Much of education and leadership involves motivation. Nearly everyone, at one time or another, has been in position to motivate or

inspire others, whether it be in our homes, workplace, or elsewhere in our everyday lives. Some people seem to have an ability or skill for inspiring people to higher aspirations. Some key principles for motivating others listed by McGinnis (1985) were (1) expect the best, (2) study other people's needs, (3) set high standards, (4) create an environment where failure is not fatal--teach people how to learn from their mistakes--fear of failure kills initiative and creativity, (5) use role models to encourage success--real persons who attained success in the manner you wish students to learn about, (6) recognize and applaud achievement, and (7) place a premium on collaboration. Leaders need to "do more than build allegiance to themselves--they also build into the organization an allegiance to one another" (p. 99). "The ultimate leader develops followers who will surpass them" (p. 100).

Administrators sometimes are caught between what was best for students and what was best for staff. A further complication was concern for what the superintendent and/or school board wanted, since they were the principal's boss (Natale 1990). In such a conflict, students' needs must come first (Power, Higgins, and Kohlberg 1989).

Ethical guidelines in education, as previously discussed, are few and vague. Laws outlined some of the ethical guidelines that educators must follow such as taking a bribe or dealing with drugs according to legally outlined procedures. It becomes more complicated when the law does not mandate solutions or when the solution offered is open to interpretation. It gets still more complicated if the prescribed or more ethical practice does not agree with that of the superintendent or if there are political pressures to follow that are other than the most ethical path (Freitas 1991; Natale 1990). Some examples to illustrate would be (1) a basketball team headed for a championship and the star players were caught with drugs (good of the school versus good of the varsity program), (2) a salary increase

replaced by favors such as college tuition waivers for employees' children (would the taking of such a waiver stand up under public scrutiny?), and (3) a school system graduating some students who are functionally illiterate.

School administrators are perceived to have more ethical challenges of crisis proportions than ever before, largely due to such factors as technology, inflation, the equal rights movement, the energy crisis, the changing values and morality, the environment, and the urban/suburban crises. The administrator must (1) be aware of these factors in society and (2) have a knowledge of the administrative behaviors needed to deal with these factors. In order to meet these challenges, the principal must have a clear view of the philosophical beliefs involved and an "inherent desire" to be successful in meeting these challenges successfully. Skills needed are knowledge in planning, decision-making, communication, and ability to communicate personal ethical qualities with an eye to promoting a positive school climate (Faily 1980).

Faily (1980) recommended that the planning role be separated from organizational management. He indicated such planning must be done with the needs of the whole organization in mind and done in a team effort. To do this effectively, there needed to be budgetary resources.

Darling-Hammond (1989) suggested that teacher involvement and autonomy in decision-making are important. Faily (1980) stated that in a democratic society, people who are affected by a decision deserve to be involved in the decision. With this in mind, an institution should apply this principle for both ethical and practical reasons. In education, this model is often called participatory decision-making. When participatory decision-making is in place, there is a tendency for improved morale, greater acceptance of decisions, reduced resistance to change, higher task motivation, greater job satisfaction, greater effort

for behavioral change, greater implementation for decisions at the operational level, more integration between individual and goals, and greater feelings of empowerment for individuals.

Communication is the primary tool for drawing people and ideas together. Effective communication involves the ability to express feelings, analyze situations, clarify interest in a situation, and utilize skills. Roadblocks to communication were ordering, warning, moralizing, advising, lecturing, criticizing, stereotyping, diagnosing, agreeing, consoling, interrogating, and withdrawing. Communication is facilitated by such behaviors as passive listening, acknowledgment responses, invitation to talk, and active listening. Such behaviors create an atmosphere of concern and caring. Two kinds of communication are not effective. These are projection talking (having contact with ideas and projecting understanding when it was not understood) and ventriloquism (pretending to speak for others). These two types of talking tend to have an adverse impact on administrative effectiveness, credibility, and respect (Faily 1980; Gorton and Burch 1974).

Administration was viewed as being broader than leadership. Effective administrative behavior, then, was an administrator behaving in such a way as to influence others to seek willingly the achievement of group objectives as well as the goals of the organization (Faily 1980, p. 35).

The administrative or leadership style and thus the behavior tend to change with the situation. The factors of planning, decision-making, communication, and ethical behavior enter into the kind of situational adaptations in style. The most effective principal is a person who (1) made himself or herself available and talked little when work was done and aims fulfilled and (2) created an atmosphere that left co-workers with the feeling they accomplished the finished task themselves.

Ethics in the working day of the principal has an effect on the effectiveness of the school. One of the major portions of the

principal's job description is that of being the instructional leader with an emphasis on curriculum, instructional modes, and school environment. However, ethical leadership is not included in most job descriptions, even though this behavior was the controlling factor behind school relationships, programs, and school mission. Ethical leadership was an integral part of instructional leadership. Major concerns in ethical leadership include fairness, equity, commitment, responsibility, and obligation (Calabrese 1988; Faily 1980). Faily (1980) indicated a school cannot be effective if the leadership does not exhibit ethical behaviors. The administrator needs to be familiar with the ethical codes of the appropriate organizations with the same codes applying to all. The higher the position, the more crucial the degree of ethical behavior.

The training curriculum for administrators tends to emphasize technical, social, and conceptual matters and ignore or neglect moral elements such as values and humanities (Calabrese 1988; Greenfield 1985). Harden (1988) extended that thought by indicating that educators tend to focus on narrow issues and ignore the larger principles that govern ethical decisions. "The principal is in the unenviable position of having to think in ethical terms and make appropriate application to concrete situations" (Harden 1988, p. 12). Throughout the day, many of the decisions that a principal makes call for some aspect of ethical consideration and reflection.

The principal's role is to deal with a complex world, full of ambiguity and conflict. Each day there are a great number of decisions that have to be made taking these conflicting viewpoints into account. Often entering into these decisions are such matters as political expediency, loyalty to colleagues versus loyalty to superiors versus loyalty to friends versus loyalty to organizational efficiency in any

combination. Each of these factors has its own set of standards (Doggett 1988; Greenfield 1990).

Principals must fulfill their responsibilities within the context of conflicting interests, often causing the principals to experience feelings of anxiety, conflict, and stress. It is important for the principal to remain unaligned with interest groups. In order to do so, he or she must understand the demands, goals, needs, and motivations of each group. This is especially true when dealing with the legalities and ethical responsibilities that are a part of P.L. 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act) (Brennan and Brennan 1988; Cotton, Patterson, Browne, and Cotton 1979).

At times, contentions have arisen between special educators and general educators in regard to mainstreaming, student-teacher load disparity, the extra work general education teachers may be asked to do for students qualifying for special education services, the general time perceived to be taken from the larger number of general education students for the sake of the smaller number of special education students, and occasional perceived overload caused by Individual Education Plan (IEP) changes in midyear. The principal must mediate these differences and at the same time attend to the legal and ethical responsibilities involved so that students may be justly served. These situations may well put a principal in a real moral dilemma. The most common special education concerns were placement decisions, discipline, and related services. Ethically, the principal must take into consideration the legal ramifications, the adequacy of the service program, and the safety factors.

Part of the role of the principal is to motivate teachers to grow professionally and ethically. Teachers are more likely to behave in an ethical manner, more motivated to develop and grow professionally, and more open to suggestion if they perceive the principal as behaving

in a manner which would earn respect. If the principal reacts in a manner perceived as being unethical, a negative chain reaction may occur. When teachers view the principal as being consistently ethical in his or her decisions, they tend to feel more secure and more stable and feel more assured that the principal will support them in their classroom. A general rule is postulated, with recognition of possible exceptions, that the teacher who feels more secure will also teach at a higher level of competency in his or her teaching (DeBruyn 1989; Seldin 1988).

Another area that is becoming more and more a dilemma is in the use and duplication of computer software. As schools are caught between the need for software for students and the high cost of multiple copies, many schools are tempted to make unauthorized copies. The question is further complicated by the high cost of computers and the feeling that this is wasted without software. The problem becomes even more complicated when students decide they would like personal copies of the program for use on their home machines or when they brought a friend's home copy to school. It was suggested that teachers should be educated as to the ethical use of software, that a checkout system be used for previewing programs, and that an inventory be kept on software in each building. At the same time, the problem needs to be presented to the district superintendent and school board in order that money be allocated for the purpose of buying sufficient software so as to render pirating unnecessary. Designated people should be the only individuals who can make agreements with companies for software for the district (usually the principal). It is a principal's responsibility to see that software is treated and used ethically (Achter and Pelowski 1986).

The software issue suggests the possibility of other factors which could influence socialization outcomes. Greenfield (1985) believes that these socialization outcomes might demand an increased

emphasis on instructional leadership. He proposed that there needed to be a process developed by which the innovation rather than custodial modes of administration might become a part of the school administrator's culture without violating or upsetting the current administrative/school culture. If principals are to effect change within the system, they must first be accepted by the shareholders in system and meet the criteria they set forth (Greenfield 1985).

In order to bring about conflict/dilemma resolution, individuals need to proceed in a manner that is acceptable to the membership at large (in this case, fellow administrators). Greenfield (1985) suggested that the school district could change outcomes through such practices as the statement of desired values, attitudes, and beliefs to be learned; the encouragement of training that includes this type of aims in knowledge, skills, and moral dispositions; the awarding of administrators who act as good role models; and the provision for retraining and support for administrators. These practices are done so as to gain the desired knowledge, skills, and moral training that would promote growth and development (Greenfield 1985).

In addition to competencies recognized as needed in administration, there needs to be a healthy set of values, beliefs, and standards by which to live and work. These standards are utilized as a guide when applying use of skills/competencies as individuals make decisions. If these factors are in place, the principal will be more effective in both leadership and school growth (Cannon 1981; Gorton 1983). Hostetler (1986) indicated that no matter how well intentioned principals may be, they have an ethical obligation to meet certain educational goals. Any ethical system must have some sort of standards. Duty should not be shirked and that people should not be considered a means to an end. No matter how well intentioned or how much caring goes into the process, the principal's actions would not be ethical if

respect for persons was not present. Respect for persons included (1) the active concern for self determinacy of others, (2) the recognition of the rule-following aspect of human behavior, and (3) the regard for the intellectual integrity of others--rational interaction without coercion, deception, or indoctrination (Hostetler 1986).

Hostetler (1986) indicated that he believed that the majority of principals wanted to do what was right. To do what is right was to respect people. This does not mean the principal gives up the leadership role. This does not mean the principal needs to consult with teachers in all things. It does mean that the "guiding principles for the leadership are transactional, not coercive or charismatic" (p. 35). It means that the use of power may be necessary at times in order to be ethical, but it must be used with respect and restraint. In that context, power is acceptable.

If coercive power is not the answer, then another mode of operation is needed. Ethical principals engage in reflective thinking proceeded by gathering facts and consulting with those involved. They are concerned about consequences for the students. Good intentions are not enough. Reading a lot about moral and ethical theory, codes, and standards is not enough. The principals can only become ethical if their feelings are genuine and sincere, if their desire is to be ethical, and if they have a commitment to the need for serving others and being concerned for the well-being of others. In the school setting, this can be enhanced and encouraged through discussions between and around all the people involved--teachers, parents, and principals (Greenfield 1990; Harden 1988).

Harden (1988) placed special emphasis on the need to communicate with parents. He indicated that there are three special areas where there is a strong need, and sometimes obligation, to communicate with parents. These areas are discipline, special

education, and counseling. In regard to discipline, this does not mean you have to call the parent(s) with each and every incident, but that there should be a generalized communication with strong obligations to specific incidents or situations when behavior becomes habitual or there is a seriousness that requires action. In regard to special education, communication and mutual agreement by means of the Individual Education Plan (IEP) are mandated by federal law (P.L. 94-142). The principal has the responsibility to assure full parental understanding and participation in the referral and IEP/special education help process. In the area of counseling, there must be communication with parents and the students must be made aware of that fact. Some of the more stressful counseling situations that could require parent-school cooperation/communication are threats of suicide, complaints of abuse, pregnancy-related matters, or drug involvement. The principal must make sure that counseling was a part of the school rather than an operation unto itself, working harmoniously and with an open-door exchange. There are possible exceptions to the need for communication with parents such as suspected child abuse. Less direct communication is needed regarding curriculum and access to curricular information. Still communication is needed since people cannot work together unless both parties have access to the same information. Schools do not exist in a vacuum. Parents have ethical grounds for needing to know. Schools have ethical grounds for not hindering this need to know.

Five standards of good practice for principals were proposed by Greenfield (1990). They were (1) have a point of view, (2) invite others to consider your point of view, (3) become informed about good educational practices, (4) develop the habit of being reflective, and (5) put your students at the center of decisions. To not do so would be unethical. Farther down the line, principals and teachers might be held legally accountable if they do not do so.

The effective schools and ethical schools are synonymous--one cannot exist without the other (Calabrese 1988; Sergiovanni 1992). The effective principal must be an ethical principal who assures that all are treated "fairly, teachers teach effectively, coaches teach their players to play hard and fairly, curriculum meets societal needs, students are held accountable, parents are incorporated into the schools" (Calabrese 1988, p. 4).

Leaders in the schools often feel they are being pulled many ways at once and at the same time being expected to lead. This results in many leaders having a tendency toward timidity and lack of leadership, possibly believing that there is no way to meet these expectations. Parents, too, are confused and often choose the option of home schools or private schools in order to ensure their views of good values were being observed (Calabrese 1990; Cannon 1981).

As educators endeavor to bring about change toward the development of an ethical school, it is easy to become discouraged. Summy (1986) noted educators need to remember good does prevail over evil, know when and when not to compromise, confront and handle problems in a positive manner, treat problems as challenges instead of obstacles, know not all problems are complex (sometimes there is definite right and wrong), learn and practice visualization (prepare for the expected and unexpected), and recognize perfection can get in the way of accomplishing goals. Sometimes imperfection is better than nothing; success takes time and some risk-taking (Summy 1986).

The evaluation of teachers, according to Doggett (1988), should be "honest, substantive, and based on adequate classroom visits" (p. 7). In regard to criticism of teachers, there is the temptation to avoid criticism in order to maintain peace (often deemed necessary for teamwork), thus reinforcing poor teaching practices. Doggett maintained that teachers deserved criticism that is sensitive and constructive and

that it is the responsibility of the principal to have the courage to give this type of criticism. Assignment of teachers in the school system should be based upon competence and effectiveness rather than upon favoritism. Teachers' participation in decision-making is currently seen to be important. Teachers should be told which decisions are theirs to make and then they should be free to decide without fear the principal will override their decision. When parents and teachers are in conflict, the principal must be honest and professional in the treatment of both, taking care that solutions are sought without playing one against the other. When teachers mistreat students, the situation should be treated in a manner that is fair regardless of whether the teacher is favored or disliked. There is a temptation for both teachers and principals to treat student leaders or stars differently than other students for the same infraction. An example of this might be athletic stars or student council president. When reporting to the school board and parents about test scores, drop out rates, or student involvement with drugs there is a temptation to make the report favorable so as to avoid controversy. Doggett maintained the parents and school board deserve both the truth and sincerity in reporting. Accepting the responsibility for your own actions requires being straightforward with the discussion of the situation and resisting the temptation to blame fellow administrators and teachers. Support of teachers often involves support in times when parents come in shouting and making threats. Teachers need administrative support when the activities are both reasonable and legitimate. Principals have a moral and legal responsibility to uphold the law. Assuring moral behaviors in schools may sometimes require notifying authorities of immoral behavior of teachers or staff. This endeavor is always difficult. It is even more difficult when the teacher is a very effective teacher in the classroom.

Doggett placed the responsibility for carrying out such actions in the hands of the principal.

Doggett (1988) believed that accepting gifts from companies that would be doing business with the school was not ethical. Examples that were given were free letter jackets, free pen and pencil sets, and other gifts of like or greater value.

Summary

In summary, Doggett (1988) noted that though issues in education individually were not so monumental as Watergate, collectively they were very important to the field of education and the students they serve. He believes that it is not so important that the action of each situation be reported so much as that each administrator/principal examines and monitors his or her own ethical conduct.

Schools can only be an "approximation of an ideal ethical and democratic community" (Calabrese 1990, p. 15). This ideal will continue to prosper and grow where ethical and democratic values are honored above competition, individualism, and hedonism (Calabrese 1990).

Grady (cited in Demsey et al. 1988) indicated that there has always been a need for ethical consideration in the role of the principal. This need has increased with the increasing use of school-based management. Two of the most apparent areas are in the hiring practices and in the management of building funds. In hiring, especially with school-based management, there is increased pressure on the principal to hire the best person possible. This is complicated by such factors as nepotism, favoritism, or undue influence being placed upon the principal in efforts to force the hiring of a given person. In the area of fund management, some of the situations commonly occurring are free products for the principal if he or she agrees to purchase their product (bribery or undue influence) or free travel tickets in

exchange for the selection of their company with which to do business. Principals must not only have the character needed to turn down such offers, but be foresighted enough that the turndown can be preplanned. Interestingly, the persons making the offer are often angry when turned down. Grady indicated that not only a turndown was important, but a refusal to do business with that company should follow.

Perry (cited in Demsey et al. 1988) indicated that ethics is not often discussed in education. Some areas of need for ethical behavior include employment decisions, special education decisions, athletic eligibility decisions, and cases of suspected drug and alcohol abuse.

Seldin (1988) listed five commandments for professional ethics for principals:

1. The educational welfare of students is always paramount.
2. The principals must respect the dignity and worth of teachers.
3. The communication with teachers (verbal and written) is privileged and confidential, broken only when the student is genuinely threatened (primary responsibility is to the public and then to the teacher).
4. The principal must be a model of ethical behavior, providing a model for teachers to emulate, reflecting professionalism through sensitivity to ethical problems.
5. The ethical behavior must be consistent and reliable, situational ethics being destructive to the principalship.

Since all human beings have biases and individual personalities, there are times when following the most ethical path seems impossible. The situation is often confused by complications of one type or another. However, if a person gives consideration to the commandments, perhaps two or three possible behaviors may become apparent. "Unethical

behaviors in the administrative/supervision practices of the principal contribute to instability in the organization" (Greenfield 1985, p. 105).

Goodlad (1990) indicated that educators needed a national vision in regard to education. However, he was unable to see that there was one in evidence at the present time. He noted that many states define success in teaching/education based on results of standardized tests. He indicated this does "little harm, and perhaps some good" (p. 18), but that it was not enough. He indicated it appeals to administrators and lay persons interested in effectiveness and/or efficiency because it can be tested and enforced. Goodlad considered this to be a behavioristic approach which was, in his estimation, "limited and hollow" (p. 18).

Some guidelines proposed for principals by Calabrese (1988) were (1) develop a vision consistent with sound educational philosophy--decision-making and human relations; (2) apply strong moral leadership; (3) condemn discriminatory practices; (4) view effective teaching as a duty; (5) build community; (6) balance the rights of all groups; (7) right issues are not always popular issues; (8) base decision-making on what is right for members of the school community; (9) make moral courage an integral part of the principal's role; and (10) communicate ethical behavior, integrity, and moral action. The ethical environment is not established overnight, but takes place over time.

Doggett (1988) listed twelve issues in the field of education that require ethical consideration on the part of the principal:

- (1) performance evaluation of teachers,
- (2) criticism of teachers versus possible resultant conflict,
- (3) assignment of teacher in the school system,
- (4) teacher participation in decision-making,
- (5) conflict

between parent and teacher, (6) mistreatment of a student by a teacher, (7) discipline of students when they are leaders in the school, (8) honesty in regard to matters such as test scores, (9) acceptance of accountability for your own actions, (10) support of teachers in activities that are reasonable and legitimate, (11) notification to authorities regarding illegal or immoral behaviors on the part of staff, and (12) acceptance of personal gifts from companies seeking to do business with your school or within your school. Notification of authorities is especially difficult when the person was a teacher who is very effective in the classroom.

Keough (1992) reported a national survey of all school administrators (superintendent, secondary principal, and elementary principal). The article reported percentages based upon the number who answered that particular question and rounded to the nearest percentage. The study, as reported in the article, gave totals and comparisons of the various administrators. The chairperson furnished the writer with the totals in the article but not the comparison numbers. Both the national survey and the North Dakota survey included some questions that were not on the other survey. The data in appendix D are a copy of the ethical questions in the North Dakota survey. In the appropriate blanks are the national percentages. Blank answer spaces indicate this question was not addressed in the national survey. Questions included in the national survey not found in the North Dakota survey are not shown. It should be noted that 0 percent does not mean there were no incidences (in each one there were some), but that the numbers were so low that it amounted to less than .5 percent. Do not pay too much attention, when comparing, to a percentage or two difference; that might be accounted for by the differing manner of calculating and the rounding of numbers.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Instrumentation

The investigator developed a questionnaire and conducted a survey of elementary principals in North Dakota. The survey questionnaire dealt with the subject of ethical practices in the principalship. Of the two types of ethics, personal and professional, the emphasis in the survey was on the professional.

The interview items were selected from possible areas of educational problems and issues of special ethical interest. Perceptions were sought as they related to the problems, issues, and dilemmas in the principal's experience.

The fifth annual national survey of school executives (Keough 1992) was conducted by The Executive Educator and a research team from Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1991. The researchers on the team were Kathrine E. Keough (chair), Leo H. Bradley, James W. Boothe, T. Michael Flick, and Susanne P. Kirk. The school executives in the Xavier University study contacted were elementary principals, secondary principals, and superintendents. The responses were tabulated and verified for statistical accuracy. The researchers assumed a random return. The estimated confidence level was 95 percent. The error rate was plus or minus 2.35 percentage points. The summary of the results of the survey was reported in the February 1992 issue of The Executive Educator (Keough 1992).

Permission to use the Xavier University instrument in a modified form was requested and granted (see appendix C). The

instrument was adapted so that the questions were addressed only to elementary principals. Biographical, demographic, and other forms of preliminary data were substantially reduced.

The modified instrument was submitted to a panel at the University of North Dakota consisting of five graduate students who had been elementary principals and three faculty members in the Educational Administration program area so that each item might be examined for pertinence, clarity, relevance, and substance. The panel members were provided with a copy of the purpose statement and the research question. They were instructed to review the instrument for congruence with the statements as well as for clarity and understandability. The panel members were invited to offer suggestions for improvement. Agreement as to content was nearly universal. It was suggested by several panelists to delete some of the original demographic information since it was descriptive and not of service to the study. There were a few minor wording changes suggested for the purpose of making the question more clearly understood. The general idea and specific questions were agreed upon by all. The final form was reviewed again by the committee. No further suggestions were offered. In this way, face and content validity were established.

The survey questionnaire consisted of fifty questions (a copy of the instrument is contained in appendix A). Seven of the questions were demographic. The remaining questions were designed to elicit perceptions and opinions on common ethical problems and issues in the school setting. These questions emphasized those decisions that are the professional responsibility of the elementary principal. The format of the instrument remained the same as in the Xavier University survey. This format had two forms. Most of the questions provided multiple choices. The respondent checked that choice that best matched his or her opinion. A few of the questions provided a scale that would

indicate the degree of importance. The respondents checked that degree of importance that best reflected their opinion. The respondents were welcome to comment on any of these questions, if they desired. Opinions and comments were accepted when given. The survey concluded with an open-ended question where the respondents were welcome to provide input as to other common ethical problems, issues, or dilemmas which they have encountered that may have not been covered in the instrument.

Ten of the participating principals were asked to participate in a follow-up interview. The type of interview would be structured based on predetermined questions (see appendix A). A list would be developed using names of those principals indicating a willingness to be interviewed. Thirty-two principals indicated a willingness to be interviewed. Ten were selected by random sampling.

Selection of the Population

The population selection was based upon the perceived need to have information from schools of different sizes and from different geographical locations across North Dakota. The population chosen was those elementary principals whose job assignment included being elementary principal for one-half of their time or more.

The total population of elementary principals in North Dakota was determined to be 329 according to information supplied by the Department of Public Instruction. This listing included federal schools, private schools, and public schools. Of the 329 schools, 206 met the criterion of having a principal assigned on a one-half time basis or more. Of the 206 schools, twenty-eight were disqualified because they were nonpublic schools, five because they were federal schools, and one because it was a state school.

The survey population included principals from 172 public elementary schools. Inviting all qualifying principals to participate ensured geographical distribution throughout the state.

Gathering the Data

A letter of invitation (see appendix B), a participation card (see appendix B), an instrument, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope were mailed to each of the 172 elementary principals in North Dakota who met the criteria established. The purpose of the letter was to discuss briefly the study, to insure confidentiality, and to invite the administrator to participate. The purpose of the card was to insure anonymity as well as to indicate their acceptance or nonacceptance of the invitation along with an indication of a willingness to be interviewed. The purpose of the instrument was to obtain the data needed for the study. The stamped, self-addressed envelope was included to facilitate returns.

All data-containing instruments were received by March 3, 1993. Of the 172 North Dakota elementary principals invited to participate in the survey, there were a total of 129 (75%) who responded before the deadline and were included in the comparative analysis. Three principals responded after the deadline. Data from their responses could not be included in the analysis.

The ten interviews were completed by April 22, 1993. The interviews were conducted by telephone regardless of location and proximity to the investigator. The interviewee was informed that notes were being taken and that the responses would be reported in a manner that would not compromise confidentiality. Notation and reporting were done in a manner that would not permit identification. The questions were open-ended, inviting responses that expanded on the survey or brought about awareness of areas not covered by the survey instrument.

Data Analysis

Analysis of the data was done quantitatively. An item-by-item description analysis was done according to the order of the item's appearance on the survey instrument. Where appropriate, a descriptive comparison to the national survey conducted by Xavier University (Keough 1992) was also done. Tallies were made as to the number of responses and the percentage of responses for each item. Comparisons were made between time spent as principal, years in current position, years of employment in a rural or urban school district, gender, age, and years as principal.

The data were treated using Chi-square statistic from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX). Tables were devised to further illuminate the findings. The tabulated data are presented in chapter four.

The open-ended question and comments provided by the respondents were descriptively listed and qualitatively analyzed. This portion of the study constituted a smaller portion of the overall data. These data also are presented in chapter four.

In addition, ten principals who had indicated a willingness to be interviewed responded to six questions from a structured interview. The interviews were conducted by telephone between March 3 and April 22, 1993. The responses were qualitatively analyzed and reported in description. These data also are presented in chapter four.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The primary purpose of this study was to assist elementary principals to conceptualize the thought of other elementary principals about ethics in school settings. This conceptualization is intended to facilitate thinking about ethics in schools. Thinking about ethics is intended to facilitate thinking and decision-making among individual principals regarding the use of ethics in their school. Thus, principals collectively may arrive at a more closely aligned consensus as to what constitutes ethical standards in schools.

The secondary purpose of the study was to examine the perceptions of elementary school principals in North Dakota regarding what they deemed to be ethical behavior. The study was not intended to measure or evaluate the ethics of principals.

The purpose of this chapter was to present the data and analyze the data in a manner which would enable the investigator and principals to gain a clearer insight into the perceptions of principals as related to ethical decision-making. The results of the study are presented in two sections. The first section includes the description and analysis of the quantitative data. This section has three parts: (1) a description of the population surveyed as reflected in the first ten questions of the survey, (2) the results and analyses of the responses to each of the forty questions on ethics as reflected by questions eleven through fifty of the survey, and (3) the results and summary of responses to question fifty-one.

The second section includes a description and analysis of the interview data. This section has two parts: (1) a description of the population and (2) the responses to the interview questions.

Description and Analysis of Quantitative Data

Description of the Population

A survey instrument which examined a number of descriptive variables and a number of ethical concerns was developed and distributed. There were 172 elementary principals in North Dakota whose job description required that 50 percent or more of their time was spent in the principalship. Surveys were sent to all 172 principals. Of these, 129 (75%) participated in the study by the time the analysis was run.

Table 1 illustrates the overall description of the 129 respondents to the survey. The first nine questions in the survey provided the description. Of the nine descriptors, the first six were used as variables in the analysis.

Of the 129 principals, eighty-eight (68.2%) were full-time principals and forty (31%) were part-time principals (defined as having between 50 percent and 99 percent of their workday being the principalship). One (0.8%) principal chose not to respond to this question.

There were ten (7.8%) principals who have been in their current position for this year only, fifty (38.8%) who had been in their position for one to five years, 37 (28.7%) who had been in their position for six to fifteen years, and 32 (24.8%) who had been in their position for sixteen or more years. The first two of these descriptors were combined to make sixty (46.5%) for the analysis.

TABLE 1

DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION

Principalship Factor	Frequency	Percentage	Number Not Answering
Full-time principal	88	68.2	1
Part-time principal	40	31.0	
Current position			
0-5 years	60	46.6	0
6-15 years	37	28.7	
16 or more	32	24.8	
Rural community	63	48.9	2
Urban community	64	49.7	
Male	98	76.0	0
Female	31	24.0	
Age			
26-43	38	29.5	1
44-51	46	35.7	
52-60	45	9.4	
Years as principal			
0-5	36	28.9	0
6-15	47	36.4	
16-32	46	35.6	
Level of education			
Bachelor	18	14.0	0
Master	97	75.2	
Specialist	9	7.9	
Doctorate	5	3.9	
Years in education			
0-13	15	11.6	0
14-26	61	47.3	
27-39	53	41.1	
Influence source			
Home	117	90.7	0
Church	7	5.4	
Elementary and secondary school	5	3.9	

There were thirteen principals (10.1%) who were employed in farm communities and fifty principals (38.8%) who were employed in rural communities. There were ten principals (7.8%) who were employed in small cities (7.8%) and fifty-four principals (41.9%) who were employed in the large cities of the state. In the analysis, these categories were combined into rural and urban. There were sixty-three (48.9%) who worked in rural communities and 64 (49.6%) who worked in urban communities. Two respondents (1.6%) did not answer this question.

There were ninety-eight (76.0%) male principals in the population surveyed. There were thirty-one (24.0%) female principals in the population surveyed.

The bachelor's degree was reported as being the highest degree earned by eighteen (14.0%) principals, the master's degree by ninety-seven (75.2%) principals, the specialist degree by nine (7.0%) principals, and the doctorate by five (3.9%) principals.

The age of the respondents ranged from twenty-six to sixty. The mean age was 46.25 years. The median age was 48 years. The age of the principals distributed themselves as follows: thirty-eight (29.5%) were in the bracket between 26 and 43, forty-six (35.7%) between 44 and 51, and forty-five (34.9%) between 51 and 60. One respondent (0.8%) chose not to answer this question.

The years that the respondents had been employed in the field of education ranged from zero (this was their first year) to thirty-nine years. The mean number of years in education was 23.08 years. The median number of years was 23. Fifteen (11.6%) principals had been in education from 0-13 years, sixty-one (47.3%) principals from 14-26 years, and fifty-three (41.1%) principals from 27-39 years.

The years that the principals had been employed in the principalship ranged from zero (this was their first year) to thirty-two years. The mean number of years as principal was 12 years. The median

was 12 years. Thirty-six (28.9%) principals have been filling that role from 0 to 10 years, forty-seven (36.4%) for 11-20 years, and forty-six (35.7%) for 21-32 years.

When reporting the most influential in forming their perceptions of what was most right, 117 (90.7%) principals reported that source to be the home, 7 (5.4%) their church, and 5 (3.9%) the elementary and secondary school system. One principal, who answered "school," indicated the school was a Catholic school.

Results and Analysis of Questions on Ethics

The following research question was identified for investigation:

1. What are the perceptions of North Dakota elementary principals about ethical standards and ethical practices in the workplace particularly as they apply to:
 - a. the employment of relatives and friends in the workplace?
 - b. the accuracy of written and received letters of recommendations?
 - c. the accuracy of reports and communications?
 - d. the student rights in school?
 - e. the parental involvement in decision-making?
 - f. the parent's choice of schools for their children?
 - g. the process of decision-making?
 - h. the practices concerning adherence to policies?
 - i. the acceptance of gifts and their influence on decisions?
 - j. the appropriate management of budgets and budgetary monies?
 - k. the use of school property for personal use?
 - l. the honoring of contract agreements?

- m. the hiring and firing practices in schools?
- n. the presence and influence of ethical training?
- o. the views on copyright laws, especially as they relate to computer software?
- p. the handling and use of student records?
- q. the use of VCR films?

Questions ten through fifty on the survey were questions concerning ethics that could be tabulated quantitatively. Where feasible, these questions were also compared using as independent variables the following: amount of time the principal is assigned to the principalship, number of years in current position, type of community in which the principal works (rural/urban), gender, age, and number of years principal has been a principal. Levels of significant relationships were determined by application of Chi-square values.

Total frequencies were found and percentages of the population calculated for each question asked in the survey. Figure 4 reports these frequencies and percentages, with the percentages being shown in parentheses.

Percentages for questions dealing with the entire population were calculated on the basis of 129 respondents. Often several people did not respond to a question, so percentages reported may not total 100 percent. The "If yes, . . ." follow-up questions are calculated on the basis of the number of persons responding to the question, and any deviation from 100 percent will be on the basis of rounding error. All the data summarizing the findings of the survey address the entire research question. It appears that the connections to the research question including its subparts is evident and does not need to be specifically noted.

In response to survey question one, "Are any relatives of your school board members employed by your district?" the majority of

principals (57.4 %) indicated that the school district in which they lived employed relatives of school board members, compared to 49.5 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). Of those responding to survey question two, "If yes to survey question 1, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?," 76.9 percent indicated "yes." However, another 7.6 percent indicated "no" and 15.4 percent indicated sometimes. This question did not appear in the national survey. These questions, considered together, indicate that the standard for most schools is to hire relatives of school board members and to do it ethically.

Of the population answering survey question three, "Are any of your relatives employed by your school district?," the majority of the principals (64.3%) indicated "no," compared to 75.3 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). Of those responding to survey question four, "If 'yes' to survey question 3, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?," 95.3 percent indicated "yes." Only a very small percentage (2.3%) indicated they had not been handled ethically. This question was not included in the national survey. These two questions considered together indicate that the standard in most schools is not to hire; but when they do, ethical practices are followed.

Of the population responding to survey question five, "Were you ever encouraged to hire a teacher who was a personal friend or relative of a school board member?," a substantial majority of principals (80.6%) indicated "no," compared to 69.7 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). In response to survey question six, "If 'yes' to survey question 5, what amount of bearing did the board member's encouragement have on your hiring decision?," the majority (53.8%) indicated that it had no bearing. This question did not appear in the national survey. These questions considered together indicate that most principals do not have to make this particular decision.

1. Are any relatives of your school board members employed by your district?	<u>51 (39.5%)</u> "Yes"	<u>74 (57.4%)</u> "No"	NR <u>4</u>	
2. If "yes" to question 1, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?	<u>40 (76.9%)</u> "Yes"	<u>4 (7.6%)</u> "No"	<u>8 (15.4%)</u> Sometimes	
3. Are any of your relatives employed by your district?	<u>42 (32.6%)</u> "Yes"	<u>83 (64.3%)</u> "No"	NR <u>4</u>	
4. If "yes" to question 3, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?	<u>41 (95.3%)</u> "Yes"	<u>1 (2.3%)</u> "No"	<u>1 (2.3%)</u> Sometimes	
5. Were you ever "encouraged" to hire a teacher who was a personal friend or relative of a school board member?	<u>21 (16.3%)</u> "Yes"	<u>104 (80.6%)</u> "No"	NR <u>4</u>	
6. If "yes" to question 5, what amount of bearing did the board member's "encouragement" have on your hiring decision?	<u>5 (19.2%)</u> Was a determining factor	<u>7 (26.9%)</u> Some bearing	<u>14 (53.8%)</u> No bearing	
7. Have you ever hired a teacher who was a friend or relative of a school board member?	<u>23 (17.8%)</u> "Yes"	<u>102 (79.1%)</u> "No"	NR <u>4</u>	
8. If "yes" to question 7, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?	<u>21 (84.0%)</u> "Yes"	<u>3 (12.0%)</u> "No"	<u>1 (4.0%)</u> Sometimes	
9. In making any school decision, which of the following factors do you consider most important?	<u>5 (3.9%)</u> Money (budget concerns)	<u>1 (0.8%)</u> Relations with faculty or unions	<u>3 (2.3%)</u> Community wishes	
	<u>2 (1.6%)</u> Board priorities	<u>115 (89.1%)</u> Impact on students	NR <u>3</u>	
10. How much confidence do you have on the reliability and accuracy of the following information that school districts release?				
	Low	Medium	High	
Student Achievement Data	<u>5 (3.9%)</u>	<u>55 (42.6%)</u>	<u>66 (51.2%)</u>	NR <u>3</u>
Student Attendance	<u>0</u>	<u>21 (16.3%)</u>	<u>104 (80.6%)</u>	NR <u>4</u>
Annual Report to DPI	<u>9 (7.0%)</u>	<u>41 (31.8%)</u>	<u>75 (58.1%)</u>	NR <u>4</u>
Public Relations Information	<u>4 (3.1%)</u>	<u>68 (52.7%)</u>	<u>50 (38.8%)</u>	NR <u>7</u>
Data on Student Use of				
Drugs and Alcohol	<u>13 (10.1%)</u>	<u>62 (48.1%)</u>	<u>50 (38.8%)</u>	NR <u>4</u>
(16) Reports on student discipline actions	<u>7 (5.4%)</u>	<u>47 (36.4%)</u>	<u>59 (45.7%)</u>	NR <u>16</u>

Figure 4. Ethics survey results

11. How much confidence do you have in the reliability of the following items?
- | | Low | Medium | High | | |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|----|----------|
| Letters of recommendation you have received | <u>5</u> (3.9%) | <u>91</u> (70.5%) | <u>32</u> (24.8%) | NR | <u>1</u> |
| Letters of recommendation you have written | <u>0</u> | <u>42</u> (32.6%) | <u>86</u> (66.7%) | NR | <u>1</u> |
12. In light of court decisions in the past five years, how do you perceive the current status of student rights in your district?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| <u>0</u> | Rights have weakened | | | |
| <u>37</u> (28.7%) | Rights have stayed the same | | | |
| <u>92</u> (71.3%) | Rights have strengthened | | | |
13. Does the protection of student's human and civil rights make it more difficult to administer the schools in your district effectively?
- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----|----------|
| <u>58</u> (45.0%) | "Yes" | <u>68</u> (52.7%) | "No" | NR | <u>3</u> |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----|----------|
14. Is it preferable to protect the Civil Rights of the minority even if the good of the many is compromised?
- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----|-----------|
| <u>66</u> (51.2%) | "Yes" | <u>50</u> (38.8%) | "No" | NR | <u>13</u> |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----|-----------|
15. Has your administration or administrative team initiated greater parental involvement in the schools?
- | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----|----------|
| <u>114</u> (88.4%) | "Yes" | <u>14</u> (10.9%) | "No" | NR | <u>1</u> |
|--------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----|----------|
16. Do you think parents should be able to choose the school their child attends?
- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|----|----------|
| <u>44</u> (34.1%) | "Yes," from other public schools in my area. | | | | |
| <u>42</u> (32.6%) | "Yes," from other public or private schools in my area. | | | | |
| <u>42</u> (32.6%) | "No" | | | NR | <u>1</u> |
17. Do you think parents should have a greater role in the decision-making process?
- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----|----------|
| <u>70</u> (54.3%) | "Yes" | <u>58</u> (45.0%) | "No" | NR | <u>1</u> |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----|----------|
18. Do you think parents are competent to assume a greater role in the decision-making process at the building level?
- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----|----------|
| <u>73</u> (56.6%) | "Yes" | <u>50</u> (38.8%) | "No" | NR | <u>6</u> |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|------|----|----------|
19. How do you implement central office directives with which you disagree?
- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|--|--|----|----------|
| <u>78</u> (60.5%) | Same as all policies | | | NR | <u>1</u> |
| <u>49</u> (38.0%) | With less enthusiasm | | | | |
| <u>1</u> (0.8%) | Do not implement | | | | |
20. How do you implement school board policies with which you disagree?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| <u>86</u> (66.7%) | Same as all policies | | | |
| <u>43</u> (33.3%) | With less enthusiasm | | | |
| <u>0</u> | Do not implement | | | |
21. Rate the extent to which you agree with the policies adopted by the school board of your school district.
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------|--|
| <u>0</u> | Never | <u>2</u> (1.6%) | Almost never | |
| <u>13</u> (10.1%) | Moderate | <u>98</u> (76.0%) | Almost always | |
| <u>14</u> (10.9%) | Always | NR | <u>2</u> | |

Figure 4. Ethics survey results--Cont.

22. Have you ever been offered the following gifts or services by a vendor?

(2)	<u>3</u> (2.3%)	Jewelry
	<u>0</u>	Travel
	<u>4</u> (3.1%)	Tickets to sporting events
	<u>1</u> (0.8%)	Recreation
	<u>1</u> (0.8%)	Consulting Work
	<u>0</u>	Sex
	<u>2</u> (1.6%)	Drugs and alcohol
	<u>1</u> (0.8%)	Money
	<u>17</u> (13.2%)	Wining and dining
	<u>3</u> (2.3%)	Use of vacation accommodations
	<u>8</u> (6.2%)	Other
	<u>98</u> (76.0%)	None

23. Do you think it is all right to accept personal gifts or services from a vendor?

	<u>22</u> (17.1%)	"Yes," if < \$10
	<u>4</u> (3.1%)	"Yes," if < \$50
	<u>8</u> (6.2%)	"Yes," regardless of price
	<u>98</u> (76.0%)	"No," regardless of price
	NR <u>1</u>	

24. Have you ever accepted personal gifts or services from vendors?

	<u>12</u> (9.3%)	"Yes"	<u>116</u> (89.9%)	"No"	NR <u>1</u>
--	-------------------	-------	---------------------	------	-------------

25. If yes to question 24, do you think this acceptance influenced a decision in favor of the vendor?

	<u>0</u>	"Yes"	<u>16</u> (100.0%)	"No"
--	----------	-------	--------------------	------

26. Do you think any of your board members have accepted valuable personal gifts from vendors?

	<u>6</u> (4.7%)	"Yes"	<u>120</u> (93.0%)	"No"	NR <u>3</u>
--	------------------	-------	---------------------	------	-------------

27. If yes to question 26, do you think this acceptance influenced a vote or decision in favor of the vendor?

	<u>4</u> (50.0%)	"Yes"	<u>4</u> (50.0%)	"No"
--	------------------	-------	-------------------	------

28. Do you think any other administrators in your school district have accepted valuable personal gifts or services from vendors?

	<u>38</u> (29.5%)	"Yes"	<u>81</u> (62.8%)	"No"	NR <u>10</u>
--	-------------------	-------	--------------------	------	--------------

29. If yes to question 28, do you think this acceptance influenced a vote or decision in favor of the vendor?

	<u>25</u> (62.5%)	"Yes"	<u>15</u> (37.5%)	"No"
--	-------------------	-------	--------------------	------

30. How often do you think other administrators accept gifts or services from vendors worth more than \$10?

	<u>28</u> (21.7%)	Never
	<u>63</u> (48.8%)	Almost never
	<u>26</u> (20.2%)	Medium
	<u>4</u> (3.1%)	Almost always
	<u>0</u>	Always
	NR <u>8</u>	

Figure 4. Ethics survey results--Cont.

31. Have you ever "fudged" on a school district expense account?
4 (3.1%) "Yes" 124 (96.1%) "No" NR 1
32. Have you ever put valuable school district goods or services to purely personal use?
18 (14.0%) "Yes" 110 (85.3%) "No" NR 1
33. Have you ever ended your contract as principal before its date of completion?
0 "Yes," at board's request
0 "Yes," for reasons of personal health
2 (1.6%) "Yes," to take another job
1 (0.8%) "Yes," by mutual consent with the board
1 (0.8%) "Yes," for other reasons
125 (96.9%) "No"
34. Do you think it is all right to leave your district in the middle of a contract to accept a better position?
4 (3.1%) Always
27 (20.9%) Sometimes
67 (51.9%) Only with board approval
31 (24.0%) Never
35. If it would further your career, would you hire a consultant who helped place you in your position to do paid work in your district?
(11) 12 (9.3%) "Yes"
107 (82.9%) "No"
NR 10
36. What importance do you place on training in ethics in the academic preparation of an administrator?
1 (0.8%) Not important
7 (5.4%) Less than average
20 (15.5%) Average
43 (33.3%) More than average
58 (45.0%) Vital
37. How would you rate your own graduate school preparation in ethics?
13 (10.1%) Poor
19 (14.7%) Not so good
56 (43.4%) Average
28 (21.7%) Good
12 (9.3%) Very good
NR 1
38. If your school cannot afford to buy multiple copies of computer program software, would you make copies for student use?
55 (42.6%) "Yes" 74 (57.4%) "No"
39. If your school has 10 computers for student use, which group of students would get preference in using them?
1 (0.8%) Gifted and talented
20 (15.5%) Upper grade students
107 (82.9%) All students by scheduling
NR 1

Figure 4. Ethics survey results--Cont.

40. What would you do if a school board member requested information about a child with learning problems, who is not his/her child?

- 18 (14.0%) Answer briefly
4 (3.1%) Tell him/her all he/she wants to know
107 (82.9%) Politely and diplomatically not answer the question

41. The movie VCR rental film charges nearly \$90 for a well known film that you desire to have the students see both for educational value and as part of the Christmas season. The film is available at the convenience store for \$15. What would you do?

- 17 (13.2%) Buy it with my own money from the convenience store and use it at school
53 (41.1%) Buy it with school funds from the convenience store and place it in the library
3 (2.3%) Pay the full \$90, even if the school is short of funds
54 (41.9%) Forego the movie in favor of some other activity
 NR 2

Figure 4. Ethics survey results--Concl.

In response to survey question seven, "Have you ever hired a teacher who was a friend or relative of a school board member?," a substantial majority of principals (79.1%) indicated "no," compared to 58.3 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). In survey question eight, "If 'yes' to question 7, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?," the majority (84.0%) indicated "yes." This question did not appear in the national survey. These questions considered together indicate that the standard of most principals is to refrain from employing friends or relatives of school board members; but when they do, the hiring is handled ethically.

In response to survey question nine, "In making any school decision, which of the following factors do you consider the most important . . .?," a substantial majority (89.1%) indicated impact on students, compared to 87.3 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). This response indicates the standard among principals is that consideration of students holds substantially more importance than money, relations with faculty or unions, community wishes, or board priorities. No significant relationships were found between any of

these factors and the time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal.

In response to survey question ten, "How much confidence do you have on the reliability and accuracy of the following information that school districts release?," the majority indicated high for student achievement data (51.2%), high for student attendance (80.6%), high for annual report to the Department of Public Instruction (58.1%), and medium for public relations information (52.7%). In comparison, the data in the national survey were 30.9 percent, 57.1 percent, NA, and 64.0 percent, respectively (Keough 1992). The question regarding the state department did not appear in the national survey. A plurality of North Dakota principals reported medium for data on student use of drugs and alcohol (48.1%) and high for reports on student discipline action (45.7%). In comparison, the data in the national survey were 58.5 percent and 21.3 percent, respectively (Keough 1992). Overall, the level of confidence for the majority of North Dakota principals is high in all areas except in the area of public relations information and the data on student use of drugs and alcohol which had a medium level of confidence. This indicates that the standard for principals is that accuracy when dispensing information about the school should be the practice.

In response to survey question eleven, "How much confidence do you have in the reliability of the letters of recommendation you have received and you have written?," a substantial majority of principals (70.5%) indicated a medium level of confidence, compared to 70.9 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). A substantial majority of North Dakota principals (66.7%) indicated a high level of confidence in letters of recommendation they have written, compared to 49.9 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). The moderate level of confidence in letters written compared to high level of confidence in letters received

(24.8%) indicates most North Dakota principals value accuracy in writing of recommendation letters, but these same principals are not so sure other principals share that value. Letters received had very few reports of a low level of confidence which indicates some level of confidence in evaluation letters received. No principals had a low level of confidence in letters written. This indicates the standard is accuracy in the writing of recommendations.

In response to survey question twelve, "In light of court decisions in the past five years, how do you perceive the current status of student rights in your district?," a substantial majority (71.3%) reported that student rights strengthened, compared to 41.4 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). None believed that they had weakened. In response to survey question thirteen, "Does the protection of student's human and civil rights make it more difficult to administer the schools in your district effectively?," the majority (52.7%) indicated "no," compared to 53.0 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). Responses to these questions indicate North Dakota principals support student rights and that they believe the school operates as well or better than when these rights were not addressed. These questions considered together indicate the standard for principals is to uphold student rights in the everyday practices in their school.

In response to survey question fourteen, "Is it preferable to protect the Civil Rights of the minority even if the good of the many is compromised?," the majority of principals (51.2%) indicated that it was preferable, compared to 40.6 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). This indicates that the standard of North Dakota principals is that ethical considerations need to protect the civil rights of students in the minority.

In response to survey question fifteen, "Has your administration or administrative team initiated greater parental

involvement in the schools?," a substantial majority (88.4%) indicated "yes," compared to 84.7 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). This indicates that the standard of most principals is that parents should be involved in the school.

In response to survey question sixteen, "Do you think parents should be able to choose the school their child attends?," the principals were nearly evenly divided. There was no clear majority. The highest percentage (34.1%) believed that there should be the choice of another public school in the area, compared to 32.6 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). A second group of principals (32.6%) believed there should be a choice from another public or private school in the area, compared to 20.5 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). A third group of principals (32.6%) believed there should not be a choice, compared to 43.5 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). This indicates that the question is still an issue and that there needs to be more discussion and debate on the issue. A clear standard is not apparent.

In response to survey question seventeen, "Do you think parents should have a greater role in the decision-making process?," a small majority of principals (54.3%) indicated "yes," compared to 52.3 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). Then in response to survey question eighteen, "Do you think parents are competent to assume a greater role in the decision-making process at the building level?," the majority of principals (56.6%) said "yes," compared to 52.7 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). These questions considered together indicate that the standard of a slight majority of principals is to trust parental involvement in decision-making.

In response to survey question nineteen, "How do you implement central office directives with which you disagree?," the majority of principals (60.5%) reported they implement them in the same manner as

policies with which they agree, compared to 64.6 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). Only a very few (0.8%) reported nonimplementation. Then in response to survey question twenty, "How do you implement school board policies with which you disagree?," the majority of principals (66.7%) reported they implement them in the same manner as policies with which they agree, compared to 82.1 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). None reported nonimplementation. These questions considered together indicate that the standard of most principals is to fulfill their duty which involves implementing policies in the school regardless of the origin of the policy. However, comparing the percentages, it seems that the principals feel more duty bound to carrying out school board policies.

In response to survey question twenty-one, "Rate the extent to which you agree with the policies adopted by the school board of your school district," a substantial majority (76.0%) of the principals reported they almost always agreed with newly adopted school district policy, compared to 71.7 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). Another 10.9 percent indicated they always agreed, compared to 9.4 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). This indicates that most principals do not have to make decisions about whether they will implement a new school board policy.

In response to survey question twenty-two, "Have you ever been offered the following gifts by a vendor?," a substantial majority (76.0%) reported that they have not been offered gifts. This question was not asked in the national survey. Of those who had, only wining and dining was of sufficient frequency (13.2%) to warrant statistical analysis. In gift offers received, the percentages were higher in the national survey except use of vacation accommodations. The question does not ask if principals accept gifts, only if they were offered. The

responses to this question indicate that whether principals should accept gifts is a decision they seldom have to make.

In response to survey question twenty-three, "Do you think it is all right to accept personal gifts or services from a vendor?," a substantial majority (76.0%) reported that it was not all right, regardless of the price of the gift, compared to 80.7 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). Then in response to survey question twenty-four, "Have you ever accepted personal gifts or services from vendors?," a substantial majority (89.9%) reported they had not, compared to 90.8 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). These questions considered together indicate that the standard of most principals is not to accept gifts regardless of price, and they follow through on this belief in their practice.

In response to survey question twenty-five, "If 'yes' to question 24, do you think this acceptance influenced a decision in favor of the vendor?," of the sixteen principals who answered, 100 percent indicated that it had not. This indicates that the standard of most principals is not to be influenced by a gift.

In response to survey question twenty-six, "Do you think any of your board members have accepted valuable personal gifts from vendors?," a substantial majority (93.0%) reported "no," compared to 83.4 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). In response to survey question twenty-seven, "If 'yes' to question 26, do you think this acceptance influenced a vote or decision in favor of the vendor?," the eight principals who responded were evenly divided between "yes" (50.0%) and "no" (50.0%). These questions considered together indicate that the standard among school board members, in the eyes of most principals, is to not accept personal gifts from vendors. In the few instances when gifts were accepted, a school board standard was not clearly apparent to the principals regarding whether it influenced a vote in favor of a vendor.

In response to survey question twenty-eight, "Do you think any other administrators in your school district have accepted valuable personal gifts or services from vendors?," the majority of principals (62.8%) indicated they did not, compared to 65.1 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). Then in response to survey question twenty-nine, "If 'yes' to question 28, do you think this acceptance influenced a vote or decision in favor of the vendor?," of the majority of the forty principals who responded, 62.5 percent answered "yes." In response to survey question thirty, "How often do you think other administrators accept gifts or services from vendors worth more than \$10?," the plurality of principals (48.8%) indicated almost never, compared to 53.4 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). These questions considered together seem to indicate that most principals believed that the perceived standard of other administrators is to not accept gifts. It also seemed that those principals who believed that when other principals did accept gifts, the perceived standard for those principals was the gift might influence decisions.

Considering survey questions twenty-two through thirty, the standard is not accepting gifts of values from vendors. In those instances where gifts are accepted, the standard is that these gifts do not influence votes or decisions in favor of a vendor. Principals also indicate this view may not always represent reality.

In response to survey question thirty-one, "Have you ever 'fudged' on a school district expense account?," a substantial majority (96.1%) responded "no," compared to 96.7 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). This indicates that principals agree that the standard should not be "fudged" on a school district expense account.

In response to survey question thirty-two, "Have you ever put valuable school district goods or services to purely personal use?," a substantial majority (85.3%) reported "no," compared to 93.6 percent in

the national survey (Keough 1992). This indicates that the standard for most principals is not to use school property and services for personal use.

In response to survey question thirty-three, "Have you ever ended your contract as principal before its date of completion?," a substantial majority (96.9%) indicated "no." In response to survey question thirty-four, "Do you think it all right to leave your district in the middle of a contract to accept a better position?," a small majority (51.9%) indicated "yes" provided there was school board approval, compared to 59.6 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). Also, there was a substantial minority (24.0%) who indicated never, compared to 11.8 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). This indicates the standard for most principals is not to end their contract without completion.

In response to survey question thirty-five, "If it would further your career, would you hire a consultant who helped place you in your position to do work in your district?," a substantial majority (82.9%) reported "no," compared to 81.9 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). This indicates the standard for most principals is that they should not hire a consultant for work in their district to advance their careers.

In response to survey question thirty-six, "What importance do you place on training in ethics in the academic preparation of an administrator?," the majority of principals (78.3%) reported it to be of great importance, compared to 86.3 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). This indicates that most principals consider training in ethics to be important in their preparation for leadership.

In response to survey question thirty-seven, "How would you rate your own graduate school preparation in ethics?," the plurality of principals (43.4%) reported their training to be average, compared to

28.8 percent in the national survey (Keough 1992). Only 9.3 percent rated their training in ethics as very good and only 0.1% rated it as poor, compared to 13.1 percent and 11.3 percent, respectively, in the national survey (Keough 1992). Considering survey questions thirty-six and thirty-seven together indicates principals see education in ethics as important but are not particularly enthusiastic about the ethics education they received in their preparation program.

In response to survey question thirty-eight, "If your school cannot afford to buy multiple copies of computer program software, would you make copies for student use?," a small majority of principals (57.4%) answered "no." This indicates that the standard for many principals is to make illegal copies of software available for students. This question was not addressed in the national survey.

In response to survey question thirty-nine, "If your school has 10 computers for student use, which group of students would get preference in using them?," a substantial majority (82.9%) reported that all students would be scheduled for computer use. This indicates the standard for principals is that all students should be given opportunity to learn to use computers. This question was not addressed in the national survey.

In response to survey question forty, "What would you do if a school board member requested information about a child with learning problems who is not his/her child?," a substantial majority of principals (82.9%) reported they would politely and diplomatically avoid answering the question. This indicates the standard for principals is that the right to privacy of information and records about individual students is to be protected, even from school board members. This question was not addressed in the national survey.

In response to survey question forty-one, "The movie VCR rental film charges nearly \$90 for a well known film that you desire to have

the students see both for educational value and as a part of the Christmas season. The film is available at the convenience store for \$15. What would you do?," a small plurality of principals (41.9%) indicated they would forego the movie in favor of some other activity. Another group of principals (41.1%) indicated they would buy the film from school funds and place it in the school library. There is not a clear standard. This question was not addressed in the national survey.

In appropriate questions, the national survey was cited by percentage (Keough 1992). Some of the results in the national survey, not reported in the article, were furnished by Dr. Keough's research team to the investigator. Though the North Dakota survey was patterned after the national survey, some questions may be found in one and not in the other.

A few principals commented in the margins, giving either reasons or qualifiers. These comments were noted in the discussion paragraph.

There was also some discussion of variables from tables showing statistical differences. If significant relationships were found for a variable, that variable was discussed. There were forty-one full-time principals (48.2%) who indicated . . ., meaning that it was 48.2 percent of the full-time principals in the comparative analysis. Significant relationships were indicated in the tables, but the percentages, as described in this paragraph, were not presented in the tables.

There were a few questions where it was not deemed feasible to do a comparison analysis. For these questions, frequencies were discussed, but tables were not developed relating to these questions, other than in figure 4. Because some of the frequencies are less than 5, the reader should interpret these results with caution since the low frequency could effect the Chi-square analysis.

The portion of the research question, "the employment of relatives and friends in the workplace," is partially addressed in Table 2. Table 2 reports frequencies regarding employment in the school district of relatives of school board members. Four principals (3.1%) chose not to answer this question. A significant relationship was found between the employment in the school district of relatives of school board members and the portion of time spent in the principalship. In both groups the majority indicated they would not. Forty-one of the eight-five responding full-time principals (48.2%) reported they had employed friends or relatives of school board members, compared to nine

TABLE 2
FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO
EMPLOYMENT IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF
RELATIVES OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	41 (82.0%)	44 (59.5%)	1	7.03**
Part-time principal	9 (18.0%)	30 (40.5%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	28 (54.9%)	29 (39.2%)	2	3.06
6-15 years	13 (25.5%)	24 (32.4%)		
16 or more	10 (19.6%)	21 (28.4%)		
Rural community	22 (43.1%)	40 (55.6%)	1	1.84
Urban community	29 (56.9%)	32 (44.4%)		
Male	38 (74.5%)	58 (78.4%)	1	0.25
Female	13 (25.5%)	16 (21.6%)		
Age				
26-43	11 (21.6%)	25 (34.2%)	2	0.38
44-51	20 (39.2%)	25 (34.2%)		
52-60	20 (39.2%)	23 (31.5%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	16 (31.4%)	19 (25.7%)	2	0.63
6-15	17 (33.3%)	29 (39.2%)		
16-32	18 (35.3%)	26 (35.1%)		

**Significant at .01 level

of the responding part-time principals (23.1%) who had hired relatives of school board members. No significant relationships were found between the employment in the school district of relatives of school board members and years in the current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as a principal.

The portion of the research question, "the employment of relatives and friends in the workplace," is partially addressed in Table 3. Table 3 reports frequencies regarding perceptions as to whether hiring of relatives of school board members was handled ethically. Fifty-one principals who indicated that there were relatives of school board members employed in their school were asked whether these

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS IN SITUATIONS WHERE RELATIVES OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WERE EMPLOYED IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT AS TO THE ETHICAL HANDLING OF SUCH EMPLOYMENT

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	Sometimes	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	32 (82.1%)	4 (100.0%)	5 (62.5%)	2	2.66
Part-time principal	7 (17.9%)	0	3 (37.5%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	21 (52.5%)	2 (50.0%)	6 (75.0%)	4	2.46
6-15 years	10 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)		
16 or more years	9 (22.5%)	1 (25.0%)	0		
Rural community	17 (42.5%)	1 (25.0%)	5 (62.5%)	2	1.73
Urban community	23 (57.5%)	3 (75.0%)	3 (37.5%)		
Male	31 (77.5%)	3 (75.0%)	4 (50.0%)	2	2.57
Female	9 (22.5%)	1 (25.0%)	4 (50.0%)		
Age					
26-43	8 (20.0%)	3 (75.0%)	1 (12.5%)	4	7.40
44-51	17 (42.5%)	0	3 (37.5%)		
52-60	15 (37.5%)	1 (25.0%)	4 (50.0%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	12 (30.0%)	2 (50.0%)	3 (37.5%)	4	1.06
6-15	13 (32.5%)	1 (25.0%)	3 (37.5%)		
16-32	15 (37.5%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)		

employment situations were handled ethically. Fifty-two principals answered the question. No significant relationships were found between the perceptions as to whether the hiring of school board members was handled ethically and time spent as principal, time in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, and years as a principal.

The portion of the research question, "the employment of relatives and friends in the workplace," is partially addressed in Table 4. Table 4 reports frequencies regarding whether relatives or friends of the principal were employed in the school district in which the principal is employed. Four principals (3.1%) chose not to answer this question. A significant relationship was found between whether relatives or friends of the principal were employed in the school district and rural/urban community, gender, and age. Forty-nine of the sixty-one principals responding who were employed in rural districts (80.3%) and thirty-four of the sixty-two principals responding who were employed in urban districts (54.8%) reported they do not have friends or relatives employed in the district. Those who do have would more likely be located in urban communities. The majority of both male principals and female principals indicated they do not have friends or relatives employed in the school district. Those who do would more likely be male. Fifty-six of the ninety-five male principals responding (58.9%) reported they did not have friends or relatives employed in the district, compared to twenty-seven of the thirty female principals (90.0%). The 52-60 age group was more likely to have friends or relatives employed in the school. Twenty-eight of the thirty-six principals in the 26-43 age group (77.8%) and thirty-two of the forty-four principals in the 44-51 age group (72.7%) reported they did not have friends or relatives employed in the district, compared to twenty-two of the forty-four principals in the 52-60 age group (50.0%).

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO EMPLOYMENT
IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF RELATIVES OF THE PRINCIPAL

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	33 (78.6%)	52 (63.4%)	1	2.95
Part-time principal	9 (21.4%)	30 (36.6%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	18 (42.9%)	38 (45.8%)	2	0.29
6-15 years	12 (28.6%)	25 (30.1%)		
16 or more	12 (28.6%)	20 (24.1%)		
Rural community	12 (30.0%)	49 (59.0%)	1	9.10**
Urban community	28 (70.0%)	34 (41.0%)		
Male	39 (92.9%)	56 (67.5%)	1	9.85**
Female	3 (7.1%)	27 (32.5%)		
Age				
26-43	8 (19.0%)	28 (34.1%)	2	8.14*
44-51	12 (28.6%)	32 (39.0%)		
52-60	22 (52.4%)	22 (26.8%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	11 (26.2%)	23 (27.7%)	2	2.68
6-15	12 (28.6%)	34 (41.0%)		
16-32	19 (45.2%)	26 (31.3%)		

*Significant at .05 level

**Significant at .01 level

No significant relationships were found between whether relatives or friends of the principal were employed in the school district and time spent as principal, years in current position, and years as principal.

The portion of the research question, "the employment of relatives and friends in the workplace," is partially addressed in Table 5. Table 5 reports frequencies related to ethical handling of the hiring when relatives of the principal were employed in the school in which the principal is employed. Forty-two principals who had indicated they had relatives employed in the school were asked and forty-three responded. A significant relationship was found between perceptions of

ethical handling and gender. The majority of both male and female principals had indicated that it had been handled ethically; the percentages varied. Thirty-eight of the forty-two male principals (97.4%) perceived that the situation had been handled ethically, compared to three of the four responding female principals (75.0%). One male principal indicated sometimes it was. One female principal indicated it was not. No significant relationships were found between whether the hiring of friends and family of the principal had been handled ethically and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, age, and years as principal.

TABLE 5

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS IN SITUATIONS WHERE RELATIVES OF PRINCIPALS WERE EMPLOYED AS TO THE ETHICAL HANDLING OF THE SITUATION

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	Sometimes	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	33 (80.5%)	1 (100.0%)	0	2	4.09
Part-time principal	8 (19.5%)	0	1 (100.0%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	18 (43.9%)	2 (100.0%)	0	4	3.89
6-15 years	11 (26.8%)	1	1 (100.0%)		
16 or more years	12 (29.3%)	1	0		
Rural community	12 (30.0%)		0	2	0.42
Urban community	28 (70.0%)	1 (100.0%)	0		
Male	38 (92.7%)		1 (100.0%)	2	10.04**
Female	3 (7.3%)	1 (100.0%)	0		
Age					
26-43	7 (17.1%)	1 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)	4	7.92
44-51	12 (29.3%)	0	0		
52-60	22 (53.7%)	0	0		
Years as principal					
0-5	11 (26.8%)	0	0	4	3.60
6-15	12 (29.3%)	1 (100.0%)	0		
16-32	18 (43.9%)	0	1 (100.0%)		

**Significant at .01 level

The portion of the research question, "the employment of relatives and friends in the workplace," is partially addressed in Table 6. Table 6 reports frequencies concerning being "encouraged" to hire a personal friend or relative of a school board member. Four principals (3.1%) chose not to answer this question. No significant relationships were found between being "encouraged" to hire a personal friend or relative of a school board member and time spent as a principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal.

TABLE 6
 FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS
 TO THE "ENCOURAGEMENT" TO HIRE A TEACHER
 WHO WAS A PERSONAL FRIEND OR RELATIVE
 OF A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	16 (76.2%)	69 (67.0%)	1	0.68
Part-time principal	5 (23.8%)	34 (33.0%)		
Current position	12 (57.1%)	44 (42.3%)	2	2.12
0-5 years	6 (28.6%)	31 (29.8%)		
6-15 years	3 (14.3%)	29 (27.9%)		
16 or more				
Rural community	9 (42.9%)	52 (51.0%)	1	0.45
Urban community	12 (57.1%)	59 (49.0%)		
Male	14 (66.7%)	81 (77.9%)	1	1.20
Female	7 (33.3%)	23 (22.1%)		
Age	6 (28.6%)	30 (29.1%)	2	0.72
26-43	9 (42.9%)	35 (34.0%)		
44-51	6 (28.6%)	38 (36.9%)		
52-60				
Years as principal	7 (33.3%)	27 (26.0%)	2	0.74
0-5	8 (38.1%)	38 (26.5%)		
6-15	6 (28.6%)	39 (37.5%)		
16-32				

The portion of the research question, "the employment of relatives and friends in the workplace," is partially addressed in Table 7. Table 7 reports the frequencies of perceptions of the principal as to the degree of bearing that "encouragement" influenced the decision. The twenty-one principals who indicated that they were "encouraged" to hire friends or relatives of school board members were asked to indicate whether this "encouragement" had any bearing upon the decision. Twenty-six responded to the question. A significant relationship was

TABLE 7
FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO
PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS AS TO THE DEGREE
OF BEARING THAT "ENCOURAGEMENT"
INFLUENCED THE DECISION

Principalship Factors	Determining Factor	Some Bearing	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	3 (60.0%)	6 (85.7%)	2	1.71
Part-time principal	2 (40.0%)	1 (14.3%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	2 (40.0%)	6 (85.7%)	4	4.15
6-15 years	2 (40.0%)	1 (14.3%)		
16 or more	1 (20.0%)	0		
Rural community	3 (60.0%)	3 (42.9%)	2	2.33
Urban community	2 (40.0%)	4 (57.1%)		
Male	5 (100.0%)	4 (57.1%)	2	2.86
Female	0	3 (42.9%)		
Age				
26-43	1 (24.0%)	3 (42.9%)	4	11.10*
44-51	4 (80.0%)	3 (42.9%)		
52-60	0	1 (14.3%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	1 (20.0%)	3 (42.9%)	4	5.32
6-15	2 (40.0%)	4 (57.1%)		
16-32	2 (40.0%)	0		

*Significant at .05 level

found between the degree of bearing that "encouragement" influenced the decision and age of the principal. The influence was recorded as being greater in the middle of the age span, 44-51, with the least influence being in effect with those principals fifty-two years of age and older. The 26-43 and 44-51 age groups reported an equal frequency of some influence. No significant relationships were found between the degree of bearing that "encouragement" influenced the decision and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal. One of the principals who answered "yes" commented that he or she had no choice.

The portion of the research question, "the employment of relatives and friends in the workplace," is partially addressed in Table 8. Table 8 reports frequencies concerning whether principals had hired friends or relatives of school board members. Four principals (3.1%) chose not to answer this question. No significant relationships were found between whether a principal had hired friends or relatives of school board members and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal. One principal, who had answered "no," added that he or she did not hire.

The portion of the research question, "the employment of relatives and friends in the workplace," is partially addressed in Table 9. Table 9 reports the frequencies of perceptions of when the principal had hired a friend or relative of a school board member whether that employment situation was handled ethically. The twenty-three principals who had hired friends or relatives of school board members were asked if that hiring had been handled ethically. Twenty-five responded to the question. No significant relationships were found between whether the situations had been handled ethically and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal. One principal, who had answered sometimes, indicated

TABLE 8

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO
WHETHER THE PRINCIPAL HAS EVER HIRED A FRIEND
OR RELATIVE OF A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	18 (78.3%)	67 (66.3%)	1	1.23
Part-time principal	5 (21.7%)	34 (33.7%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	11 (47.8%)	45 (44.1%)	2	0.17
6-15 years	6 (26.1%)	31 (30.4%)		
16 or more	6 (26.2%)	26 (25.5%)		
Rural community	10 (43.5%)	51 (51.0%)	1	0.42
Urban community	13 (56.5%)	49 (49.0%)		
Male	17 (73.9%)	78 (76.5%)	1	0.06
Female	6 (26.1%)	24 (23.5%)		
Age				
26-43	5 (21.7%)	31 (30.7%)	2	0.72
44-51	9 (39.1%)	35 (34.7%)		
52-60	9 (39.1%)	35 (34.7%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	5 (21.7%)	29 (28.4%)	2	0.42
6-15	9 (39.1%)	37 (36.3%)		
16-32	9 (39.1%)	36 (35.3%)		

that when he or she had hired friends or relatives of school board members, it was in a situation where the school board had hiring power and the principal did not. The school board acted against the principal's recommendation.

The portion of the research question, "the process of decision-making," is partially addressed in Table 10. Table 10 reports frequencies of such factors as money/budget, relationships with the faculty/unions, community wishes, board priorities, and impact on students in decision-making. Three principals (2.3%) chose not to answer the question.

TABLE 9

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS WHEN THE PRINCIPAL HAD HIRED A FRIEND OR RELATIVE OF A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER WHETHER THAT EMPLOYMENT SITUATION WAS HANDLED ETHICALLY

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	Sometimes	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	18 (85.7%)	1 (33.3%)	1 (100.0%)	2	0.42
Part-time principal	8 (19.5%)	2 (66.7%)			
Current position					
0-5 years	9 (42.9%)	3 (100.0%)	0	4	6.12
6-15 years	6 (28.6%)	0	0		
16 or more years	6 (28.6%)	0	1 (100.0%)		
Rural community	8 (38.1%)	2 (66.7%)	0	2	1.58
Urban community	13 (61.9%)	1 (33.3%)	1 (100.0%)		
Male	14 (66.7%)	3 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)	2	1.85
Female	7 (33.3%)	0	0		
Age					
26-43	4 (19.0%)	2 (66.7%)	0	4	5.82
44-51	7 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)	1 (100.0%)		
52-60	10 (47.6%)	0	0		
Years as principal					
0-5	3 (14.3%)	2 (66.7%)	0	4	6.42
6-15	9 (42.9%)	1 (33.3%)	0		
16-32	9 (42.9%)	0	1 (100.0%)		

The portion of the research question, "the accuracy of reports and communications," is partially addressed in Table 11. Table 11 reports the confidence in the reliability and accuracy of student achievement data. Three principals (2.3%) chose not to answer this part of the question. A significant relationship was found between perceived reliability and accuracy of information released by schools regarding student attendance and gender. Fifty-two of the ninety-six male principals responding (54.2%) reported high confidence, compared to fourteen of the thirty responding female principals (46.7%). One of the ninety-six male principals responding (1.0%) reported low confidence, compared to four of the thirty female principals (13.3%). No

TABLE 10

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO THOSE
FACTORS CONSIDERED TO BE OF THE GREATEST IMPORTANCE
BY THE PRINCIPAL IN DECISION-MAKING

Principalship Factor	Money	PR w/ Tchrs/Union	Community Wishes	Impact on Students	Board Priorities	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	4 (80.0%)	1 (100.0%)	2 (66.7%)	78 (68.4%)	0	4	5.06
Part-time principal	1 (20.0%)	0	1 (33.3%)	36 (31.6%)	2 (100.0%)		
Current position							
0-5 years	2 (40.0%)	1 (100.0%)	3 (100.0%)	51 (44.3%)	1 (50.0%)	8	5.92
6-15 years	2 (40.0%)	0	0	34 (29.6%)	1 (50.0%)		
16 or more	1 (20.0%)	0	0	30 (26.1%)	0		
Rural community	3 (60.0%)	0	2 (66.7%)	55 (48.7%)	2 (100.0%)	4	3.61
Urban community	2 (40.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1 (33.3%)	58 (51.3%)	0		
Male	5 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1 (33.3%)	86 (74.8%)	2 (100.0%)	4	5.49
Female	0	0	2 (66.7%)	29 (25.2%)	0		
Age							
26-43	1 (20.0%)	0	3 (100.0%)	33 (28.9%)	0	8	11.13
44-51	3 (60.0%)	1 (100.0%)	0	40 (35.1%)	1 (50.0%)		
52-60	1 (20.0%)	0	0	41 (36.0%)	1 (50.0%)		
Years as principal							
0-5	1 (20.0%)	1 (100.0%)	2 (66.7%)	32 (27.8%)	0	8	9.16
6-15	2 (40.0%)	0	1 (33.3%)	44 (38.3%)	0		
16-32	2 (40.0%)	0	0	39 (33.9%)	2 (100.0%)		

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEIVED
RELIABILITY AND ACCURACY OF INFORMATION RELEASED BY
SCHOOLS RELATED TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Principalship Factor	Low	Medium	High	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	3 (60.0%)	35 (64.8%)	48 (72.7%)	2	1.05
Part-time principal	2 (40.0%)	19 (35.2%)	18 (27.3%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	2 (40.0%)	24 (43.6%)	32 (48.5%)	4	3.82
6-15 years	3 (60.0%)	17 (30.9%)	16 (24.2%)		
16 or more	0	14 (25.5%)	18 (27.3%)		
Rural community	3 (60.0%)	28 (51.9%)	30 (46.2%)	2	0.62
Urban community	2 (40.0%)	26 (48.1%)	35 (53.8%)		
Male	1 (20.0%)	43 (78.2%)	52 (78.8%)	2	9.06*
Female	4 (80.0%)	12 (21.8%)	14 (21.2%)		
Age					
26-43	3 (60.0%)	18 (33.3%)	17 (25.8%)	4	4.92
44-51	1 (20.1%)	21 (38.9%)	21 (31.8%)		
52-60	1 (20.0%)	15 (27.8%)	28 (42.4%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	1 (20.0%)	17 (30.9%)	17 (25.8%)	4	1.93
6-15	3 (60.0%)	20 (36.4%)	23 (34.8%)		
16-32	1 (20.0%)	18 (32.7%)	26 (39.4%)		

*Significant at .05 level

significant relationships were found between the accuracy of student achievement data and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, age, and years as principal.

The portion of the research question, "the accuracy of reports and communications," is partially addressed in Table 12. Table 12 reports frequencies regarding the confidence in the reliability and accuracy of student attendance records. Four principals (3.1%) chose not to answer this question. No significant relationships were found between confidence in the reliability and accuracy of reported

attendance records and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, age, gender, or years as principal.

TABLE 12

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEIVED
RELIABILITY AND ACCURACY OF INFORMATION RELEASED BY
SCHOOLS RELATED TO STUDENT ATTENDANCE RECORDS

Principalship Factor	Low	Medium	High	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	0	13 (65.0%)	72 (69.2%)	1	0.13
Part-time principal	0	7 (35.0%)	32 (30.8%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	0	10 (47.6%)	48 (46.2%)	2	0.37
6-15 years	0	5 (23.8%)	31 (29.8%)		
16 or more	0	6 (28.6%)	25 (24.0%)		
Rural community	0	10 (47.6%)	51 (50.0%)	1	0.03
Urban community	0	11 (52.4%)			
Male	0	14 (66.7%)	81 (77.9%)	1	1.20
Female	0	7 (33.3%)	23 (22.1%)		
Age					
26-43	0	7 (33.3%)	31 (30.1%)	2	1.40
44-51	0	9 (42.9%)	34 (33.0%)		
52-60	0	5 (23.8%)	38 (36.9%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	0	7 (33.3%)	28 (26.9%)	2	0.58
6-15	0	8 (38.1%)	38 (36.5%)		
16-32	0	6 (28.6%)	38 (36.5%)		

The portion of the research question, "the accuracy of reports and communications," is partially addressed in Table 13. Table 13 reports frequencies regarding the confidence in the reliability and accuracy of the annual report to the Department of Public Instruction. Four principals (3.1%) chose not to answer this question. No significant relationships were found between confidence in the reliability and accuracy of reports to the Department of Public Instruction and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, age, or years as principal.

TABLE 13

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEIVED RELIABILITY
AND ACCURACY OF INFORMATION RELEASED BY SCHOOLS RELATED
TO THE ANNUAL REPORT TO THE DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (DPI)

Principalship Factor	Low	Medium	High	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	5 (55.6%)	24 (60.0%)	56 (74.7%)	2	3.36
Part-time principal	4 (44.4%)	16 (40.0%)	19 (25.3%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	3 (33.3%)	22 (53.7%)	33 (44.0%)	4	3.92
6-15 years	4 (44.4%)	12 (29.3%)	19 (25.3%)		
16 or more	2 (22.2%)	7 (17.1%)	23 (30.7%)		
Rural community	6 (66.7%)	21 (52.5%)	34 (45.9%)	2	1.57
Urban community	3 (33.3%)	19 (47.5%)	40 (54.1%)		
Male	6 (66.7%)	31 (75.6%)	58 (77.3%)	2	0.50
Female	3 (33.3%)	10 (24.4%)	17 (22.7%)		
Age					
26-43	5 (55.6%)	16 (40.0%)	17 (22.7%)	4	7.61
44-51	3 (33.3%)	13 (32.5%)	27 (36.0%)		
52-60	1 (11.1%)	11 (27.5%)	31 (41.3%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	2 (22.2%)	16 (39.0%)	17 (22.7%)	4	7.93
6-15	5 (55.6%)	16 (39.0%)	25 (33.3%)		
16-32	2 (22.2%)	9 (22.0%)	33 (44.0%)		

The portion of the research question, "the accuracy of reports and communications," is partially addressed in Table 14. Table 14 reports frequencies regarding confidence in the reliability and accuracy of public relations information. Seven principals (5.4%) chose not to answer this question. A significant relationship was found between reliability and accuracy of public relations information and age. The only principals having low confidence were in the 26-43 age group. The greater number of principals had medium confidence about evenly distributed, with the greater number being in the 44-51 age group. Those having high confidence rose as the age increased, with the larger number being in the 52-60 age group. No significant relationships were

TABLE 14

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEIVED
RELIABILITY AND ACCURACY OF INFORMATION RELEASED BY
SCHOOLS RELATED TO PUBLIC RELATIONS INFORMATION

Principalship Factor	Low	Medium	High	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	2 (66.7%)	44 (64.7%)	37 (74.0%)	2	1.16
Part-time principal	1 (33.3%)	24 (35.3%)	13 (26.0%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	2 (50.0%)	32 (47.1%)	24 (48.0%)	4	1.80
6-15 years	2 (50.0%)	19 (27.9%)	13 (26.0%)		
16 or more	0	17 (25.0%)	13 (26.0%)		
Rural community	2 (50.0%)	36 (53.7%)	22 (44.9%)	2	0.88
Urban community	2 (50.0%)	31 (46.3%)	27 (55.1%)		
Male	2 (50.0%)	53 (77.9%)	37 (74.0%)	2	1.68
Female	2 (50.0%)	15 (22.1%)	13 (26.0%)		
Age					
26-43	4 (100.0%)	22 (32.8%)	11 (22.0%)	4	11.16*
44-51	0	24 (35.8%)	19 (38.0%)		
52-60	0	21 (31.3%)	20 (40.0%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	2 (50.0%)	18 (26.5%)	15 (30.0%)	4	5.10
6-15	2 (50.0%)	29 (42.6%)	14 (28.0%)		
16-32	0	21 (30.9%)	21 (42.0%)		

*Significant at .05 level

found between the reliability of public relations information and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, or years as principal.

The portion of the research question, "the accuracy of reports and communications," is partially addressed in Table 15. Table 15 reports frequencies regarding the confidence level in the reliability and accuracy of data reporting student use of alcohol and drugs. Four principals (3.1%) chose not to answer this question. No significant relationships were found between the reporting of student use of alcohol and drugs and time spent as a principal, years in current position,

rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as a principal. One principal, who indicated high confidence, added that he or she did not think this information was released by schools unless the press found out about it in another way.

TABLE 15

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEIVED RELIABILITY AND ACCURACY OF INFORMATION RELEASED BY SCHOOLS RELATED TO REPORTS CONCERNING STUDENT USE OF DRUGS AND ALCOHOL

Principalship Factor	Low	Medium	High	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	8 (61.5%)	38 (62.3%)	39 (78.0%)	2	3.47
Part-time principal	5 (38.5%)	23 (37.7%)	11 (22.0%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	5 (38.5%)	29 (46.8%)	23 (46.0%)	4	1.79
6-15 years	5 (38.5%)	15 (24.2%)	16 (32.0%)		
16 or more	3 (23.1%)	18 (29.0%)	11 (22.0%)		
Rural community	7 (53.8%)	34 (54.8%)	20 (41.7%)	2	1.98
Urban community	6 (46.2%)	28 (45.2%)	28 (58.3%)		
Male	10 (76.9%)	49 (79.0%)	37 (74.0%)	4	0.39
Female	3 (23.1%)	13 (21.0%)	13 (26.0%)		
Age					
26-43	3 (25.0%)	22 (35.5%)	12 (24.0%)	4	1.99
44-51	4 (33.3%)	20 (32.3%)	19 (38.0%)		
52-60	5 (41.7%)	20 (32.3%)	19 (38.0%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	4 (38.8%)	16 (25.8%)	15 (30.0%)	4	2.04
6-15	3 (23.1%)	22 (35.5%)	20 (40.0%)		
16-32	6 (42.2%)	24 (38.7%)	15 (30.0%)		

The portion of the research question, "the accuracy of reports and communications," is partially addressed in Table 16. Table 16 reports frequencies regarding the confidence level in the reliability and accuracy of data reporting student disciplinary actions. Sixteen principals (12.4%) did not answer this question. No significant relationships were found between the reporting of student disciplinary

actions and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal.

TABLE 16

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEIVED RELIABILITY AND ACCURACY OF INFORMATION RELEASED BY SCHOOLS RELATED TO REPORTS ON STUDENT DISCIPLINE ACTIONS

Principalship Factor	Low	Medium	High	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	6 (85.7%)	31 (67.4%)	40 (67.8%)	2	1.00
Part-time principal	1 (14.3%)	15 (32.6%)	19 (32.2%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	5 (71.4%)	19 (40.4%)	31 (52.5%)	4	6.04
6-15 years	0	12 (25.5%)	17 (28.8%)		
16 or more	2 (28.6%)	16 (34.0%)	11 (18.6%)		
Rural community	1 (14.3%)	26 (56.5%)	29 (50.0%)	2	4.34
Urban community	6 (85.7%)	20 (43.6%)	29 (50.0%)		
Male	5 (71.4%)	36 (76.6%)	48 (81.4%)	2	0.59
Female	2 (28.6%)	11 (23.4%)	11 (18.6%)		
Age					
26-43	1 (16.7%)	11 (23.4%)	23 (39.0%)	4	5.47
44-51	2 (33.3%)	22 (46.8%)	17 (28.8%)		
52-60	3 (50.0%)	14 (29.8%)	19 (32.2%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	3 (42.9%)	12 (25.3%)	19 (32.2%)	4	1.84
6-15	2 (28.6%)	15 (31.9%)	21 (35.6%)		
16-32	2 (28.6%)	20 (42.6%)	19 (32.2%)		

The portion of the research question, "the accuracy of written and received letters of recommendation," is partially addressed in Table 17. Table 17 reports frequencies regarding the confidence in reliability of letters of recommendation the principal has received. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer the question. No significant relationships were found between letters of recommendation received and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal.

TABLE 17

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS
OF RELIABILITY OF RECOMMENDATION LETTERS BOTH RECEIVED
AND WRITTEN RELATED TO THE RELIABILITY OF
RECOMMENDATION LETTERS RECEIVED

Principalship Factor	Low	Medium	High	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	4 (80.0%)	61 (67.8%)	23 (71.9%)	2	0.46
Part-time principal	1 (20.0%)	29 (32.2%)	9 (28.1%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	3 (60.0%)	39 (42.9%)	18 (56.3%)	4	3.50
6-15 years	2 (40.0%)	27 (29.7%)	8 (25.0%)		
16 or more	0	25 (27.5%)	6 (18.8%)		
Rural community	3 (60.0%)	45 (50.6%)	14 (43.8%)	2	0.67
Urban community	2 (40.0%)	44 (49.4%)	18 (56.3%)		
Male	5 (100.0%)	70 (76.9%)	23 (71.9%)	2	1.92
Female	0	21 (23.1%)	9 (28.1%)		
Age					
26-43	1 (20.0%)	27 (29.7%)	10 (32.3%)	4	1.38
44-51	3 (60.0%)	32 (35.2%)	11 (35.5%)		
52-60	1 (20.0%)	32 (35.2%)	10 (32.3%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	1 (20.0%)	22 (24.2%)	13 (40.6%)	4	4.46
6-15	3 (60.0%)	34 (37.4%)	10 (31.3%)		
16-32	1 (20.0%)	35 (38.5%)	9 (28.1%)		

The portion of the research question, "the accuracy of written and received letters of recommendation," is partially addressed in Table 18. Table 18 reports frequencies regarding confidence in reliability of letters of recommendation the principal has sent. No significant relationships were found between reliability of letters sent and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer the question.

The portion of the research question, "the student rights in school," is partially addressed in Table 19. Table 19 reports frequencies regarding the perceived current status of student civil

TABLE 18

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS
OF RELIABILITY OF RECOMMENDATION LETTERS BOTH RECEIVED
AND WRITTEN RELATED TO THE RELIABILITY OF
RECOMMENDATION LETTERS WRITTEN

Principalship Factor	Low	Medium	High	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	0	29 (69.0%)	59 (69.4%)	1	0.00
Part-time principal	0	13 (31.0%)	26 (30.6%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	0	17 (40.5%)	42 (48.8%)	2	3.86
6-15 years	0	10 (23.8%)	27 (31.4%)		
16 or more	0	15 (35.7%)	17 (19.8%)		
Rural community	0	22 (53.7%)	40 (47.1%)	1	0.48
Urban community	0	19 (46.3%)	45 (52.9%)		
Male	0	36 (85.7%)	62 (72.1%)	1	2.91
Female	0	6 (14.3%)	24 (27.9%)		
Age					
26-43	0	9 (21.4%)	28 (32.9%)	2	1.95
44-51	0	16 (38.1%)	30 (35.3%)		
52-60	0	17 (40.5%)	27 (31.8%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	0	9 (21.4%)	26 (30.2%)	2	1.64
6-15	0	15 (35.7%)	32 (37.2%)		
16-32	0	18 (42.9%)	28 (32.6%)		

rights in their own school district. A significant relationship was found between the status of student civil rights and years in current position. More of the principals believed the student civil rights had strengthened. Twenty-three of the thirty-two principals who have held their current positions for sixteen or more years (71.9%) and fifty of the fifty-nine principals who have held their current positions five years or less (84.7%) reported student civil rights had strengthened, compared to nineteen of the thirty-seven principals who held their current positions six to fifteen years (51.4%).

The portion of the research question, "the student rights in school," is partially addressed in Table 20. Table 20 reports whether

TABLE 19

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO AFFECTS OF
COURT DECISIONS IN STRENGTHENING OR
WEAKENING STUDENT RIGHTS

Principalship Factor	Rights Have:			DF	χ^2
	Weakened	Strengthened	Stayed Same		
Full-time principal	0	25 (67.6%)	63 (69.2%)	1	0.03
Part-time principal	0	12 (32.4%)	28 (30.8%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	0	10 (27.0%)	50 (54.3%)	2	11.45**
6-15 years	0	18 (48.6%)	19 (20.7%)		
16 or more	0	9 (24.3%)	23 (25.0%)		
Rural community	0	20 (55.6%)	43 (47.3%)	1	0.71
Urban community	0	16 (44.4%)	48 (52.7%)		
Male	0	26 (70.3%)	72 (78.3%)	1	0.92
Female	0	11 (29.7%)	20 (21.7%)		
Age					
26-43	0	12 (32.4%)	26 (28.6%)	2	2.43
44-51	0	16 (43.2%)	30 (33.0%)		
52-60	0	9 (24.3%)	35 (38.5%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	0	7 (18.9%)	29 (31.5%)	2	2.79
6-15	0	17 (45.9%)	30 (32.6%)		
16-32	0	13 (35.1%)	33 (35.9%)		

**Significant at .01 level

the protection of student human and civil rights hinders the effective administration of schools. Three principals (2.3%) chose not to answer this question. There was a significant relationship between whether the protection of student human and civil rights hinders the effective administration of schools and years in current position. Twenty-eight of the thirty-seven principals who have held their current positions for six to fifteen years (75.7%) and sixteen of the thirty principals who have held their positions sixteen or more years (53.3%) reported they did not see a hinderance to effective school administration, compared to thirty-five of the fifty-nine principals who have held their positions

TABLE 20

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS
ABOUT THE DIFFICULTY OF ADMINISTERING SCHOOLS
BASED ON STUDENT HUMAN AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Principalship Factor	Does It Effect?		DF	χ^2
	Yes	No		
Full-time principal	38 (65.5%)	48 (71.6%)	1	0.54
Part-time principal	20 (34.5%)	19 (28.4%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	35 (60.3%)	24 (35.3%)	2	11.21**
6-15 years	9 (15.5%)	28 (41.2%)		
16 or more	14 (24.1%)	16 (23.5%)		
Rural community	32 (57.1%)	30 (44.1%)	1	2.08
Urban community	24 (42.9%)	38 (55.9%)		
Male	46 (79.3%)	49 (72.1%)	1	2.08
Female	12 (20.7%)	19 (27.9%)		
Age				
26-43	17 (29.8%)	21 (30.9%)	2	0.54
44-51	19 (33.3%)	26 (38.2%)		
52-60	21 (36.8%)	21 (30.9%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	20 (34.5%)	16 (23.5%)	2	2.89
6-15	17 (29.8%)	29 (42.6%)		
16-32	21 (36.2%)	23 (33.3%)		

**Significant at .01 level

less than five years (59.3%) who reported it did hinder administration. No significant relationships were found between whether the protection of student human and civil rights hinders the administration of school and the time spent as principal, rural/urban community, gender, age, and years as principal. One of the principals, who answered "no," added the qualifying thought unless one counted the principal's being more careful to document. One of the principals, who answered "yes," added that parent's interpretation of student's rights was a factor.

The portion of the research question, "the student rights in school," is partially addressed in Table 21. Table 21 reports

frequencies regarding whether it was preferable to protect the civil rights of the minority even if the good of the many is compromised was a question. Thirteen principals (10.1%) chose not to answer this question. No significant relationships were found between whether it was preferable to protect the civil rights of the minority even if the good of many is compromised and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal. One principal, who did not answer, commented that sometimes it was preferable and sometimes not, indicating a point midway between "yes" and "no." One principal, who answered "no," added that "sometimes educators have gone too far in some individual circumstances--to the

TABLE 21

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS AS TO WHETHER IT IS PREFERABLE TO PROTECT THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE MINORITY EVEN IF THE GOOD OF THE MANY IS COMPROMISED

Principalship Factor	Is It Preferable?		DF	χ^2
	Yes	No		
Full-time principal	47 (71.2%)	30 (61.2%)	1	1.26
Part-time principal	19 (28.8%)	19 (38.8%)		
Current position			2	1.16
0-5 years	34 (51.5%)	21 (42.0%)		
6-15 years	18 (27.3%)	15 (30.0%)		
16 or more	14 (21.2%)	14 (28.0%)		
Rural community	29 (44.6%)	29 (58.0%)	1	2.02
Urban community	36 (55.4%)	21 (42.0%)		
Male	49 (74.2%)	40 (80.0%)	1	0.52
Female	17 (25.8%)	10 (20.0%)		
Age			2	0.27
26-43	21 (31.8%)	14 (28.6%)		
44-51	25 (37.9%)	18 (36.7%)		
52-60	20 (30.3%)	17 (34.7%)		
Years as principal			2	2.31
0-5	23 (34.8%)	11 (22.0%)		
6-15	21 (31.8%)	20 (40.0%)		
16-32	22 (33.3%)	19 (38.0%)		

point of the ridiculous." One principal, who had not answered, commented that "it was most important that we protect the civil rights of all [emphasis added] people."

The portion of the research question, "the parental involvement in decision-making," is addressed in Table 22. Table 22 reports frequencies regarding whether the administrator or administration team has initiated a greater parental involvement in the school. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer this question. Significant relationships were found between initiation of greater parental

TABLE 22

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO THE INITIATION OF PRACTICES BY THE PRINCIPAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE TEAM FOR GREATER PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

Principalship Factor	Initiated by Your School?		DF	χ^2
	Yes	No		
Full-time principal	85 (75.2%)	3 (21.4%)	1	16.93***
Part-time principal	28 (24.8%)	11 (78.6%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	53 (46.5%)	7 (50.0%)	2	0.08
6-15 years	33 (28.9%)	4 (28.6%)		
16 or more	28 (24.6%)	3 (21.4%)		
Rural community	51 (45.5%)	11 (78.6%)	1	5.43*
Urban community	61 (54.5%)	3 (21.4%)		
Male	87 (76.3%)	11 (78.6%)	1	0.03
Female	27 (23.7%)	3 (21.4%)		
Age				
26-43	32 (28.3%)	6 (42.9%)	2	1.26
44-51	42 (37.2%)	4 (28.6%)		
52-60	39 (34.5%)	4 (28.6%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	31 (27.2%)	5 (35.7%)	2	0.60
6-15	43 (37.7%)	4 (28.6%)		
16-32	40 (35.1%)	5 (35.7%)		

*Significant at .05 level

***Significant at the .001 level

involvement and both time spent as principal and rural/urban community. Both full-time and part-time principals indicated that parental involvement had been initiated. However, the percentage of full-time principals so responding was substantially greater than for the part-time principals. Eighty-five of the eighty-eight full-time principals responding (97.3%) reported initiation of practices for greater parental involvement, compared to twenty-eight of the thirty-nine part-time principals responding (71.8%). Principals in both rural and urban communities indicated initiation of parental involvement. However, the percentage from urban communities was substantially greater than the percentage from rural communities. Sixty-one of the sixty-four principals employed in urban districts reported initiation of practices for greater parental involvement (95.3%), compared to fifty-one of the sixty-two principals employed in rural districts (82.3%). No significant relationships were found between initiation of parental involvement and years in current position, gender, age, or years as principal. One principal commented, "This was something schools must work on all of the time." One principal, who had answered "no," indicated there needed to be involvement at a greater level than was currently being done.

The portion of the research question, "the choice of schools," is addressed in Table 23. Table 23 reports frequencies regarding parental choice of which school their children attend. One principal (0.8%) did not answer this question. No significant relationships were found between parental choice of which school their children attend and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal. Two principals, who had answered "yes, from other schools in the area," added that "this would be dependent on space available." A principal, who did not answer, commented "yes and no" for public and private. One principal, who had

TABLE 23

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS
OF PRINCIPALS AS TO THE RIGHT OF PARENTS TO HAVE CHOICE
OF SCHOOLS WHICH THEIR CHILDREN ATTEND

Principalship Factor	Choice in the Area?			DF	χ^2
	Yes fr/Public School	Yes fr/Public or Private	No		
Full-time principal	31 (72.1%)	28 (66.7%)	28 (66.7%)	2	0.38
Part-time principal	12 (27.9%)	14 (33.3%)	14 (33.3%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	23 (52.3%)	20 (47.6%)	16 (38.1%)	4	4.10
6-15 years	13 (29.5%)	13 (31.0%)	11 (26.2%)		
16 or more	8 (18.2%)	9 (21.4%)	15 (35.7%)		
Rural community	21 (50.0%)	24 (57.1%)	17 (40.5%)	2	2.34
Urban community	21 (50.0%)	18 (42.9%)	25 (59.5%)		
Male	33 (75.0%)	28 (66.7%)	37 (88.1%)	2	5.45
Female	11 (25.0%)	14 (33.3%)	5 (11.9%)		
Age					
26-43	10 (22.7%)	14 (34.1%)	13 (31.0%)	4	3.22
44-51	18 (40.9%)	16 (39.0%)	12 (28.6%)		
52-60	16 (36.4%)	11 (26.8%)	17 (40.6%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	9 (20.5%)	18 (42.9%)	8 (19.0%)	4	8.88
6-15	20 (45.5%)	12 (28.6%)	15 (35.7%)		
16-32	15 (34.1%)	12 (28.6%)	19 (45.2%)		

answered "public schools," and one principal, who had answered "public and private," indicated that students should have the right to attend private schools, but those students should not receive public funds.

Several questions were asked on the survey that were not compared with the variables and not tested by Chi-square. However, totals were tabulated. The first of these was whether parents should have a greater role in decision-making. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer this question. One of the principals who answered "yes" added that "most of the parents don't care and so choose not to be involved." One of the principals, who answered "yes," added "this was especially

true in sharing of mutual concerns between principal and parent." One principal commented that parents were involved in decision-making. The same principal indicated that parents needed to be informed and their approval given.

It was asked if principals considered parents to be competent to assume a greater role in building level decision-making. Six principals (4.7%) chose not to answer this question. Two of the principals, who answered "no," and one principal who had chosen not to answer indicated that some parents were capable and some were not. One of these principal added that "this was the principal's job, not the parent's." Two principals, who answered "yes," added that it was a "qualified yes with some." One principal, who answered "yes," commented that "parents were competent, but not adequately informed." One principal, who had chosen not to answer, commented that this was a question about which he or she was not sure.

How principals implemented central office directives with which they disagree was considered. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer this question.

How principals implemented board policies with which they disagree was considered. A principal who implemented the same as always commented that "this would be so if the principal could not bring about a change of policy."

The principals were asked to what degree they tended to agree with policies adopted by the school board--choices being never, almost never, moderate, almost always, and always. Two principals (1.6%) chose not to answer this question.

People sometimes hear of vendors offering gifts as a means of garnering the good will of persons that can give them the "competitive edge." Literature indicated that this was true, not only in business but also in education.

The portion of the research question, "the acceptance of gifts and their influence on decisions," is partially addressed in Table 24. Table 24 reports frequencies regarding the offer of gifts. Gifts considered were jewelry, sporting tickets, consulting work, money,

TABLE 24

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO WHETHER THE PRINCIPAL HAS RECEIVED OFFERS OF GIFTS FROM VENDORS RELATED TO THE ACCEPTANCE OF ALL GIFTS (EXCEPT WINING AND DINING)

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Jewelry				
Portion of time prin.	3 (2.3%)	125 (97.7%)	1	0.00
Time current position	3 (2.3%)	126 (97.7%)	2	2.42
Size of community	3 (2.4%)	124 (97.6%)	1	0.35
Gender	3 (2.3%)	126 (97.7%)	1	0.97
Age	3 (2.3%)	125 (97.7%)	2	1.84
Years as principal	3 (2.3%)	126 (97.7%)	2	0.04
Sporting tickets				
Portion of time prin.	4 (3.1%)	124 (96.9%)	1	0.07
Current position	4 (3.1%)	125 (96.9%)	2	4.74
Size of community	4 (3.1%)	123 (96.9%)	1	1.06
Gender	4 (3.1%)	125 (96.9%)	1	0.00
Age	4 (3.1%)	124 (96.9%)	2	0.81
Years as principal	4 (3.1%)	125 (96.9%)	2	4.91
Consulting work				
Portion of time prin.	1 (0.8%)	127 (99.2%)	1	2.21
Current position	1 (0.8%)	128 (99.2%)	2	1.15
Size of community	1 (0.8%)	126 (99.2%)	1	1.02
Gender	1 (0.8%)	128 (99.2%)	1	0.31
Age	1 (0.8%)	128 (99.2%)	2	2.60
Money				
Portion of time prin.	1 (0.8%)	127 (99.2%)	2	2.60
Current position	1 (0.8%)	128 (99.2%)	2	2.50
Size of community	1 (0.8%)	126 (99.2%)	1	0.99
Gender	1 (0.8%)	128 (99.2%)	1	0.31
Age	1 (0.8%)	127 (99.2%)	2	2.38
Years as principal	1 (0.8%)	128 (99.2%)	2	1.75
Vacation				
Portion of time prin.	3 (2.3%)	125 (97.7%)	2	1.39
Current position	3 (2.3%)	126 (97.7%)	2	3.16
Size of community	3 (2.3%)	124 (97.6%)	1	0.32
Gender	3 (2.3%)	126 (97.7%)	1	0.97
Age	3 (2.3%)	125 (97.7%)	2	1.72
Years as principal	3 (2.3%)	126 (97.7%)	2	1.69

TABLE 24--Cont.

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Travel				
Portion of time prin.	0	128 (100.0%)		
Current position	0	129 (100.0%)		
Size of community	0	127 (100.0%)		
Gender	0	129 (100.0%)		
Age	0	128 (100.0%)		
Years as principal	0	129 (100.0%)		
Recreation				
Portion of time prin.	1 (0.8%)	127 (99.2%)	1	2.21
Time current position	1 (0.8%)	128 (99.2%)	2	1.15
Size of community	1 (0.8%)	126 (99.2%)	1	1.02
Gender	1 (0.8%)	128 (99.2%)	1	0.31
Age	1 (0.8%)	127 (99.2%)	2	1.92
Years as principal	1 (0.8%)	128 (99.2%)	2	2.60
Sex				
Portion of time prin.	0	128 (100.0%)		
Current position	0	129 (100.0%)		
Size of community	0	127 (100.0%)		
Gender	0	129 (100.0%)		
Age	0	128 (100.0%)		
Years as principal	0	129 (100.0%)		
Drugs or alcohol				
Portion of time prin.	2 (1.6%)	126 (98.4%)	1	
Current position	2 (1.6%)	127 (98.4%)	2	
Size of community	2 (1.6%)	125 (98.4%)	1	
Gender	2 (1.6%)	127 (98.4%)	1	
Age	2 (1.6%)	126 (98.4%)	2	
Years as principal	2 (1.6%)	127 (98.4%)	2	
Other				
Portion of time prin.	8 (6.3%)	128 (93.8%)	1	0.15
Current position	8 (6.2%)	121 (93.8%)	2	2.20
Size of community	7 (5.5%)	120 (94.5%)	1	0.16
Gender	8 (6.2%)	121 (93.8%)	1	2.69
Age	8 (6.3%)	120 (93.8%)	2	1.34
Years as principal	8 (6.2%)	121 (93.8%)	2	2.75

vacation accommodations, travel, recreation, sex, drugs or alcohol, and wining and dining. Also considered was frequency of principals who had not received offers of gifts. The frequencies were so skewed that analysis was not meaningful in all of the preceding except wining and dining and not receiving offers. Table 24 also reports the acceptance

of all gifts other than wining and dining. When the answer was other gifts, the principal was asked to specify. Some of the specified other gifts were clothes (1), flowers (1), food (1), candy (2), calendars (1), pins (1), books (1), gifts (1) (what the gifts were not specified), coffee cup (1), pens (1), television (1), computer (1), fishing gear (1), t shirt (1).

The portion of the research question, "the acceptance of gifts and their influence on decisions," is partially addressed in Table 25. Table 25 reports frequencies regarding the offer of wining and dining.

TABLE 25

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO WHETHER
THE PRINCIPAL HAS RECEIVED OFFERS OF GIFTS FROM VENDORS
RELATED TO WINING AND DINING

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	14 (82.4%)	74 (66.7%)	1	1.68
Part-time principal	3 (17.6%)	37 (33.3%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	8 (47.1%)	52 (46.4%)	2	0.01
6-15 years	5 (29.4%)	32 (28.6%)		
16 or more	4 (23.5%)	28 (25.0%)		
Rural community	4 (25.0%)	59 (53.2%)	1	4.43*
Urban community	12 (75.0%)	52 (46.8%)		
Male	16 (94.1%)	82 (73.2%)	1	3.53
Female	1 (5.9%)	30 (26.8%)		
Age				
26-43	5 (29.4%)	33 (29.7%)	2	0.49
44-51	5 (29.4%)	41 (36.9%)		
52-60	7 (41.2%)	37 (33.3%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	3 (17.6%)	33 (29.5%)	2	2.64
6-15	5 (29.4%)	42 (37.5%)		
16-32	9 (52.9%)	37 (33.0%)		

*Significant at .05 level

A significant relationship was found between the offer of wining and dining as a gift to the principal and rural/urban community. Though such offers exist in both, 6.3 percent of the principals in rural communities had received such an offer compared to 18.8 percent of the principals in urban communities.

The portion of the research question, "the acceptance of gifts and their influence on decisions," is partially addressed in Table 26. Table 26 reports frequencies regarding not being offered gifts. These data were somewhat skewed. A significant relationship was found between

TABLE 26

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO WHETHER
THE PRINCIPAL HAS RECEIVED OFFERS OF GIFTS FROM VENDORS
RELATED TO NONE OF THESE

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	X ²
Full-time principal	66 (68.0%)	22 (71.0%)	1	0.09
Part-time principal	31 (32.0%)	9 (29.0%)		
Current position			2	3.92
0-5 years	47 (48.0%)	13 (41.9%)		
6-15 years	24 (24.5%)	13 (41.9%)		
16 or more	27 (27.6%)	5 (16.1%)		
Rural community	51 (52.0%)	12 (41.4%)	1	1.01
Urban community	47 (48.0%)	17 (58.6%)		
Male	69 (70.4%)	29 (93.5%)	1	6.90*
Female	29 (29.6%)	2 (6.5%)		
Age			2	0.51
26-43	28 (28.9%)	10 (32.3%)		
44-51	34 (35.1%)	12 (38.7%)		
52-60	35 (36.1%)	9 (29.0%)		
Years as principal			2	0.87
0-5	29 (29.6%)	7 (22.6%)		
6-15	36 (36.7%)	11 (35.5%)		
16-32	33 (33.7%)	13 (41.9%)		

*Significant at .05 level

not being offered gifts and gender. Twenty-nine of the ninety-eight male principals responding (29.6%) reported they had not received offers of gifts, compared to two of the thirty-one female principals responding (6.5%).

The portion of the research question, "the acceptance of gifts and their influence on decisions," is partially addressed in Table 27. Table 27 reports frequencies regarding what constitutes acceptable gifts from vendors. No significant relationships were found between this question and the considered variables. The analysis broke down to "yes, for gifts under \$10"; "yes, for gifts under \$50"; "yes, for any gift regardless of value"; and "no gift accepted regardless of value." Other choices on the survey were not chosen by the principals. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer this question. One principal, who indicated "yes, regardless of value," added a qualifier: "if it was something one could give to the school." A principal who answered "yes, under \$10" substituted \$5 for the \$10 and added that small gifts/samples such as cups and pens were okay. One principal, who answered "yes, if under \$10," commented that "no other gifts should be accepted whether they be gifts or samples." One principal, who answered "no, regardless of value," commented that he or she also never purchased from vendors who offered gifts such as televisions, computers, and fishing gear.

The portion of the research question, "the acceptance of gifts and their influence on decisions," is partially addressed in Table 28. Table 28 reports frequencies regarding whether the principal had ever accepted a gift of more than \$10 from a vendor. No significant relationships were found between whether principals had accepted gifts and time spent as a principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer the question. A principal, who had accepted gifts, indicated the gift was candy samples. A principal, who had accepted

TABLE 27

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS
OF PRINCIPALS AS TO WHAT IS PERMISSIBLE
IN REGARD TO THE ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS

Principalship Factor	<\$10	Yes if: <\$50	Any Value	No: Any Value	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	15 (68.2%)	3 (75.0%)	6 (75.0%)	63 (67.7%)	3	0.26
Part-time principal	7 (31.8%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)	30 (32.3%)		
Current position						
0-5 years	8 (36.4%)	4 (100.0%)	4 (50.0%)	43 (45.7%)	6	9.04
6-15 years	10 (45.5%)	0	1 (12.5%)	26 (27.7%)		
16 or more	4 (18.2%)	0	3 (37.5%)	25 (26.6%)		
Rural community	11 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	5 (62.5%)	45 (48.9%)	3	0.54
Urban community	11 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	3 (37.5%)	47 (51.1%)		
Male	14 (63.6%)	4 (100.0%)	6 (75.0%)	73 (77.7%)	3	3.22
Female	8 (36.4%)	0	2 (25.0%)	21 (22.3%)		
Age						
26-43	4 (18.2%)	2 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	30 (32.3%)	6	4.36
44-51	10 (45.5%)	2 (50.0%)	3 (37.5%)	30 (32.3%)		
52-60	8 (36.4%)	0	3 (37.5%)	33 (35.5%)		
Years as principal						
0-5	6 (27.3%)	3 (75.0%)	1 (12.5%)	26 (27.7%)	6	8.36
6-15	11 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	3 (37.5%)	32 (34.0%)		
16-32	5 (22.7%)	0	4 (50.0%)	36 (38.3%)		

gifts, indicated the gift was books, which he or she gave to the school. In conjunction to the question presented in Table 28, the twelve principals who had answered "yes" were asked if this acceptance influenced a decision in favor of the vendor. Sixteen principals (12.4%) chose to answer the question. This is not shown in a table.

TABLE 28

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS AND WHETHER THE PRINCIPAL HAS EVER ACCEPTED A GIFT OF MORE THAN \$10

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	10 (83.3%)	77 (67.0%)	1	1.35
Part-time principal	2 (16.7%)	38 (33.0%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	5 (41.7%)	54 (46.6%)	2	0.14
6-15 years	4 (33.3%)	33 (28.4%)		
16 or more	3 (25.0%)	29 (25.0%)		
Rural community	3 (25.0%)	60 (52.6%)	1	3.31
Urban community	9 (75.0%)	54 (47.4%)		
Male	10 (83.3%)	87 (75.0%)	1	0.41
Female	2 (16.7%)	29 (25.0%)		
Age				
26-43	5 (41.7%)	33 (28.7%)	2	1.02
44-51	3 (25.0%)	42 (36.5%)		
52-60	4 (33.3%)	40 (34.8%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	2 (16.7%)	34 (29.3%)	2	0.86
6-15	5 (41.7%)	42 (36.2%)		
16-32	5 (41.7%)	40 (34.5%)		

The portion of the research question, "the acceptance of gifts and their influence on decisions," is partially addressed in Table 29. Table 29 reports frequencies regarding whether principals believed school board members accepted gifts. Three principals (2.3%) chose not to answer the question. No significant relationships were found between whether principals believed their school board members accepted gifts

and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, age, gender, or years as principal.

TABLE 29
FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO
PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS AS TO WHETHER SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS ACCEPT GIFTS FROM VENDORS

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	4 (80.0%)	81 (67.5%)	1	0.34
Part-time principal	1 (20.0%)	39 (32.5%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	3 (50.0%)	55 (45.8%)	2	0.49
6-15 years	1 (16.7%)	35 (29.2%)		
16 or more	2 (33.3%)	30 (25.0%)		
Rural community	3 (50.0%)	60 (50.8%)	1	0.00
Urban community	3 (50.0%)	58 (49.2%)		
Male	4 (66.7%)	92 (76.7%)	1	0.31
Female	2 (33.3%)	28 (23.3%)		
Age				
26-43	2 (33.3%)	36 (30.3%)	2	0.89
44-51	3 (50.0%)	42 (35.3%)		
52-60	1 (16.7%)	41 (34.5%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	3 (50.0%)	33 (27.5%)	2	0.42
6-15	1 (16.7%)	45 (37.5%)		
16-32	2 (33.3%)	42 (35.0%)		

The six principals who had answered "yes" were to indicate if they believed it influenced the vote or decision in favor of the vendor. Eight principals responded. One of the six principals who had answered "yes" in the prior question did not answer this question, indicating that he or she did not know.

The portion of the research question, "the acceptance of gifts and their influence on decisions," is partially addressed in Table 30. Table 30 reports frequencies regarding whether principals believed other

administrators in their school district accepted gifts. Ten principals (7.8%) chose not to answer this question. A significant relationship was found between whether principals believed other administrators in the district accepted gifts and time spent as principal and whether

TABLE 30

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS
OF PRINCIPALS AS TO WHETHER OTHER ADMINISTRATORS IN
THEIR DISTRICT ACCEPT GIFTS FROM VENDORS

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	31 (81.6%)	49 (60.5%)	1	5.21*
Part-time principal	7 (18.4%)	32 (39.5%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	18 (47.4%)	37 (45.7%)	2	0.16
6-15 years	11 (28.9%)	22 (27.2%)		
16 or more	9 (23.7%)	22 (27.2%)		
Rural community	14 (36.8%)	49 (62.0%)	1	6.54*
Urban community	24 (63.2%)	30 (38.0%)		
Male	29 (76.3%)	62 (76.5%)	1	0.00
Female	9 (23.7%)	19 (23.5%)		
Age				
26-43	9 (23.7%)	27 (33.8%)	2	1.28
44-51	15 (39.5%)	26 (32.5%)		
52-60	14 (36.8%)	27 (33.8%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	10 (26.3%)	23 (28.4%)	2	0.15
6-15	13 (34.2%)	29 (35.8%)		
16-32	15 (39.5%)	29 (35.8%)		

*Significant at .05 level

located in a rural or urban community. Though the majority of both full-time and part-time principals indicated they did not believe other administrators in their school district accepted gifts, the balance was different. Forty-nine of the eighty full-time principals responding (61.2%), compared to thirty-two of the thirty-nine part-time principals (82.1%), show the disparity in the balance. In comparing the responses

from rural and urban communities, forty-nine of the fifty-three principals employed in rural districts (92.5%) reported a negative, compared to thirty of the fifty-four principals employed in urban districts (55.6%). No significant relationships were found between whether principals believed that other administrators in their school district accepted gifts and years in current position, gender, age, or years as principal.

The thirty-eight principals who had answered "yes" were asked if they thought this influenced decisions in favor of the vendor. Forty principals responded. One of the thirty-eight principals who had answered "yes" to the prior question did not answer this follow-up question, since he or she was not sure.

The portion of the research question, "the acceptance of gifts and their influence on decisions," is partially addressed in Table 31. Table 31 reports frequencies regarding how often the principals believed other principals accept gifts, with the options being, never, almost never, medium, almost always, and always. Eight principals (6.2%) chose not to answer this question. A significant relationship was found between how often it was believed other principals accepted gifts and age. The greater percentage of principals in each age group indicated almost never. In the 26-43 and 52-60 age groups, the majority (67.6% and 53.7%, respectively) indicated they believed this to be true. The 44-51 age group was the only group that indicated almost always (9.5%) by some of the principals, with almost never indicated by the greater number (38.1%).

The portion of the research question, "the appropriate management of budgets and budgetary monies," is addressed in Table 32. Table 32 reports frequencies regarding whether principals have "fudged" a budget account. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer this question. No significant relationships were found between "fudged"

TABLE 31

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS
AS TO HOW OFTEN OTHER ADMINISTRATORS ACCEPT GIFTS

Principalship Factor	Never	Seldom	Medium	Often	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	22 (78.6%)	41 (66.1%)	16 (61.5%)	3 (75.0%)	3	1.97
Part-time principal	6 (21.4%)	21 (33.9%)	10 (38.5%)	1 (25.0%)		
Current position						
0-5 years	13 (46.4%)	31 (49.2%)	10 (38.5%)	2 (50.0%)	6	2.95
6-15 years	6 (21.4%)	20 (31.7%)	9 (34.6%)	1 (25.0%)		
16 or more	9 (32.1%)	12 (19.0%)	7 (26.9%)	1 (25.0%)		
Rural community	12 (42.9%)	29 (46.8%)	18 (69.2%)	3 (75.0%)	3	5.54
Urban community	16 (57.1%)	33 (53.2%)	8 (30.8%)	1 (25.0%)		
Male	19 (67.9%)	54 (85.7%)	17 (65.4%)	3 (75.0%)	3	5.98
Female	9 (32.1%)	9 (14.3%)	9 (34.6%)	1 (25.0%)		
Age						
26-43	5 (18.5%)	25 (39.7%)	7 (26.9%)	0	6	12.99*
44-51	12 (44.4%)	16 (25.4%)	10 (38.5%)	4 (100.0%)		
52-60	10 (37.0%)	22 (34.9%)	9 (34.6%)	0		
Principal						
0-5	7 (25.0%)	18 (28.6%)	8 (30.8%)	1 (25.0%)	6	1.55
6-15	9 (32.1%)	25 (39.7%)	10 (38.5%)	2 (50.0%)		
16-32	12 (42.9%)	20 (31.7%)	8 (30.8%)	1 (25.0%)		

155

*Significant at .05 level

expense accounts and time as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal. One principal, who had answered "no," added that the principal "has paid for classroom expenses without reimbursement--all part of the job!" (a sort

TABLE 32

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO WHETHER THE PRINCIPAL HAS EVER "FUDGED" AN EXPENSE ACCOUNT

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	3 (75.0%)	84 (68.3%)	1	0.08
Part-time principal	1 (25.0%)	39 (31.7%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	1 (25.0%)	58 (46.8%)	2	1.03
6-15 years	2 (50.0%)	35 (28.2%)		
16 or more	1 (25.0%)	31 (25.0%)		
Rural community	1 (25.0%)	62 (50.8%)	1	1.03
Urban community	3 (75.0%)	60 (49.2%)		
Male	4 (100.0%)	93 (75.0%)		
Female	0	31 (25.0%)		
Age				
26-43	1 (25.0%)	37 (30.1%)	2	0.39
44-51	2 (50.0%)	43 (35.0%)		
52-60	1 (25.0%)	43 (35.0%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	0	36 (39.0%)	4	2.9
6-15	3 (75.0%)	44 (35.5%)		
16-32	1 (25.0%)	44 (35.5%)		

of reverse "fudging"). A principal, who had answered "no," added that he or she had moved accounts around within the budget.

The portion of the research question, "the use of school property for personal use," is addressed in Table 33. Table 33 reports frequencies regarding principals using school property for strictly personal use. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer this question. A significant relationship was found between use of school property for

TABLE 33

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO
WHETHER THE PRINCIPAL HAS PUT VALUABLE SCHOOL
PROPERTY TO PERSONAL USE

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	13 (72.2%)	74 (67.9%)	1	0.13
Part-time principal	5 (27.8%)	35 (32.1%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	10 (55.6%)	49 (44.5%)	2	0.99
6-15 years	5 (27.8%)	32 (29.1%)		
16 or more	3 (16.7%)	29 (26.4%)		
Rural community	7 (38.9%)	56 (51.9%)	1	1.03
Urban community	11 (61.1%)	52 (48.1%)		
Male	17 (94.4%)	80 (72.7%)	1	3.97*
Female	1 (5.6%)	30 (27.3%)		
Age				
26-43	9 (50.0%)	29 (26.6%)	2	4.10
44-51	5 (27.8%)	40 (36.7%)		
52-60	4 (22.2%)	40 (36.7%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	7 (38.9%)	29 (26.4%)	2	3.24
6-15	8 (44.4%)	39 (35.5%)		
16-32	3 (16.7%)	42 (38.2%)		

*Significant at .05 level

personal use and gender. The majority of both male and female principals indicated "no." Seventeen of the ninety-seven male principals responding (17.5%) reported they had used school property for personal use, compared to one of the thirty-one female principals (3.2%). No significant relationships were found between use of school property for personal use and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, age, or years as principal.

The portion of the research question, "the honoring of contract agreements," is partially addressed in Table 34. Table 34 reports frequencies regarding whether a principal has ever ended a contract before the completion date. Since the results were skewed to such a

marked degree and the comparisons relatively lacking in meaning, only the totals, degrees of freedom, and Chi-square numbers were given for each variable. The options were "yes, at board's request"; "yes, for reasons of personal health"; "yes, to take another job"; "yes, by mutual agreement with the board"; "yes, for other reasons"; and "no." "Yes, to take another job" was indicated by two principals (1.6%); "yes, by mutual agreement" by one principal (0.8%); "yes, for other reasons" by one principal (0.8%); and "no" by 125 principals (96.9%). One principal, who answered "yes, for other reasons," indicated the reason was a superintendent-approved vacation, which was later made up in days served the school outside of contact time. One principal, who answered "yes, by mutual agreement with the board," commented that "it had been when student contact time was not involved."

TABLE 34

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO
WHETHER THE PRINCIPAL HAS EVER ENDED HIS OR HER
CONTRACT BEFORE THE COMPLETION DATE

Principalship Factor	Yes, Take Other Job	Mutual Agreement	Other Reasons	No	DF	χ^2
Portion time prin.	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.8%)	124 (96.9%)	3	1.23
Current position	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.8%)	125 (96.9%)	6	6.92
Size of community	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.8%)	123 (96.9%)	3	4.00
Gender	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.8%)	125 (96.9%)	3	1.30
Age	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.8%)	124 (96.9%)	6	4.90
Yrs. as principal	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.8%)	125 (96.9%)	6	4.90

The portion of the research question, "the honoring of contract agreements," is partially addressed in Table 35. Table 35 reports frequencies regarding whether principals thought it was all right to leave your district in the middle of a contract to accept a better position. No significant relationships were found between leaving the school district in the middle of a contract and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal.

The portion of the research question, "the presence and influence of ethical training," is partially addressed in Table 36. Table 36 reports frequencies regarding whether principals, if it would further their career to do so, would hire a consultant for a paid position who had helped the principal secure his or her position. Ten principals (7.8%) chose not to answer this question. A significant relationship was found between hiring a consultant and age. The majority in all age groups indicated "no." However, the majority percentages of the 26-43 and 52-60 age groups were greater when compared to the 44-51 age group. Thirty-two of the thirty-three principals in the 26-43 age group who responded (97.0%) and forty-one of the forty-three principals in the 52-60 age group (95.3%) reported "no," compared to thirty-three of the forty-two principals in the 44-51 age group (78.6%). No significant relationships were found between hiring consultants and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, or years as principal.

The portion of the research question, "the presence and influence of ethical training," is partially addressed in Table 37. Table 37 reports frequencies regarding the perceived importance of ethical training for administrators. No significant relationships were found between ethical training and time spent as principal, years in

TABLE 35

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS
OF PRINCIPALS AS TO THE ACCEPTABILITY OF LEAVING
BEFORE THE END OF THE CONTRACT

Principalship Factor	Always	Sometimes	W/Board Approval	Never	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	4 (100.0%)	18 (69.2%)	47 (70.1%)	19 (61.3%)	3	2.68
Part-time principal	0	8 (30.8%)	20 (29.9%)	12 (38.7%)		
Current position					6	4.13
0-5 years	2 (50.0%)	15 (55.6%)	26 (38.8%)	17 (54.8%)		
6-15 years	1 (25.0%)	7 (25.9%)	23 (34.3%)	6 (19.4%)		
16 or more	1 (25.0%)	5 (18.5%)	18 (26.9%)	8 (25.8%)		
Rural community	1 (25.0%)	14 (51.9%)	31 (47.7%)	17 (54.8%)	3	1.45
Urban community	3 (75.0%)	13 (48.1%)	34 (52.3%)	14 (45.2%)		
Male	4 (100.0%)	16 (59.3%)	54 (80.6%)	24 (77.4%)	3	6.21
Female	0	11 (40.7%)	13 (19.4%)	7 (22.6%)		
Age					6	10.24
26-43	0	8 (30.8%)	18 (26.9%)	12 (38.7%)		
44-51	3 (75.0%)	13 (50.0%)	24 (35.8%)	6 (19.4%)		
52-60	1 (25.0%)	5 (19.2%)	25 (37.3%)	13 (41.9%)		
Years as principal					6	8.21
0-5	1 (25.0%)	9 (33.3%)	15 (22.4%)	11 (35.5%)		
6-15	2 (50.0%)	13 (48.1%)	21 (31.3%)	11 (35.5%)		
16-32	1 (25.5%)	5 (18.5%)	31 (46.3%)	9 (29.0%)		

TABLE 36

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS
OF PRINCIPALS AS TO THE HIRING OF A CONSULTANT FOR A
PAID POSITION WHO HAD HELPED THE PRINCIPALS
OBTAIN THEIR CURRENT POSITION

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	10 (83.3%)	71 (66.4%)	1	1.43
Part-time principal	2 (16.7%)	36 (33.6%)		
Current position				
0-5 years	5 (41.7%)	49 (45.8%)	2	1.95
6-15 years	2 (16.7%)	32 (29.9%)		
16 or more	5 (41.7%)	26 (24.3%)		
Rural community	3 (25.0%)	57 (53.8%)	1	3.57
Urban community	9 (75.0%)	49 (46.2%)		
Male	10 (83.3%)	81 (75.7%)	1	0.34
Female	2 (16.7%)	26 (24.3%)		
Age				
26-43	1 (8.3%)	32 (30.2%)	2	9.10*
44-51	9 (75.0%)	33 (31.1%)		
52-60	2 (16.7%)	41 (38.7%)		
Years as principal				
0-5	3 (25.0%)	30 (28.0%)	2	1.04
6-15	3 (25.0%)	39 (36.4%)		
16-32	6 (50.0%)	38 (35.5%)		

*Significant at .05 level

current position, rural/urban community, age, gender, or years as principal.

The portion of the research question, "the presence and influence of ethical training," is partially addressed in Table 38. Table 38 reports frequencies regarding how principals rated their ethical training in graduate school. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer this question. No significant relationships were found between ethical training and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, gender, age, or years as principal. One principal commented that "a course on ethics will not make one into an

TABLE 37

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO
PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE
OF ETHICAL TRAINING FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Principalship Factor	None	Less	Importance: Medium	More	Vital	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	1 (100.0%)	5 (71.4%)	14 (70.0%)	23 (53.5%)	45 (78.9%)	4	7.91
Part-time principal	0	2 (28.6%)	6 (30.0%)	20 (46.5%)	12 (21.1%)		
Current position							
0-5 years	1 (100.0%)	3 (42.9%)	9 (45.0%)	18 (41.9%)	29 (50.0%)	8	3.44
6-15 years	0	3 (42.9%)	7 (35.0%)	13 (30.2%)	14 (24.1%)		
16 or more	0	1 (14.3%)	4 (20.0%)	12 (27.9%)	15 (25.9%)		
Rural community	0	4 (57.1%)	12 (60.0%)	24 (57.1%)	23 (40.4%)	4	4.91
Urban community	1 (100.0%)	3 (42.9%)	8 (40.0%)	18 (42.9%)	34 (59.6%)		
Male	1 (100.0%)	6 (85.7%)	17 (85.0%)	34 (79.1%)	40 (69.0%)	4	3.35
Female	0	1 (14.3%)	3 (15.0%)	9 (20.9%)	18 (31.0%)		
Age							
26-43	0	2 (33.3%)	5 (25.0%)	15 (34.9%)	16 (27.6%)	8	6.31
44-51	1 (100.0%)	3 (50.0%)	10 (50.0%)	14 (32.6%)	18 (31.0%)		
52-60	0	1 (16.7%)	5 (25.0%)	14 (32.6%)	24 (41.4%)		
Years as principal							
0-5	1 (100.0%)	2 (28.6%)	6 (30.0%)	10 (23.3%)	17 (29.3%)	8	7.18
6-15	0	3 (42.9%)	9 (45.0%)	19 (44.2%)	16 (27.6%)		
16-32	0	2 (28.6%)	5 (25.0%)	14 (32.6%)	25 (43.1%)		

TABLE 38

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS
OF PRINCIPALS AS TO HOW THEIR GRADUATE TRAINING WOULD
RATE IN REGARD TO ETHICS

Principalship Factor	Very Poor	Poor	Medium	Very Good	Good	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	11 (84.6%)	13 (68.4%)	35 (63.5%)	21 (75.0%)	8 (66.7%)	4	2.73
Part-time principal	2 (15.4%)	6 (31.6%)	20 (36.4%)	7 (25.0%)	4 (33.3%)		
Current position							
0-5 years	5 (38.5%)	9 (47.4%)	24 (42.9%)	14 (50.0%)	7 (58.3%)	8	4.34
6-15 years	3 (23.1%)	6 (31.6%)	18 (32.1%)	6 (21.4%)	4 (33.3%)		
16 or more	5 (38.5%)	4 (21.1%)	14 (25.0%)	8 (28.6%)	1 (8.3%)		
Rural community	4 (30.8%)	11 (57.9%)	29 (52.7%)	11 (39.3%)	7 (63.6%)	4	4.63
Urban community	9 (69.2%)	8 (42.1%)	26 (47.3%)	17 (60.7%)	4 (36.4%)		
Male	10 (76.9%)	18 (94.7%)	43 (76.8%)	17 (60.7%)	10 (83.3%)	4	7.72
Female	3 (23.1%)	1 (5.3%)	13 (23.2%)	11 (39.3%)	2 (16.7%)		
Age							
26-43	2 (15.4%)	7 (36.8%)	15 (26.8%)	9 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	8	4.31
44-51	4 (30.8%)	7 (36.8%)	23 (41.1%)	8 (29.6%)	4 (33.3%)		
52-60	7 (53.8%)	5 (26.3%)	18 (32.1%)	10 (37.0%)	4 (33.3%)		
Years as principal							
0-5	2 (15.4%)	7 (36.8%)	11 (19.6%)	8 (28.6%)	7 (58.3%)	8	13.30
6-15	6 (46.2%)	7 (36.8%)	25 (44.6%)	9 (32.1%)	0		
16-32	5 (38.5%)	5 (26.3%)	20 (35.7%)	11 (39.3%)	5 (41.7%)		

ethical person." Ethics are learned throughout life starting from birth, almost. He or she does believe that being an ethical person is important as an educator. He or she accredited the presence of that value for his or her attaining his or her current position. One principal commented that graduate training in ethics was absent until there was an inservice on ethics by request of students.

The portion of the research question, "the views on copyright laws, especially as they relate to computer software," is partially addressed in Table 39. Table 39 reports frequencies regarding whether principals would copy computer software for student use if the school could not afford to buy it. No significant relationships were found between copying of computer software and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, age, gender, or years as principal. Two principals, who answered "yes," and two principals, who answered "no," indicated that they would only if it were allowable, since some programs/companies give permission that allows schools to make a given number of student copies; some programs are copyrighted with no copy privileges and others are not copyrighted. One principal, who answered "no," commented that he or she has not yet, but might sometime in the future.

The portion of the research question, "the views on copyright laws, especially as they relate to computer software," is partially addressed in Table 40. Table 40 reports frequencies regarding which students would have the use of computers when the computers were limited in number. Choices were gifted and talented students, special education students, students who could provide their own software, upper grade students, lower grade students, and all students by scheduling. Of these options, only gifted and talented students, upper grade students, and all students by scheduling appeared in the responses. No

TABLE 39

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS OF
PRINCIPALS AS TO COPYING COMPUTER SOFTWARE FOR STUDENTS

Principalship Factor	Yes	No	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	42 (76.4%)	46 (63.0%)	1	2.60
Part-time principal	13 (23.6%)	27 (37.0%)		
Current position			2	0.09
0-5 years	26 (47.3%)	34 (45.9%)		
6-15 years	15 (27.3%)	22 (29.7%)		
16 or more	14 (25.5%)	18 (24.3%)		
Rural community	30 (55.6%)	33 (45.2%)	1	1.33
Urban community	24 (44.4%)	40 (54.8%)		
Male	45 (81.8%)	53 (71.6%)	1	1.79
Female	10 (18.2%)	21 (28.4%)		
Age			2	5.71
26-43	21 (38.2%)	17 (23.3%)		
44-51	21 (28.2%)	25 (34.2%)		
52-60	13 (23.6%)	31 (42.5%)		
Years as principal			2	1.20
0-5	14 (25.5%)	22 (29.7%)		
6-15	23 (41.8%)	24 (32.4%)		
16-32	18 (32.7%)	28 (37.8%)		

significant relationships were found between computer use and time spent as principal, years in current position, rural/urban community, age, gender, or years as principal. One principal (0.8%) chose not to answer this question. One principal, who did not answer, noted that "the students or groups having access to the computers would be those students who had a constructive purpose for being at the computer."

The portion of the research question, "the handling and use of student records," is addressed in Table 41. Table 41 reports frequencies regarding what to do when a school board member asks to see the records of a student having learning problems who is not his or her child. No significant relationship was found between student records requested by a school board member and time spent as principal, years in

TABLE 40

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO
THE PRINCIPAL'S CONCEPTION OF EFFECTIVE COMPUTER
USE GIVEN LIMITED NUMBERS OF COMPUTERS

Principalship Factor	Gifted	Upper Grade	All Students by Scheduling	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	1 (100.0%)	14 (70.0%)	72 (67.9%)	2	0.49
Part-time principal	0	6 (30.0%)	34 (32.1%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	0	8 (40.0%)	51 (47.7%)	4	3.52
6-15 years	0	7 (35.0%)	30 (28.0%)		
16 or more	1 (100.0%)	5 (25.0%)	26 (24.3%)		
Rural community	1 (100.0%)	11 (55.0%)	51 (48.6%)	2	1.28
Urban community	0	9 (45.0%)	54 (51.4%)		
Male	1 (100.0%)	18 (90.0%)	78 (72.9%)	2	3.00
Female	0	2 (10.0%)	29 (27.1%)		
Age					
26-43	0	4 (20.0%)	33 (31.1%)	4	4.62
44-51	0	6 (30.0%)	40 (37.7%)		
52-60	1 (100.0%)	10 (50.0%)	33 (31.1%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	0	5 (25.0%)	31 (29.0%)	4	2.75
6-15	0	6 (30.0%)	40 (37.4%)		
16-32	1 (100.0%)	9 (45.0%)	36 (33.6%)		

current position, rural/urban community, age, gender, or years as principal. One principal indicated that it would depend upon what kind of information was desired. If a new piece of equipment was needed, he or she would answer briefly. If it were inquiring as to specific details about a student's problem, he or she would politely and diplomatically not answer. Some of the comments coming from one principal each who had indicated a "polite no" were (1) student's school records were privileged information, (2) qualified by stating that unless the superintendent tells him or her there is a need to do so, (3) indicated that one needed to let the school board member know that

this information is confidential, and (4) indicated that principals need to respect confidentiality.

The portion of the research question, "the use of VCR films," is addressed in Table 42. Table 42 reports frequencies regarding what the principal would do when the movie rental for the VCR for school use costs \$90 and the same movie on VCR can be purchased for \$15. Two principals (1.6%) chose not to answer this question. No significant relationships were found between renting of movies/VCR and years in current position, rural/urban community, age, gender, or years as principal. One principal, who answered he or she would "forego,"

TABLE 41
FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO
PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS AS TO THE COURSE TO
FOLLOW WHEN A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER WANTS
INFORMATION ON A CHILD NOT
HIS OR HER OWN

Principalship Factor	Answer Briefly	Answer Complete	Politely Not Answer	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	13 (72.2%)	2 (50.0%)	73 (68.9%)	2	0.75
Part-time principal	5 (27.8%)	2 (50.0%)	33 (31.1%)		
Current position					
0-5 years	8 (44.4%)	3 (75.0%)	49 (45.8%)	4	2.06
6-15 years	6 (33.3%)	0	31 (29.0%)		
16 or more	4 (22.2%)	1 (25.0%)	27 (25.2%)		
Rural community	11 (64.7%)	3 (75.0%)	49 (46.2%)	2	3.06
Urban community	6 (35.3%)	1 (25.0%)	57 (53.8%)		
Male	12 (66.7%)	4 (100.0%)	82 (76.6%)	2	2.14
Female	6 (33.3%)	0	25 (23.4%)		
Age					
26-43	8 (44.4%)	0	30 (28.3%)	4	5.39
44-51	6 (33.3%)	3 (75.0%)	37 (34.9%)		
52-60	4 (22.2%)	1 (25.0%)	39 (36.8%)		
Years as principal					
0-5	6 (33.3%)	2 (50.0%)	28 (26.2%)	4	1.39
6-15	6 (33.3%)	1 (25.0%)	40 (37.4%)		
16-32	6 (33.3%)	1 (25.0%)	39 (36.4%)		

TABLE 42

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING PRINCIPALSHIP FACTORS TO PERCEPTIONS
OF PRINCIPALS AS TO THE COURSE TO TAKE WHEN
OBTAINING VCR FILMS FOR THE SCHOOL

Principalship Factor	Use Own Money	Use School Funds fr/Store	Use School Funds Full Price	Do without	DF	χ^2
Full-time principal	6 (37.5%)	42 (79.2%)	3 (100.0%)	37 (68.5%)	3	11.51**
Part-time principal	10 (62.5%)	11 (20.8%)	0	17 (31.5%)		
Current position					6	4.41
0-5 years	10 (58.8%)	24 (45.3%)	1 (33.3%)	24 (44.4%)		
6-15 years	4 (23.5%)	19 (35.8%)	1 (33.3%)	13 (24.1%)		
16 or more	3 (17.6%)	10 (18.9%)	1 (33.3%)	17 (31.5%)		
Rural community	12 (70.6%)	23 (44.2%)	0	26 (49.1%)	3	6.52
Urban Community	5 (29.4%)	29 (55.8%)	3 (100.0%)	27 (50.9%)		
Male	11 (64.7%)	44 (83.0%)	2 (66.7%)	40 (74.1%)	3	2.89
Female	6 (35.3%)	9 (17.0%)	1 (33.3%)	14 (25.9%)		
Age					6	7.43
26-43	8 (47.1%)	14 (26.9%)	0	14 (25.9%)		
44-51	4 (23.5%)	23 (44.2%)	2 (66.7%)	17 (31.5%)		
52-60	5 (29.4%)	15 (28.8%)	1 (33.3%)	23 (42.6%)		
Years as principal					6	5.71
0-5	7 (41.2%)	15 (28.3%)	0	13 (24.1%)		
6-15	4 (23.5%)	23 (43.4%)	1 (33.3%)	19 (35.2%)		
16-32	6 (35.3%)	15 (28.3%)	2 (66.7%)	22 (40.7%)		

**Significant at .01 level

commented that the reason would be because this issue is a "muddy issue." That principal found this to be an issue that he or she had still not decided in his or her own mind. One of the principals, who did not answer, commented that the other activity in his or her school was to sponsor a feature film at Christmas and pay the theater. One principal, who chose to pay the \$90, added that a person has to understand that this activity is a priority with the staff (teachers). One principal, who indicated buying it with school funds, commented that he or she could not really see an ethical issue in the question. That principal would not allow use of a home recorded video film in school. One principal, who had not answered, indicated that if the video was not copyrighted, buy it, and, if not, forego the film. One principal, who would follow the course of buying from school funds and put it in the library, commented that this was a DUMB QUESTION! [emphasis added], though there was no elaboration on meaning.

A significant relationship was found between the choices and the portion of time spent as principal. Six of the eighty-eight full-time principals responding (6.8%) would use their own money to purchase a VCR film from the convenience store, compared to ten of the thirty-eight part-time principals (26.3%). Forty-two of the full-time principals responding (47.7%) would use school funds to purchase a VCR film from the convenience store, compared to eleven of the part-time principals (28.9%). Only three full-time principals responding (3.4%) chose to pay the full price, compared to none of the part-time principals (0.0%). Thirty-seven of the full-time principals responding (42.0%) would do without the VCR film, compared to seventeen of the part-time principals (44.7%).

Input from Question 51

The principals were asked to list briefly situations not covered in the survey questions that were of ethical concern. Fourteen principals responded to this request. The frequency of a situation being mentioned was once unless otherwise stated. The responses were as follows:

1. One principal discussed the area of school boundary restructuring in schools. This included working with neighboring administrators to seek land openly for annexation and students through tuition agreements. This was done with school board approval. The principal proposed that this was a form of recruiting and not professionally ethical. He or she expressed concern that this could lead to student and land "wars." He or she believed there needs to be cooperation between schools but in a manner in which the student "always comes out the winner."
2. One principal discussed one child's rights and the potential conflict between them and the rights of all children. The issue was whether a child who is very disruptive in the classroom has the right to remain in the classroom even though doing so would jeopardize the learning of the other students and might jeopardize the safety of the other children. The older a disruptive child gets, the more likely the safety issue would be of concern. The question was asked, "How is the judgment made as to when the actions of one child are hindering the education of others to the degree that it is a violation of other students' rights?"
3. One principal identified the problem of giving out student information as an ethical concern.

4. One principal identified the problem of gossip about students, parents, and others as a concern.
5. One principal identified nominating yourself for an award (e.g., Superintendent of the Year) as a concern.
6. One principal identified asking a teacher about another teacher who was suspected of doing unethical things as a concern. The principal wondered how this should be handled.
7. Two principals expressed concern about copying copyrighted printed material for class. One of these principals gave as examples copying from books and copying worksheets.
8. One principal discussed the area of equal treatment of students as a concern. The treatment of students such as the school board members' children or the treatment of a child of a prominent community member were identified concerns. The principal indicated that there had been some instances of favorable treatment for children from families of influence, power, and prestige in his or her experience. The principal indicated that it was not consciously done. This was expressed as a deep concern.
9. One principal discussed the area of school discipline and teaching students moral/ethical values. The principal noted a situation in which a sixth-grade male student had been making lists of sixth-grade girls with sexual references. The principal expressed concern as to the most effective and ethical manner in which to work with that boy. The principal found this to be a moral/ethical struggle within himself or herself. In this instance, the principal decided to communicate with the boy's parents and let them handle it.

10. One principal identified a concern about school board members who are themselves under contract in the school district for services.
11. Two principals had ethical concerns about school board members who were married to school employees. One of the principals noted that since it was not illegal, the school board association supported the school in this practice. Sometimes the school board member's spouse was hired even when there were more qualified applicants available for the position. This principal's past experience included a situation where the purpose of running for the school board was to insure that his or her spouse would get a job.
12. One principal identified a concern regarding discussion about confidential school matters downtown by school board members and school employees.
13. One principal was concerned about the ethics of school board members soliciting information from parents and employees downtown.
14. One principal noted a concern about gender equity in the area of interviewing and hiring of school staff and administrators. The principal indicated this would be something interesting to know.
15. One principal reported a concern about coaches favoring the children of faculty.
16. One principal reported a concern about administrators being to school on time.
17. One principal identified a concern about administrators being supportive for all extracurricular events.
18. One principal discussed the use of hot lunch money being used to provide cookies and baked goods for staff meetings

or in the lounge. The principal believed that this was using hot lunch resources illegally.

19. One principal expressed concern about businesses using school students to promote their business or product, giving the school a "pittance in return for the exploitation."
20. One principal asked the question, "What becomes harassment in our current educational system?" The principal did not indicate a context or who was possibly being harassed.
21. One principal was concerned about the ethics of "previewing" visual materials with a class and then sending them back to the company.
22. One principal was concerned about copying personal materials on the school copier.
23. One principal identified administrators taking lunch and milk without paying as a concern.
24. One principal noted two concerns about disciplining. He or she believed there were inconsistencies in disciplining the children of the principal's friends and children of teachers' friends as well as disciplining the children of parents with whom the principal/teacher may have had "run ins."

Description and Analysis of Interview Data

Description of Interview Population

Of the 129 principals who returned cards, thirty-two indicated on the postcards they would be willing to be interviewed about the subject of ethics in schools. Ten principals were selected by random sampling. No attempt was made to stratify those selected. However, it did happen that the selections were scattered across the state, were

from both large and small school enrollment districts, and included both male and female principals. The interviews were conducted by telephone.

The questions were open-ended; the responses were paraphrased.

The following questions were asked:

1. Were there any questions on the survey that you would like to emphasize, expand upon, qualify, or otherwise address?
2. Were there any questions or interests involving ethics in schools that were not included in the survey? These need not be from personal experience or need not be current. It might be something you could foresee as happening and would seek to adhere to ethical decisions so as to prevent problems.
3. Have you ever had a dilemma about which you really didn't know what to do and later you wondered whether the right decision had been made (right meaning ethically right, rather than effective)? It need not be at your current position.
4. What are some of the pressures that might cause a principal to make decisions contrary to his or her personal ethical standards? How does one deal with these pressures?
5. If one believes that an effective school is an ethical school, what would you recommend to assure that your school is an ethical school?

Responses in Telephone Interviews

Only one principal discussed a matter unless otherwise indicated. Numbers in parentheses indicate how many principals mentioned a topic when there were more than one.

1. Were there any questions on the survey that you would like to emphasize, expand upon, qualify, or otherwise address?

- a. Hiring friends or relatives or friends of school board members (6)

Two principals believed a principal should never hire friends or relatives of school board members. It disrupted the process of learning. In one situation where it occurred, the result was poor teaching. Then the principal was the person held responsible.

The principal felt this put the principal in jeopardy, even though the situation was not of his or her making. The principal indicated that if he or she evaluates the relative or friend of a school board member honestly, he or she is putting himself or herself "on the line."

Two principals indicated that superintendents get more pressure to hire relatives of school board members than do principals. One principal stated that often the superintendent makes the decision to hire the relative of a school board member and the principal has nothing to say about it. This principal indicated that he or she "tells it like it is" on evaluations even if it might displease a school board member. However, if the teacher's performance was so poor that nonrenewal should occur, it was impossible so long as the same people who employed the teacher were still on the school board. It was suggested by one principal that the solution would be to have a written policy in regard to hiring relatives.

One principal pointed out that sometimes, especially in small communities, employment of a family member or relative of a school board member was a matter of availability. A principal needed to put relationships

aside and be objective by hiring the individual who was most qualified. Sometimes the relative was the most qualified person available.

b. Parental involvement (4)

Active parental involvement was viewed as being best for both students and parents. Obtaining parental involvement was reported to be more and more difficult. In more and more families both parents worked, making time for school involvement a problem even when parents were interested.

Two principals indicated that communication was a key factor in encouraging parental involvement.

Communication may be enhanced via radio program, frequent memo, PTA/PTO or like organization, and parenting skills programs.

One principal indicated that the improvement of parenting skills was a part of encouraging parental involvement. This principal talked about implementing a parenting skills program in the school. The difficulty with the parenting skills program was trying to get parents to attend. All parents in the district were offered the opportunity to attend and some may have had it specifically suggested. A grant was available to purchase texts for the program. Some parents wanted to attend the parenting skills program but were not aware of its availability; some who were aware did not want the program; and still others who wanted the program were aware.

As the program was designed, parental involvement needed to occur when the school personnel were making

decisions about their children. There needed to be a team approach which included teachers, principal, parents, and students. There needed to be open, honest discussion. There needed to be a shared responsibility, an exchange of ideas, and the right to say "no" to each other without ill will. This approach was for all students and their parents. Some teachers did not wish to teach in this framework. Teachers who were not willing to follow this course should work toward change or possibly be transferred into a bigger school system.

c. The acceptance of gifts (2)

The principals felt that acceptance of gifts created obligations to the vendor. It also might tempt administrators to purchase an unnecessary product or to purchase larger amounts of a product than would be useful to the school. The temptation toward bulk buying should be avoided.

Sometimes "gifts" could be purchasing incentives more than gifts. Administrators do need to be careful not to be tempted to buy more than can be used in order to get the buying incentive.

d. Serving the minority even if it may compromise the interests of the many (1)

There are some areas that make a person wonder about the goals of education and which direction educators are going--example #1: Educable Mentally Handicapped (EMH) preschool programs which bring toddlers into the school setting, example #2: treatment of some students in special education programs who really cannot be educated and probably should be institutionalized if parents

would permit, example #3: regulations that demand everything be wheelchair accessible even though there was not a wheelchair student or parent in the community, example #4: an Individual Education Plan (IEP) that requires carpeting in all the classrooms for the good of one student in special education. Ever changing standards and directions caused huge monetary expenditures that seemed questionable. These resources could have been better used elsewhere, especially given the increasing costs of education and the current economic situation.

2. Were there any questions of interest involving ethics in schools that were not included in the survey?

a. Confidentiality of teacher records (1)

Teachers' records needed to be kept confidential. School board members have requested seeing teacher evaluation files. School board members have no more right to see these files than anyone else. These files should only be revealed in a hearing situation.

b. Copyright laws (1)

Copyright laws are something most schools break at times. Perhaps there is more violation in elementary schools as teachers copy worksheets/workbooks and other materials for school use.

c. Leaving the school district (2)

When leaving the school district, often a polite reason was given rather than the real reason. One principal believed the real reason should be stated.

d. Hiring and firing (3)

A superintendent's relative should not be hired. It effects the internal power structure and has adverse effects upon the principal. One principal extended this thought to not hiring the principal's relatives or even the relatives of his or her spouse.

One principal expressed the thought that there should be a clear hiring practice when hiring principals so that the "good old boy network" was not in force. For example, a practice to be avoided would be hiring a high school principal, who is a friend of the superintendent, with fewer qualifications than the elementary principal but at a greater salary.

One principal noted it was very difficult for the principal when a husband and wife were working in the school, especially if one of them was very good at his or her assignment and much needed by the school and the other spouse was not very good at his or her assignment. This was even more complicated if the latter was the superintendent's wife.

e. Teacher behaviors (4)

Dealing with teacher behavior was viewed as very difficult by one principal when a teacher was very good in the classroom, but behaved in negative ways outside his or her classroom assignment such as carrying tales to the superintendent, evaluating other teachers, and causing dissention among the teachers. It was up to the principal to promote change. However, when change does not occur, the school finds it more difficult to nonrenew. The disruptive and inappropriate teacher

behaviors often are not illegal. Teamwork as the most effective method of promoting change involves no documentation. When circumstance dictates a move toward nonrenewal practices, the instances of working with the teacher and promoting change practiced during the team approach are difficult to substantiate because of the lack of documentation. Even when the negative behavior is common knowledge, even when some of the teachers do not approve of the behavior, teachers are disinclined to testify against teachers. In North Dakota, for nonrenewal, "the administrator shall substantiate the reasons with written or oral evidence presented at the meeting" (North Dakota Century Code 1991, Chapter 15-47-38[5]).

Teachers who cheat and swear in school were viewed as being poor role models for their students. The teachers need to teach students proper behaviors.

Another principal observed that so many young teachers seemed to be self-centered. How to work with the teacher to get to a student-centered approach to teaching was something of a dilemma. Prescriptive teaching techniques helped, somewhat, to address the dilemma. This self-centered attitude took on special implications when principals attempted using decision-making approaches such as site-based management.

One principal questioned the North Dakota Education Association (NDEA) stance, especially the manner and actions taken, when a nonrenewal was being proposed. He or she asked, "What is their point?" He or she questioned whether NDEA was working for what was best

for the school and the student. Personal feelings appear to be put ahead of professional judgments. Teachers expected principals to defend them. When the principal did not defend a teacher being considered for nonrenewal, the other teachers worked to undermine the principal.

f. Politics (1)

Political problems that affected decision-making could be problematic. Sometimes the politics could cause injustice in decisions. Principals needed to have a process that was followed so as to avoid injustice.

g. Favoritism in the schools (1)

Favoritism occurred and was not in the best interest of either the school or the student. The idea was that some of those who pay the most taxes expect to get preferential treatment in school (awards, discipline, plum roles) and outside the school (bussing schedules). Sometimes they asked directly and sometimes they were more indirect and subtle. Principals must tell parents that their duty is to all children and that all children must be treated with fairness.

h. Teacher role conflict (1)

Athletic directors who were also head coaches were considered a potential problem since "no one is minding the store"--he or she is responsible to no one.

i. Retention or promotion of a student who is the child of a friend (1)

Teachers and principals often avoided decisions concerning student retention when the student was the child of a friend even though professional judgment

indicated that retention would be in the best interest of the child. This is especially true if the parent was not totally convinced there was a need for retention. The temptation is to promote in order to retain the friendship.

j. Mutual trust (2)

There needed to be more trust between staff and administration. The staff tended to think mostly in terms of money received on the salary schedule. School boards needed to be told all of the factors that enter into a decision. Often they were asked to make a decision based on insufficient information. There needed to be mutual trust and two-way communication between school boards and administration. This communication needed to be honest and open.

k. New school board members with an ax to grind (1)

New board members were sometimes willing to demand unethical decisions and act in a manner that was unethical to attain their goals. These board members tended to mellow with time as they became aware that there were a lot of factors and problems to consider other than their special interest. Board membership is a thankless job. No one wants to serve on the school board.

l. Money problems (2)

Money problems, such as a salary freeze, could lead to unethical behaviors and decisions. So much emphasis was placed upon money, which was sad. Educators feel so bad until looking at films about Africa. Maybe people just have to learn to "tighten our belts." Money can do only

so much. Everyone tends to want more. Individuals do not need to try to get ahead of the Jones's.

Money is a problem in all society now. The free meal count is going up each year. It has doubled in the last five years in this school.

m. Misuse of money (1)

Using school travel money for personal business was viewed as an unethical use of school money.

n. Evaluations (1)

People like peace and harmony. It is so easy to be dishonest in order to keep the peace and save time. Principals need to be more honest and thorough in this process.

o. Sexual harassment, both teachers and students (1)

Sexual harassment occasionally occurs in school. This behavior was considered to be unethical.

p. Room assignments (1)

This principal believed change in room assignments should be a team decision with superintendent and teacher input.

q. Awareness of ethical behavior (1)

When an educator has been in an ethical school and community for a number of years, it perhaps makes him or her insensitive, since the need for concerted consideration of ethics had not been needed. The principal needs to guard against complacency and keep himself or herself aware of the issues and ethical concerns in education, even though there may not be an issue or lack of ethical behavior in his or her school. It would be easy for the school to move gradually into

questionable behaviors due to a lack of awareness rather than conscious unethical behavior.

r. Site-based management (1)

Site-based management seemed to be the coming thing. This principal felt there were many good things about this approach, but that the ultimate result might be ineffective. He or she believed teachers should have an active part in decision-making, in any case.

s. Discipline (1)

Disciplining students should have been handled with dignity. The principal was especially concerned about those active little boys in first grade who sometimes suffered in self-esteem because of the form and manner of discipline (not presence or absence of, but form). He or she must learn to help a student learn appropriate behavior in a way that is not harmful to the inner being of that child.

t. Public relations (1)

A lot of public relations was done to avoid making others angry rather than to do what was good for students. This often led to unethical decisions.

u. Expectations of the principal (1)

More and more, the only expectation from school boards and superintendents was that the school runs smoothly. More and more principals were evaluated based upon this criterion. This can be detrimental to the principal who (1) adheres to ethical principles when others do not wish to do so, (2) implements new ideas that may not gain immediate acceptance, (3) insists on professional behaviors from teachers, or (4) tries to develop

consensus among team members (teachers, parents, administrators) about issues and/or dilemmas. If the principal administers in a manner that fails to provide complete peace and quiet, he or she may be overlooked for promotion, may have permission for requests or monies denied, or may be demoted.

v. Needs of the child (2)

Educators needed always to be aware of what was going on in the home of the child and that situations should be considered when making decisions about the child in school. This must be done consistently. Decisions must be made based upon what is best for the child (1).

When the best interest of students conflicts with rules, the principal is in an ethical dilemma. For example, when a student is significantly behind and needs help but does not fit the criteria for Chapter I, should a principal serve the child through Chapter I anyway? This principal indicated he or she probably would but would probably leave the child off the official list (1).

3. Have you ever had a dilemma about which you really didn't know what to do and later you wondered whether the right decision had been made (right meaning ethically right, rather than effective)?

a. Teacher evaluation (4)

The biggest dilemma, in the opinion of one principal, was evaluating teachers. It was difficult to know at what point a person changes from informal working toward growth and development to a more formal documentation process. Knowing where the line was which indicated the

teacher had made sufficient movement toward possible nonrenewal and having assurance that all has been done to serve that teacher with justice and fairness was a most difficult call. In this process, documentation and open communication are needed. Evaluation time always takes a certain amount of agonizing (1).

It is difficult to word negative criticism in teacher evaluations in a way that helps teachers grow (rather than just feel put down) but without being "too tactful" (so that it is not taken seriously and fails to lead to improvement) (1).

A principal needs to protect teachers who are doing a so-so job. You may be well aware of the problem and working with that teacher; however, when parents come in, the principal cannot tell them that they are working to help that teacher improve. The rights to privacy and confidentiality must be maintained (1).

A dilemma about whether to terminate a homosexual teacher who had been "bothering" the male students in the school was described. The teacher was considered to be a nice person and good teacher in the classroom. To know what was the right thing to do was a dilemma which caused a lot of lost sleep. The teacher was counseled into resigning, which alleviated the publicity aspect of the dilemma. Even though this event occurred a number of years ago, it still caused the principal to ponder its ethical implications (1).

b. In-house conflict (1)

Disagreements between teachers, administrators, parents, and others were sometimes considered to be an

ethical problem. The principal needed to communicate that it was permissible to disagree. Whether the groups disagreed was not so important as was the manner in which they disagreed.

c. Finding demarcation lines (1)

One principal "follows the book" usually but cannot always do so when considering ethical decisions. This principal felt people need to learn from their mistakes. When the dilemmas, such as identifying borderline cases of child abuse arose, the principal's job was to find where the dividing line was between the role of the school, the role of the parent, and when one should have precedence over the other. Both legal and moral implications were recognized. Knowing what was right to do and when to do it was viewed as difficult both for the teacher and the principal.

d. Hiring against the principal's best judgment (1)

When the principal was told who to hire, was told who to recommend even when it was not in his or her better judgment, was told to go through the procedure as if it was based on his or her better judgment, should the principal do it? The principal must make the choice. Alternatives would be (1) recommend the person as though it was in his or her better judgment, as recommended; (2) recommend the person he or she was directed to recommend, indicating it was not in his or her better judgment; or (3) recommend based upon the best qualifications of the applicant, knowing the possible and even probable consequence.

e. Teacher duty assignment outside the classroom (1)

The principal must make decisions about noon duty by teachers or teacher aides. Teachers typically do not want such duty. Legally, schools may be affected by who is on duty. To require teachers to do this duty when they do not want to creates problems between administration and staff. Aides are not trained to work with children and so do not always make the right decisions. The expectation from the superintendent is to have teachers supervise children during the lunch hour and recess. The principal must struggle with this potential ethical and legal conflict.

f. Use of funds (1)

Funding is typically handled in such a way that whenever the principal does not use the budgeted amount, the following year that budgeted amount will be reduced. This tempts principals to spend their reserves whether they are needed or not.

g. Confidentiality (1)

What happens when secretaries or teachers discuss school affairs and/or students downtown? One principal warned that people enlarge upon the situation being discussed and it gets exaggerated. Most of these matters are things the general public does not need to know. Such matters sometimes violate the right to privacy and confidentiality.

School board members also sometimes discuss some specific matters concerning school that they should not. This principal asks the school board member to "put the shoe on the other foot," that is, ask those board

members how they would like it if someone else talked about their child the way they are now talking about a child.

h. Dress codes (1)

Dress codes such as a ban against blue jeans create an ethical problem. There is a dilemma as to why jeans should be banned when some designer jeans cost \$80 or more. Still, there is a need to follow this policy which bans blue jeans because it is a directive of the superintendent, who is the principal's superior. However, the principal questions the wisdom of that particular policy.

i. Need to work with staff (1)

There is a need to work with staff in decision-making. This practice helps to alleviate many dilemmas that may occur.

j. Special education (1)

Inclusion in the classroom of special education students with other students of their same age can be an ethical problem. The principal agrees that this should be done whenever it is beneficial to the students. However, he or she contended that it was not always beneficial to the special education student or to the students in the classroom. The ethical problem is found between what is legal and what is in the best interest of students. He or she noted that general education teachers are not always willing for "inclusion" to occur. He or she also indicated that we need to learn to be teachers of students, not teachers of material.

k. Outcome-based education and its implementation (1)

The principal voiced concern relating to outcome-based education. He or she was not sure, in his or her own mind, whether this approach would be the best way to meet the needs of students.

One respondent believed problems faced by principals seem to be increasing. As evidenced by this belief was the observation that superintendents were giving up and resigning or retiring. It appeared the principal was experiencing a malaise regarding school problems.

4. What are some of the pressures that might cause a principal to make decisions contrary to his or her personal ethical standards? How does one deal with these pressures?

a. One principal noted that the types and amount of pressure vary with community and geographical location. Another principal noted that, in North Dakota, there tend to be good morals and good families (2).

b. External and internal pressures such as legal restrictions, government mandates, superintendent and school board directives, and the effects upon job security have a great impact upon decision-making, sometimes resulting in decisions that are contrary to personal ethical standards (1).

The real power was in the hands of the worker to get things turned around or ignored. For example, sexual equality was a big issue in the sixties. This principal was opposed to many of the mandates in this issue at the time. Now attitudes have changed and the change has been beneficial. Those who opposed the change have seen

they were wrong. This principal perceived the real change came from within the lower ranks of power.

c. Job security and family peace (2)

Two principals believed job security and family peace were threatened in the school setting stemming from situations where (1) an occurrence was "brought to light" in which the administrator did succumb to pressure or (2) there was failure to succumb to pressure. Which of these that would be more threatening would be somewhat dependent on the situation and power structure of the people involved. In some situations, the principal may be in a "Catch-22" position where he or she will be in a peace-threatened setting regardless of the decision.

d. Pressure from the public (2)

The general public tends to think that because school employees are paid with public money (taxes), they have the right to tell educators what to do. This belief is the basis of a great deal of the outside pressures (1).

School board members and educators tend to back down under parental pressure. This tendency could put all the power in parents' hands. In the perception of this principal, the decisions made under parental pressure were not always in the best interest of the student (1).

e. Pressure from the school board (3)

One principal said that if pressured by the school board to do something that would be compromising to his or her ethical standards, the principal would state that he or she would resign first--and would do so if insistence continued. Two principals echoed this

sentiment stating they could not be coerced but could be convinced. If there was not a choice, if pressures were too uncomprising, the principal would not do it. A principal needs to be strong to follow that course.

f. Pressures from superintendents (1)

The principal indicated that pressure from the superintendent can cause people to be afraid to offer a suggestion or say what they believe. The consequences of these circumstances may take the form of not granting money to that teacher or principal for needed supplies, job assignment demotion, or loss of job security.

g. Pressures from ourselves (1)

One principal noted that a lot of the pressures that cause us problems are self-inflicted pressures as principals agonize over the decision/dilemma that confronts them.

h. Suggestions

A principal suggested that one way to prevent ethical problems brought about by pressure was to have a reputation for ethical practices. People do not try to pressure the principal or teachers if there is belief that it will not be effective (1).

5. If one believes that an effective school is an ethical school, what would you recommend to assure that your school is an ethical school?

a. Principal's integrity (3)

One principal indicated that he or she must "live with oneself" and this cannot be done unless the principal adheres to personal moral values and ethical principles. Two principals agreed, saying that he or she need not

bow to outside influences but rather keep his or her integrity.

b. Open to ideas, making own judgment (1)

The principal needs to be willing to listen to ideas different from his or her own and change his or her ideas when others can demonstrate that their ideas are sound or that the principal's ideas are not. However, he or she needs to have faith in his or her own judgment and stick to it despite pressures when the discussion is not persuasive.

c. Professionalism (2)

Two principals indicated that professionalism is important. To decide and act in a manner that is professional is the key.

d. Prevention (1)

A principal indicated that educators should practice prevention as much as possible. Principals must try to foresee potential problems in situations and take steps to prevent occurrence of these problems.

e. What is best for the child (7)

Seven principals concurred that when making decisions in school, he or she must decide in accordance with what is best for the students, what one principal called a "child centered" school. When self-interest conflicts with the interest of the students, eliminate the self-interest. What is best for the student outweighs any other interests. This precept serves as the "bottom line."

f. Policy (4)

Four principals indicated that schools should have policies and procedures that were very clearly stated so that everyone could understand. Two of these principals indicated that people needed to be informed of these policies. One of these principals added that principals should follow the policies even if they do not agree with them. If principals do not agree with a policy, then work to change it; but they need to adhere to the policy while it is in force.

One of these principals expanded on issues related to the policy handbook. He or she noted that policies, written in a handbook, cannot cover all contingencies, but they should cover many of the major concerns. He or she listed some of the ethical concerns that can be covered in the policy handbook relating both to students and personnel: sexual harassment; alcohol and drug use; confidentiality of records--educational, health; attendance; racial, ethnic, gender, religious, socioeconomic, and other discrimination; practices in disciplinary action; child abuse; dress code; weapons in school; crisis management; and the place of religion in school--observance of religious holidays, place in curriculum (teach about but not promote a given religion), student participation in activities that the parents find objectionable on religious grounds, distribution of religious literature in the school.

One of these principals noted that sometimes the handbooks contain policies that are too broad and vague. Other times the handbooks have so many situational

specific policies that a person cannot possibly remember them all. Educators were then reduced to always having to look through the handbook in the process of reaching each decision. The principal indicated the former needs to be tightened up and the latter have the specificity reduced.

One principal indicated that parents need to have some input and the right to voice a point of view when policies are being made. All opinions need to be heard and considered.

- g. One principal noted that administrators must do what they can to eliminate the political pressures. He or she suggested communication with the public via the media (newspapers, radio, television) would contribute to the attainment of this goal.
- h. Three principals indicated that teacher consultation about school decisions was important. It does need to be understood by teachers that decisions need administrative approval. A principal tries to help teachers so that they do not have to act against their principles. Teachers should be involved in policy development. Principals must work with teachers to help them articulate, address, and solve the problem at hand. If it is a matter of "must," then tell them so rather than allow them to think they have choice. Often people who work together on projects learn to share. It also needs to be understood that some decisions rest with the principal only.

i. Team approach to decision-making

Four principals indicated that the team approach allowed more views so that more aspects of a question might be considered. However, there must be a careful team selection so that no special interest group controls the membership in order to assure all ideas will be considered and all opinions valued. There must be an agreement on goals and desired outcomes. There needs to be administrative approval of the group, so that the opinions and consensus of the committee will be convincing/persuasive. (1) It needs to be recognized that some decisions are made by the principal only. (2) The principal cannot know it all; the team approach utilizes the varying knowledge of the people involved.

j. Human relations

Two principals expressed a belief that principals needed to be open and honest with all people involved in schools. One principal indicated that principals need to be fair. He or she noted that not only must principals be fair but be perceived as being fair. One principal noted that the reasons behind a decision need to be communicated. One principal indicated that every situation needs to be weighed as to both sides of a question. He or she indicated that there should also be consideration relating to how important the problem is in the "whole picture." Two principals indicated that there is a need to be able to work with people in a positive manner. Leaders and decision-makers must be willing to listen, consider, and look into the concerns

of all people. One principal indicated a need to speak well of all people, not "put people down."

k. Communication

Three principals viewed communication as very important, if not the most important of principal responsibilities. There needs to be open and honest two-way communication and mutual trust between people working together. This was believed to be true when communicating with all individuals and groups.

l. Effective leadership

Four principals viewed effective leadership as important. Suggested were programs such as (1) peer coaching, (2), site-based management, and (3) clinical supervision. Action needs to be based upon what has proven to be effective.

m. One principal indicated that the most basic need was to deal with situations on an individual basis.

n. One principal indicated a need for teachers in the area of growth and development. He or she suggested workshops as an effective way to meet this need.

Workshops enhance the communication of ideas.

This chapter presented the statistical analysis of the data generated by the survey. The last chapter includes the summary of the findings, conclusions drawn based upon the survey responses, discussion of the information, and recommendations.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to assist elementary principals to conceptualize the thought of other elementary principals about ethics in school settings. This conceptualization is intended to facilitate thinking about ethics in schools. Thinking about ethics is intended to facilitate thinking and decision-making among individual principals regarding the use of ethics in their school. Thus, principals collectively may arrive at a more closely aligned consensus as to what constitutes ethical standards in schools.

The secondary purpose of the study was to examine the perceptions of elementary school principals in North Dakota regarding what they deemed to be ethical behavior. The study was not intended to measure or evaluate the ethics of principals.

Decision-making was viewed as an integral actively bearing on the effectiveness of the school. Whenever two people interact, decisions must be made, whether the consequence be large or small. The principal was considered to be a key person in setting the tone in the school and establishing the manner of decision-making. He or she was also the person who made many key decisions and interacted with a great number of people.

Readers must keep these purposes in mind when perusing the narrative, examining the tabulated data, and reading the summary. There were no "right or wrong" answers. The data were examined to find where

the majority lies and the implied standards. Using the information, a reader might be led to reexamine his or her thinking.

To the investigator's knowledge, the subject of ethics has not undergone substantial study in the field of education. Educators, such as Goodlad (1990) and others, are just beginning to write articles and books on the subject. Most articles and books concerning ethics in schools have appeared in the past eight or nine years, increasing as time approached the present. These writings were based more on personal observation or personal concern than actual research. Some of the observations stemmed from related research, such as Goodlad's research on effective schools. Research relating to ethics, such as the ASCD Panel on Moral Education (1988) about ethical codes, and research on levels of moral maturity, based on Kohlberg's (1978) model, has been in evidence. The national study on the ethics of school administrators (Keough 1992) was the fifth annual study. Extensive searching did not reveal any other research of this nature.

Both individual and societal ethical standards are arrived at and defined by consensus. Principals work in semi-isolation from each other and, based on the investigator's personal experience, do not talk about ethics even when they do get together. Therefore, it is difficult for any principal to have an idea of what constitutes the consensus among his or her peers. There also may be regional or demographic differences in perception. What is true in a basically rural state like North Dakota might be different, either in consensus or degree, from that in a basically metropolitan state like New York or in the nation as a whole. If there were similar studies in other states, the investigator was unable to locate them. The national study (Keough 1992) was used as a model for this study.

The returns from the survey participants were very prompt and a high response rate was obtained, making follow-up mailings or calls

unnecessary. This seemed to indicate that the place of ethics in the decision-making process of principals was of substantial interest.

Summary of Quantitative Data and Related
Qualitative Input

A visual examination of the demographic data (table 1) shows the majority of principals studied were full-time principals, males, employed rather evenly between rural and urban districts. These principals had been employed in their current position less than five years, served in a principalship for more than five years (mean of 12 years), and served in education for more than thirteen years (mean of 23 years). This group of principals averaged forty-six years in age, held a master's degree, and felt the greatest source of ethical influence had been a result of home influence. The range in age was from twenty-six to sixty.

Many principals declined to answer some questions, even though their anonymity was protected with great care. This may have indicated a fear that their anonymity was less than secure and that their responses might be communicated in a way that would have an adverse affect. Another possibility was that the unanswered questions were ones for which the principals, in their own minds, did not yet have a satisfactory response. In a few cases, a notation in the margin indicated a lack of years of experience in general or years in their current school district precluded answering that particular question.

It was also interesting to note that when there was a question followed by a question beginning "If 'yes' to question (previous question number), . . .," more principals answered this question than had answered "yes" to the previous question. The investigator did not know how to interpret this behavior.

Some of the questions brought forth responses that were about evenly divided between the suggested alternatives. This seemed to

indicate there was no clear consensus on the issue under consideration. Others questions were answered in such a manner so that the distributions were skewed very heavily toward one response, which seemed to indicate principals were generally in agreement on that ethical standard.

Statistical analyses were conducted on the questions and six of the demographic variables. Relatively few were found to have a significant relationship. The investigator had expected significant relationships to be more common. No one variable constituted all or a large number of the incidence of significance. One variable, the total number of years as principal, was found not to have a significant relationship with any of the questions.

There were forty-one questions which generated fifty-one comparisons. Forty-one tables described the demographic variables and the comparison data. Five questions were asked where no comparisons were made.

Summary of Significant Findings

Full-time principals were more likely to employ relatives of school board members in the school district, initiate practices allowing greater parental involvement, and perceive that other administrators in their school accepted gifts.

Two alternatives about selecting VCR tapes for school use were separated by a very narrow margin. These were doing without the film and finding another alternative or using school funds to purchase and place it in the library. The first alternative was favored by the greater percentage of part-time principals. The second alternative was favored by a greater percentage of full-time principals.

The current status of students' rights was perceived to be strengthened by those principals who have been in their position from

1-5 years; the strengthening of status was perceived to decrease as the number of years in the position increased. Principals who have been in their positions for 1-5 years believe that human and civil rights adversely affected the administration of schools while those in their positions 6-15 years did not. Those in their positions for longer than fifteen years seemed to be about evenly divided.

Principals employed in urban districts were more likely to employ their relatives, initiated practices for greater parental involvement, either by themselves or by involving a team, and received more offers of wining and dining as gifts. Principals in urban districts had perceptions that other administrators in their district accepted gifts more frequently than was true of principals in rural districts.

A larger percentage of male principals employed their relatives but indicated the hiring had been done ethically. Male principals had greater confidence in the reliability of information on student achievement than did their female counterparts. A higher percentage of female principals had never received an offer of gifts. All principals indicated avoidance of the practice of putting school property to personal use, but female principals were less likely to do so. There were comparatively few gender comparisons showing significant differences between principals. There were no readily apparent reasons. However, comparative analyses were not done to determine the relationship between gender and the other variables such as location or amount of time spent as principal.

The reason for difference in hiring of relatives may result from more male principals being married to teachers or secretaries than female principals who are married to teachers. The chance of female principals being married to secretaries was almost none. The survey did not ask the vocation of the spouse.

The incidence of employment of relatives of principals was greater with principals who were fifty-two or older but fell as age decreased. Of those principals who indicated that they had received "encouragement" to hire friends or relatives of school board members, the perceptions that the "encouragement" had a bearing on employment were greater with the principals 44-51 years old, less with those younger, and almost never with those older. Principals 52-60 years old indicated confidence in the reliability of public relations information; however, the degree of confidence decreased with age. The principals in all age groups perceived the frequency of other principals accepting gifts to be seldom. However, the greater percentages of principals who perceived the frequency to be often and never both came from the 44-51 age group. Principals in all age groups overwhelmingly indicated they would not hire a consultant who had been instrumental in helping them obtain their position. Still there were differences. The greater percentage who would not were from the 52-60 age group, with the 44-51 age group indicating a greater likelihood that they would hire a consultant.

No significant relationship was found between years spent as a principal and any of the questions, differing from expectations. It would seem that principals were aware of the importance of ethics from the beginning of their experience.

Summary of Quantitative Comparisons by Question

A summary of the results of the quantitative material about the specific areas was undertaken. Some of the questions were discussed together, such as the questions that were followed by "If 'yes' to the previous question, . . .," some of the hiring questions, and the questions related to gifts offered.

Relatives of school board members or principals were not hired in most schools. In those schools where relatives of school board members or principals were hired, the principals perceived the hiring to be handled ethically. The greater number of both full-time and part-time principals indicated that relatives of school board members were infrequently hired. Full-time principals were more likely to hire relatives of school board members than were part-time principals.

Principals who have relatives employed by the school district were more likely to be employed in an urban community, be male, and over age fifty-two. There did not seem to be a discernible reason as to why a greater percentage of urban principals had relatives in the schools than did rural principals. The survey did not ask if spouses were also in education. With the greater number of families being two-income families, a higher percentage of male principals may be married to teachers or secretaries than female principals married to teachers or secretaries.

Principals were not "encouraged" to hire friends or relatives of school board members. Of those who had, the majority indicated that the "encouragement" had no bearing on their decision. Most principals had never hired the friend or relative of a school board member. Of those who had, a large majority indicated that the hiring had been handled ethically.

The large majority indicated that the impact upon students was the most important factor when weighing decisions. Other factors such as money, relations with faculty and union, community wishes, and board priorities were of most importance to some principals.

When considering student achievement data, student attendance reports, annual reports to the Department of Public Instruction, and reports on student drug and alcohol abuse, the majority of the principals held a high level of confidence in the information except for

information concerning public relations information and the reports on student drug and alcohol abuse. Data from these two areas were considered to have a medium level of confidence by the majority of the principals. A low level of confidence by the majority was not indicated for information from any areas of communications. When considering letters of recommendation, the majority of the principals held a medium level of confidence in letters they received and a high level of confidence in letters they sent.

It was shown that students' rights were perceived to have been strengthened in their school in the past five years by the majority of the principals. A small majority of the principals indicated that the protection of students' human and civil rights did not make it more difficult to administer their school effectively. A small majority of principals indicated that it was preferable to protect the civil rights of the minority even if the good of the many was compromised. This question was the one with the greatest number of principals not answering.

In the area of parental involvement, it was shown that principals or an administrative team had initiated greater parental involvement in their schools. A small majority of principals believed that the parents should have a greater role in decision-making. Both full-time and part-time principals in both rural and urban schools had the large majority of their numbers indicating an initiation of parental involvement by the principal. However, full-time principals employed in urban schools were more likely to have done so. The greater likelihood for full-time principals to have initiated practices for greater parental involvement may be partly a matter of availability for organizing, communicating, and other activities involved in these practices. Principals also perceived that parents should be able to choose which school their child attends among the public schools in the

area. Principals perceived that parents should have a greater role in decision-making. Principals indicated that the parents were competent to be involved in the decision-making process.

Policies of central office or school board, with which they did not agree, were implemented in the same manner as other policies by the majority of principals. Principals indicated that they almost always agreed with the policies adopted by the school board in their district.

Being offered gifts in order to influence decision-making did not seem to have a high incidence in North Dakota. The survey only asked what had been offered, not how many times of each, so perhaps the incidence was a bit higher than a person would conclude from first glance. Of those possibilities on the list, sex and travel had never been offered. No offers had been received by 75 percent of the principals.

The national survey did not ask how many had never received offers, but by subtraction 49.5 percent is reached. Reasons for this difference may be (1) this practice on the part of vendors has not reached North Dakota as much as it has in the more industrial states; (2) as literature and one of the interviewed principals suggest, it might be that if the principal is highly principled by reputation, the vendors know better than to offer; or (3) North Dakota principals and/or North Dakota vendors generally agree upon the ethics of such practice. Of the offered gifts, wining and dining was the gift indicated to be offered most frequently (14.4%). Still, it was found that in both rural and urban communities wining and dining had seldom been offered to principals. Those who most often had received offers were shown to be male principals employed in urban districts.

Most principals considered acceptance of gifts, regardless of price, not permissible. Some principals indicated that it was permissible, if the price was under ten dollars. Some principals added

qualifiers other than monetary value such as (1) if the gift was something that could be used by the school (principal would give it to the school rather than use personally); (2) if it was, in actuality, a sample rather than a gift; or (3) if the gift was an advertisement such as calendars, cups, or pens. Then acceptance of the gift may be all right. The investigator has known of offers from book companies whereby a free book was offered for every designated number purchased. Computer program salesmen sometimes leave a sample disk that is only a small sampling of the computer program contents. Are these gifts purchasing incentives or a sale offer as would be encountered every week in stores? A principal has to decide.

The greater majority of principals indicated that they personally had never accepted gifts. Of those who answered "yes," their reasoning would seem to agree with the previous questions in that the gifts could be used by and were given to the school; some of the gifts were samples or advertisements. Of those who had accepted gifts, all indicated that the gift did not influence their decisions. Wining and dining, the most prevalent gift, would be more easily accomplished in the urban setting. A consideration would be whether wining and dining meant a full-scale gourmet meal or a sandwich and a cup of coffee. This definition was not clarified in the survey. Respondents interpreted it according to their understanding of the term.

Most principals generally did not think their school board members accepted gifts from vendors. Those who did believe their school board members accepted gifts were evenly split as to whether or not the gift influenced their decisions.

Most principals did not think other administrators in the district accepted gifts. Of those who thought fellow administrators did accept gifts, the greater number believed that it did influence decisions. Perceptions that other administrators did accept gifts were

higher for full-time principals employed in urban communities. Part of this may be due to the fact that rural communities have fewer administrators in the system, decreasing the probabilities. Another factor may be that a greater proportion of part-time principals was employed in rural communities. Urban schools may possibly be visited by a greater number of vendors. Vendors in urban schools would be realizing a larger sale and so perhaps more likely to offer gifts than they would in a rural setting where the sale would be comparatively smaller. This would possibly prompt salesmen or saleswomen to make more lucrative offers to principals employed in urban districts. The larger sales would also probably increase competition which could also prompt bigger and better offers. Perceptions of gift-taking may be influenced by principals' definitions of what constitutes a gift.

Most principals had never "fudged" on school district expense accounts. Most principals never have put school district goods or services to a purely personal use. Of those who did, no one commented on what goods or services were used and their reasoning behind the personal use. Unfortunately, the survey did not ask about uses of goods or services and the supporting reasoning. This would have given a more complete picture about qualifiers and specifics. It would seem that the qualifiers related to policy, permission, and compensation (when monetary cost was involved) would enter into and be key factors in the associated ethical question. Though both genders typically indicated that they did not use school property for personal use, those who did were more likely to be male.

The vast majority of principals had never ended their contract before completion. Among those who had, student contact time and repayment of time were factors in the decision. The slight majority of principals indicated that they believed it to be permissible to end their contract before completion if it was with school board approval.

The principals who indicated that it was sometimes permissible did not comment on the determiners as to when it was sometimes permissible. Most principals would not hire a consultant for pay who was instrumental in helping them attain their position.

Most principals believed ethical training was of vital importance in the preparation of administrators. The degree of importance (more, medium, less, and none) each had its advocates--the numbers graduating respectively. Principals judged that their training in ethics during their preparation was about average.

In regard to the use of computer program software, most principals would not make illegal copies for student use. Whether the software was copyrighted or whether company permission was present would be the determinant. It has been the investigator's experience that there are some programs developed special for schools, where the company permits a designated number of copies may be made provided they are used by students for classroom use. Once the designated number of copies have been made, the disk refuses copy attempts. The survey did not inquire about computer networks where only one copy is needed for multiple use. That would have been another option and perhaps one used by some of those principals answering "no," though they did not comment that it was so. In regard to computer use, it was shown that principals would schedule computer time so that all students would benefit from their use.

If a school board member requested pertinent information about a student other than his or her own child, principals indicated they generally would avoid answering the question politely and diplomatically. There were some reasons cited for answering sometimes: (1) if there was need to buy equipment to serve that student a brief answer would be necessary or (2) if the superintendent directed the principal to do so. Those principals who had answered "no" gave a

variety of reasons centering around the need for confidentiality: school records are confidential/privileged information, principals need to respect confidentiality, and communication as to the importance of confidentiality needs to be communicated to the school board member. The investigator would add that the Right to Privacy Act assures the need to honor confidentiality for legal reasons in addition to ethical reasons.

Given a choice between paying ninety dollars to a dealer to rent a VCR film for school use, buy it with their own money from a convenience store and use it at school, buy it with school funds from the convenience store and put it in the library, or doing without, principals indicated that they would forego the film for some other activity. The next larger number indicated they would buy it with school funds from the convenience store and put it in the library.

Where the ethical question entered in the question about VCR film was that films bought from the convenience store were to be for private use. When films were put to public use (showing en masse to students was considered a public use), the dealer (and the higher price) was considered currently, by law, to be the proper source. Another reason may be that enforcement is infrequent and would be difficult, though the film companies were beginning to look at school use more closely. Therefore, principals, superintendents, teachers, and librarians must decide what is most ethical.

Summary of Comparison to the National Survey

In general, data from the North Dakota study tended to agree with the data in the national survey. Sometimes the degree of agreement (percentages) was reasonably close. Other times, the degree of agreement showed a great disparity. For example, there were three questions with the greatest disparity. In question seven, the

percentage of principals who had hired a teacher who was a friend or relative of a school board member was quite a bit higher in the national survey. In questions ten and eleven, the national survey indicated a greater percentage with a low level of confidence in all categories of confidence in information that were congruent with questions in the North Dakota survey (the national survey did not ask about the state department).

In three questions, the majority in the national survey did not agree with the majority in the North Dakota survey. In question twelve, the majority in the national survey indicated that student rights had stayed about the same, while the majority in the North Dakota survey indicated they had been strengthened. In question fourteen, the majority in the national survey indicated that it was not preferable to protect the civil or human rights of the minority even if the good of the many is compromised, while the majority in the North Dakota survey indicated that it was (in both cases, the percentages were in the fifties--fairly slim majorities). In question sixteen, the majority in the national survey did not believe parents should be able to choose the schools their children attend. This was a larger percentage than for the North Dakota survey with the distribution between the three choices not being so even. In North Dakota, the majority believed students should be able to choose from among public schools in the area. This was a very slim majority with the frequency almost evenly divided among the three choices.

Summary of Qualitative Data Gathered from
Question Fifty-one on the Survey

Question fifty-one was an open-ended invitation to principals to support any areas of ethics that were not asked about specifically in the survey. Some of the responses were related to but not exactly the questions asked on the survey. Others were entirely new avenues of

thought. Sometimes an opinion was offered. At other times an individual had the feeling the principal was asking, "What is the answer?" Most of these concerns were discussed by only one or two principals.

Some of the concerns had to do with preferential treatment of students, concern of rights of all children in balance with special education, gossip, confidentiality concerning school records and school situations, how principals obtained in-house information, copyright laws, discipline of students, conflict of interest for school board members and how the principal deals with it, use of school property and money ethically, hiring practices, purchasing practices, student and teacher rights, self-serving behaviors, outside the building practices such as recruiting students, and community relations.

Summary of Qualitative Information Gathered from Telephone Interviews

The telephone interviews ascertained ethical concerns that had been covered in the survey but were enlarged upon or emphasized. The telephone interviews also ascertained ethical concerns not covered in the survey. Most of these concerns were touched upon by only one or two principals. Some concerns were expressed as opinions. Others were expressed in the spirit of a question. That is, they were concerned but were still searching for an answer.

Some of the expressed concerns dealt with the hiring of friends and relatives; parental involvement; acceptance of gifts; special education; confidentiality of student and teacher records; gossip; confidentiality of such information as recipients of reduced lunch fees; hiring of relatives of school board members and principals; equity in hiring as related to various types of discrimination and to "the good old boy network"; parental demands for favoritism; teacher behaviors in the workplace--including the NDEA; politics in schools; teacher role

conflicts; retention-promotion decisions; lack of mutual trust; working with board members with an "ax to grind"; misuse of school funds; teacher evaluations; sexual harassment; room assignment; some newer theories being tried such as site-based management; discipline; public relations; in-house conflicts; assignment and acceptance of duties for teachers outside the classroom--especially recess duty; dress codes; pressures and how to handle them (from special interest groups, overaggressive parents, school board members, superintendent, and teachers); and evaluations of principal's performance.

Conclusions

1. Most models of decision-making consider the positive and negative consequence of each possible option. However, there is no place in these models to assure the inclusion of any consequence other than the pragmatic. There would seem to be a need to include ethical considerations as an extra step in whichever decision-making model being used.
2. Some vocations, such as law and medicine, have always emphasized the importance of ethics in their practices. They also have been active and successful in self-monitoring. In education, the public discussion and interest in ethics have been recent. The profession has had its codes but with little or no enforcement. The attitudes have been somewhat complacent or casual. Those who have felt ethics to be of importance have often felt frustration. This area is being increasingly publicized and the awareness is important. Principals often do not talk about ethics--perhaps it is time.
3. Most principals really do take their ethical roles seriously--the wish to do what is most right--but are not

always so sure what the most right would be. To be able to examine a question and indicate that they do not know what is most right but they want to know would seem to indicate that principals will put more time into thinking about ethical aspects of a question in order to better determine that answer. To not know is not wrong. For many issues it is difficult to determine what is most right. Dilemmas are even more difficult. To be aware, to think about, to learn from mistakes made, and to do the best to do what is most right would be the path that would lead to decisions that are the most ethical most of the time. However, principals cannot be absolutely right all of the time, no matter how hard they try.

4. An agreed-upon code of ethics, both formal and informal, was considered important. A working code for elementary principals must be formulated by means of building a consensus involving all participants. There must be a degree of leeway to allow for individual differences, freedom of choice, and freedom of speech. However, there also needs to be a generally most accepted practice with agreed-upon outer limitations that are enforceable.
5. The principals who responded did not seem to be threatened by the survey or the interviews. Most of the interviewees were very open and honest, with an "I tell it like it is" attitude. There was a feeling of confidence in what they were doing.
6. When comparing the North Dakota study to the national study, the perceptions seem to be generally the same in most areas. Where there was agreement, there was sometimes a different

weighing or balance. Where there was a difference, the disparity was generally not great.

Relationship of the Interview Data
to the Literature

According to the literature, whistleblowing has not occurred very much in schools. There was included in the literature chapter information as to consequences of whistleblowing and the fact that fear of such consequence stems voicing of perceived infractions. There was also an indication that sometimes people do unethical things without fear. In business, individuals in power know subordinates will fear the consequence of speaking out and so will not do so. Responses to question fifty-one, "Briefly list any situations that are not covered by the above questions which have ethical implications," and in the telephone interviews would seem to indicate this may be at least a partial explanation as to the lack of whistleblowing in education. There seemed to be the thought that the consequences of whistleblowing occur when such opposition showed itself, even if the opposition was not to the degree where it would be considered to be whistleblowing. That is, it may not be brought out in public meetings, formal complaints, or with any type of real publicity.

According to the literature, the way a person perceived himself or herself often was based upon how well a person believes he or she lives up to his or her own and society's ethical standards--the effect upon self-identity, self-esteem, and expectations of self in the future. This feeling was reflected in the interview, the thought that principals must decide and act with integrity, as that person must live with himself or herself.

The literature indicated that both the direct instruction and the modeling methods of teaching morals were important but that the most effective method was modeling good ethics. In the open-ended questions,

principals indicated a concern that behaviors were important since teachers and principals should be demonstrating to students the most acceptable behaviors.

In both the literature and principals' responses, the importance of professionalism in everyday school activities was emphasized. Professionalism was viewed as having a variety of characteristics of which ethics was one, and a high level of competency was another.

The literature noted that it is important to be committed to the needs of students and their learning. The interviews and responses to the survey questions put great emphasis on the idea that what is best for students generally should be the determining factor in decision-making in schools.

In the literature, authors discussed issues and dilemmas. In some of the question areas, it was made clear that the principal had not clarified his or her own thinking about an issue or dilemma. This would seem to indicate that there had been some reading and thinking in the area, but that every principal had not been able to come to a conclusion that satisfied him or her as to what was most right. It would also seem to imply that the principal did care, did want to know what was most right, and so this circumstance caused him or her a degree of consternation (a personal issue or dilemma). Some of the questions elicited about evenly divided sets of their responses, which would seem to indicate that there was possibly a group issue or dilemma (society or vocational issue or dilemma) if not a personal one.

According to the literature, verbal agreement does not make an ethical agreement. There must be a sincere belief, a commitment to the standards under agreement, along with a common language and agreement on definitions. Ethical training, alone, will not ensure ethical decisions. A commentary on the survey reflected the same thought from a

responding principal. Literature indicated that training in ethics does help individuals sort out their thoughts as each tries to work out what is of value to him or her, what principles to apply, what is most right as the individual approaches life's decisions, and attempts to solve matters at issue along with life's dilemmas. The survey question secured responses that indicated that most principals felt ethical training was of importance in varying degrees, with relatively few believing it was not of importance.

The literature indicated that to follow prescribed decision-making processes does not guarantee that the best decisions will be made, but it does increase that probability. The more people exercise and attempt to practice this skill, with ethics involved in the decision, the more proficient they become. In the survey, and in the interviews, principals seemed concerned that their decision-making be done in such a manner that the best possible decisions be made.

Both the literature and the surveys indicated a great importance should be placed upon communication between the school and the community/society it serves. Both indicated that communication must be a two-way street based upon mutual trust. Both the literature and the respondents indicated that a part of the reason for this importance was the feelings of ownership that come with the fact that schools are funded with public monies.

In summary, the literature and survey indicated that when considering decision-making and deciding what was the most ethical in schools, the key factors seemed to be freedom of choice, doing no harm to others, doing what was best for students, laws and regulations, policy at all levels, intent of all concerned in the decision, and commitment to ethical decision-making. This was done in accordance with moral values such as fairness, justice, equality, equity, honesty, and truth.

Overall, the findings from the survey, the responses to question fifty-one, "Briefly list any situations that are not covered by the above questions which have ethical implications," and the interview findings seemed to reflect much of the same views of what is important in decision-making in schools and the ethical standards that entail as was found in literature. The quick and high percentage of response would seem to indicate both an awareness and interest in the subject of ethics as related to schools.

Recommendations

Conclusions from the present study, in conjunction with the background information and insights found in the literature, led to the following recommendations:

1. School boards, superintendents, and principals (especially, the principal) need to take a leadership role in assuring that the school becomes more ethical and, therefore, more effective in the implementing of growth and development of the students as they learn.
2. The principal needs to assure the needs of students come before the needs of others when there is a conflict of interest such as needs of teachers versus needs of students.
3. The principal needs to work at building trust between the school and the parents and community based upon ethical principles.
4. Principals should take care to make decisions in such a manner that ethics are involved, whether the decisions be large or small.
5. Principals should be encouraged to become educated in ethics. It may be true that education will not assure ethical behavior, but principals should have such education

so that they will be aware of the meaning of their behavior to others.

6. The principals should look at the North Dakota survey as compared to the national survey since a true vocational consensus would have to be somewhat nationwide, even if there might be some regional differences in emphasis.
7. In the survey were several questions that had interesting potential should they be enlarged upon or branched out using additional variables such as special education, hiring equity, and principals being actively included in the hiring process. These would be topics for further study.
8. The reference list in this study included all the reading done in the preparation of this dissertation. The information therein was much too extensive to be included in chapter two. It is recommended that principals read beyond the literature.
9. Studies of this nature have not been very numerous. For a consensus to emerge, there needs to be a number of studies, and a more widespread awareness. This study involved only elementary principals in North Dakota. The investigator would recommend similar studies be conducted involving secondary principals, superintendents, school board members, and special education directors in North Dakota. Similar studies in other states would further contribute to the development of consensus.

APPENDIX A
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES SURVEY

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES SURVEY

The first portion of the survey solicits information on your job setting as an Elementary School Principal of a K-6 or K-8 elementary school.

In questions 1 through 3, check the one response that most nearly describes your situation.

1. What portion of your time are you assigned as an elementary principal?
 Full-time Elementary Principal Less than full-time Elementary Principal
2. How many years have you held your current position at this school?
 Less than a year 1-5 years
 6-15 years 16 years or more
3. In what type of school district/community do you work?
 Farm community (smaller than 500) Rural community (between 500 and 2,499)
 Small city (2,500 to 9,999) Larger Cities (10,000 and Over)

The second portion of the survey solicits demographic information.

In questions 4 through 5, check one response to each item.

4. What is your gender?
 Male Female
5. What is your highest degree earned?
 Bachelor Master
 Specialist Doctorate

In questions 6 through 8, fill in a response to each item.

6. What is your age? _____ Years
7. How many years employed in education? (do not include current year)
 _____ Years
8. How many years employed as a principal? (do not include current year)
 _____ Years

The third portion of the survey solicits information about your school career and background.

9. From your perspective, which item below had the LARGEST impact on values learned by you?
 Home Church
 Elementary and secondary school

Professional Practices Survey: 2

The fourth portion of the survey solicits your perceptions and opinions about ethics and ethical situations.

Ethics Defined: Ethics are the standards by which behaviors are measured as to "right" and "wrong" (Terry 1982).

In questions 10 through 18, check one response to each item.

10. Are any relatives of your school board members employed by your district? If the answer is no, go to question 12.
 Yes No
11. If yes to question 10, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?
 Yes No
 Sometimes
12. Are any of your relatives employed by your district? If the answer is no, go to question 14.
 Yes No
13. If yes to question 12, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?
 Yes No
 Sometimes
14. Were you ever "encouraged" to hire a teacher who was a personal friend or relative of a school board member? If the answer is no, go to question 16.
 Yes No
15. If the answer to question 14 was yes, what amount of bearing did board member "encouragement" have on your hiring decision?
 Was a determining factor Had some bearing
 Not Applicable
16. Have you ever hired a teacher who was a friend or relative of a school board member? If the answer is no, go to question 18.
 Yes No
17. If yes to question 16, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?
 Yes No
 Sometimes
18. In making any school decision, which of the following factors do you consider most important? (Choose only one)
 Money (budget concerns) Relations with faculty or unions
 Community wishes Impact on students
 Board priorities
19. How much confidence do you have in the reliability and accuracy of the following information that school districts release? Check one response in each row.
- | Information Release | Low | Medium | High |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Student achievement data | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student attendance | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Annual report to D.P.I. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Public relations information..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Data on student use of drug and alcohol | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reports on student discipline actions.... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Professional Practices Survey: 4

Vendors, in the following questions, are any companies selling materials or services to the school district, eg., banks, year book companies, class ring companies, pop and candy vendors, computer software salespersons, textbook companies, paper and/or office supplies companies, and any or similar supplies or services.

Personal gifts or services, in the following questions, are given to individuals for their own use, not to the school. This would not include office calendars and note pads as these are essentially given as advertising.

31. Have you ever been offered the following gifts or services by a vendor? Check all that apply
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jewelry
<input type="checkbox"/> Tickets to sporting events
<input type="checkbox"/> Consulting work
<input type="checkbox"/> Money
<input type="checkbox"/> "Wining and dining"
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> Use of vacation accommodations
<input type="checkbox"/> Travel
<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Sex
<input type="checkbox"/> Drugs or alcohol
<input type="checkbox"/> None of these |
|--|--|

In questions 32 through 50, check one response to each item

32. Do you think it is all right to accept personal gifts or services from vendors?
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, if under \$10
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, if under \$100
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, regardless of value | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, if under \$50
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, if over \$100
<input type="checkbox"/> No, regardless of value |
|--|--|
33. Have you ever accepted a personal gifts or services worth more than \$10 from a vendor? If the answer is no, go directly to question 35.
- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
34. If yes to question 33, do you think this acceptance influenced a decision in favor of the vendor?
- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
35. Do you think any of your board members have accepted valuable personal gifts from vendors? If the answer is no, go directly to question 37.
- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
36. If yes to question 35, do you think this acceptance influenced a vote or decision in favor of the vendor?
- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
37. Do you think any other administrators in your school district have accepted valuable personal gifts or services from vendors? If the answer is no, go directly to question 39.
- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
38. If yes to question 37, do you think this acceptance influence a vote or decision in favor of the vendor?
- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
39. Using a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (always), how often do you think other administrators accept gifts or services from vendors worth more than \$10?
- | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
40. Have you ever "fudged" on your school district expense account?
- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
41. Have you ever put valuable school district goods or services to purely personal use?
- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|

51. Briefly list any situations that are not covered by the above questions which have ethical implications. Feel free to use separate sheets of paper.

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF INVITATION AND POST CARD

3904 University Avenue Apt. 8
Grand Forks, ND 58203
April 20, 1992

[Hovel.DB:NOT ON DESKTOP] [Hovel.DB:NOT ON DESKTOP], [Hovel.DB:NOT ON DESKTOP]
[Hovel.DB:NOT ON DESKTOP]
[Hovel.DB:NOT ON DESKTOP]
[Hovel.DB:NOT ON DESKTOP], [Hovel.DB:NOT ON DESKTOP] [Hovel.DB:NOT ON DESKTOP]

Dear [Hovel.DB:NOT ON DESKTOP] [Hovel.DB:NOT ON DESKTOP]:

I am a doctoral student at the University of North Dakota conducting dissertation research concerning the perceptions of elementary principals in North Dakota about ethical decision making in the principalship. As you know, some situations have clear ethical solutions. Others are not at all clear. The investigator recognizes that there is no way research could cover all the contingencies. However, this is an attempt to gather perceptions in some areas that are commonly faced by principals but may be viewed in different ways.

The study does not attempt to arrive at definitive answers to complex ethical questions. The major purpose of this study is to bring together the perceptions and opinions of elementary principals in North Dakota to develop a clearer picture of what would be considered more ethical in our part of the world. Another purpose is to study some of the pressures and considerations that effect those decisions. The purpose of this study is not, in any way, to measure or make judgements about the ethics of North Dakota elementary principals.

A few principals will be asked to consent to a follow-up interview. This interview would likely take place in the summer. In this interview, the principals interviewed would be asked to enlarge on their decision-making philosophy and to share some applications of that philosophy as well as concerns that they see in the principalship and in education, in general. I am enclosing a card for you to return showing that you have completed and mailed the questionnaire. On the card is a place for you to indicate whether you would be willing to allow me to contact you for an interview.

You have my assurance that strict confidentiality will be maintained. Neither school district or principal will be identified in the reporting of the data. I'm sure you already know that you are not required to participate in the study. But, I do want and need your participation. I also want you to know that you do not need to answer any specific question you choose not to answer. However, it will make the study more complete if you choose to answer all the questions and, I urge you to do so.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please call me collect at (701) 775-0270 or leave a message at (701) 777-4255. The only scheduled time in which I would be unavailable would be Wednesday and Thursday mornings.

Thank you for your cooperation. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Isabel Hovel

- I have returned the survey to you.
- I choose not to participate in this study.
- I would be willing to participate in an interview.

Name _____

School _____

Address _____

City, State Zip _____

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF PERMISSION TO USE THE INSTRUMENT

The Executive Educator[®]

1680 Duke Street Alexandria, Virginia 22314 (703) 838-6722

February 28, 1992

Ms. Isabel Hovel
3904 University Avenue #8
Grand Forks, ND 58203

Dear Ms. Hovel:

Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire used by Katherine Keough and her colleagues at Xavier University in developing the article "Questions of Ethics." Results of the survey are written in on each question.

You have our permission to use the questionnaire, with modifications as you see fit, in your research.

Sincerely,



Sally Banks Zakariya
Managing Editor

cc: Katherine Keough

APPENDIX D

FREQUENCY DATA TOTALS REFLECTING THE PERSPECTIVE
OF ADMINISTRATORS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OF THE NATION

1. Are any relatives of your school board members employed by your district? 50.0% Yes 50.0% No
2. If yes to question 1, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?
 _____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes
3. Are any of your relatives employed by your district?
 29.7% Yes 75.3% No
4. If yes to question 3, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?
 _____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes
5. Were you ever "encouraged" to hire a teacher who was a personal friend or relative of a school board member?
 29.7% Yes 69.7% No
6. If yes to question 5, what amount of bearing did the board member's "encouragement" have on your hiring decision?
 ___ Was a determining factor ___ Some bearing
 ___ No bearing
7. Have you ever hired a teacher who was a friend or relative of a school board member?
 41.0% Yes 58.7% No
8. If yes to question 7, in your opinion were these employment situations handled ethically?
 _____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes
9. In making any school decision, which of the following factors do you consider most important?
 6.9% Money (budget concerns)
 0.4% Relations with faculty or unions
 0.8% Community wishes
 4.5% Board priorities
 87.3% Impact on students
10. How much confidence do you have on the reliability and accuracy of the following information that school districts release?
- | | Low | Medium | High |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Student achievement data | <u>10.4%</u> | <u>58.7%</u> | <u>30.9%</u> |
| Student attendance | <u>5.2%</u> | <u>37.6%</u> | <u>57.1%</u> |
| Annual report to DPI | | | |
| Public relations information | <u>17.1%</u> | <u>64.0%</u> | <u>18.7%</u> |
| Data on student use of
drugs and alcohol | <u>28.1%</u> | <u>58.5%</u> | <u>12.3%</u> |
| Reports on student
discipline actions | <u>15.7%</u> | <u>61.8%</u> | <u>21.3%</u> |

11. How much confidence do you have in the reliability of the following items?
- | | Low | Medium | High |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Letters of recommendation you have received | <u>16.6%</u> | <u>70.9%</u> | <u>12.3%</u> |
| Letters of recommendation you have written | <u>2.8%</u> | <u>47.2%</u> | <u>49.9%</u> |
12. In light of court decisions in the past five years, how do you perceive the current status of student rights in your district?
6.1% Rights have weakened
52.6% Rights have stayed the same
41.4% Rights have strengthened
13. Does the protection of student's human and civil rights make it more difficult to administer the schools in your district effectively?
46.7% Yes 53.0% No
14. Is it preferable to protect the Civil Rights of the minority even if the good of the many is compromised?
42.8% Yes 57.1% No
15. Has your administration or administrative team initiated greater parental involvement in the schools?
84.7% Yes 57.2% No
16. Do you think parents should be able to choose the school their child attends?
35.1% Yes, from other public schools in my area
20.5% Yes, from other public or private schools in my area
43.5% No
17. Do you think parents should have a greater role in the decision-making process?
52.9% Yes 46.4% No
18. Do you think parents are competent to assume a greater role in the decision-making process at the building level?
53.7% Yes 46.2% No
19. How do you implement central office directives with which you disagree?
74.8% Same as all policies
22.7% With less enthusiasm
2.4% Do not implement
20. How do you implement school board policies with which you disagree?
82.4% Same as all policies
17.0% With less enthusiasm
0.5% Do not implement
21. Rate the extent to which you agree with the policies adopted by the school board of your school district.
0.1% Never 2.0% Almost never
16.2% Moderate 71.7% Almost always
9.4% Always

22. Have you ever been offered the following gifts or services by a vendor?
- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <u>8.4%</u> Jewelry | <u>0.3%</u> Travel |
| <u>26.3%</u> Tickets to sporting events | <u>11.0%</u> Recreation |
| <u>2.9%</u> Consulting work | <u>0</u> Sex |
| <u>5.2%</u> Drugs and alcohol | <u>1.9%</u> Money |
| <u>39.1%</u> Wining and dining | <u>4.5%</u> Other |
| <u>0.6%</u> Use of vacation accommodations | <u> </u> None |
23. Do you think it is all right to accept personal gifts or services from a vendor?
- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> Yes, if < \$10 | <u>5.4%</u> Yes, regardless of price |
| <u>13.0%</u> Yes, if < \$50 | <u>80.7%</u> No, regardless of price |
24. Have you ever accepted personal gifts or services from vendors?
- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| <u>9.0%</u> Yes | <u>90.8%</u> No |
|-----------------|-----------------|
25. If yes to question 24, do you think this acceptance influenced a decision in favor of the vendor?
- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| <u>7.6%</u> Yes | <u>92.4%</u> No |
|-----------------|-----------------|
26. Do you think any of your board members have accepted valuable personal gifts from vendors?
- | | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| <u>12.2%</u> Yes | <u>87.8%</u> No |
|------------------|-----------------|
27. If yes to question 26, do you think this acceptance influenced a vote or decision in favor of the vendor?
- | | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| <u>44.1%</u> Yes | <u>55.9%</u> No |
|------------------|-----------------|
28. Do you think any other administrators in your school district have accepted valuable personal gifts or services from vendors?
- | | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| <u>29.3%</u> Yes | <u>70.6%</u> No |
|------------------|-----------------|
29. If yes to question 28, do you think this acceptance influenced a vote or decision in favor of the vendor?
- | | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| <u>50.9%</u> Yes | <u>49.0%</u> No |
|------------------|-----------------|
30. How often do you think other administrators accept gifts or services from vendors worth more than \$10?
- | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| <u>20.0%</u> Never | <u>55.9%</u> Almost never | <u>19.6%</u> Medium |
| <u>3.3%</u> Almost always | <u>0.3%</u> Always | |
31. Have you ever "fudged" on a school district expense account?
- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| <u>3.3%</u> Yes | <u>96.7%</u> No |
|-----------------|-----------------|
32. Have you ever put valuable school district goods or services to purely personal use?
- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| <u>6.4%</u> Yes | <u>93.6%</u> No |
|-----------------|-----------------|
33. Have you ever ended your contract as superintendent before its date of completion?
- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| <u>0.8%</u> Yes, at board's request | <u>78.3%</u> No |
| <u>0</u> Yes, for reasons of personal health | |
| <u>16.6%</u> Yes, to take another job | |
| <u>2.5%</u> Yes, by mutual consent with the board | |
| <u>1.8%</u> Yes, for other reasons | |

34. Do you think it is all right to leave your district in the middle of a contract to accept a better position?
9.2% Always 59.6% Sometimes
 _____ Only with board approval 1.8% Never
35. If it would further your career, would you hire a consultant who helped place you in your position to do paid work in your district?
9.7% Yes 90.2% No
36. What importance do you place on training in ethics in the academic preparation of an administrator?
1.2% Not important
2.8% Less than average
9.5% Average
32.0% More than average
54.3% Vital
37. How would you rate your own graduate school preparation in ethics?
11.3% Poor 20.5% Not so good 28.8% Average
26.1% Good 13.1% Very good
38. If your school cannot afford to buy multiple copies of computer program software, would you make copies for student use?
 _____ Yes _____ No
39. If your school has 10 computers for student use, which group of students would get preference in using them?
 _____ Gifted and talented
 _____ Upper grade students
 _____ All students by scheduling
40. What would you do if a school board member requested information about a child with learning problems who is not his/her child?
 _____ Answer briefly
 _____ Tell him/her all he/she wants to know
 _____ Politely and diplomatically not answer the question
41. The movie VCR rental film charges nearly \$90 for a well-known film that you desire to have the students see both for educational value and as part of the Christmas season. The film is available at the convenience store for \$15. What would you do?
 _____ Buy it with my own money from the convenience store and use it at school
 _____ Buy it with school funds from the convenience store and place it in the library
 _____ Pay the full \$90, even if the school is short of funds
 _____ Forego the movie in favor of some other activity

APPENDIX E
SOME ADOPTED CODES OF ETHICS

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
STATEMENT OF ETHICS

An educational administrator's professional behavior must conform to an ethical code. The code must be idealist and at the same time practical, so that it can apply reasonably to all educational administrators. The administrator acknowledges that the schools belong to the public they serve for the purpose of providing educational opportunities to all. However, the administrator assumes responsibility for providing professional leadership in the school and community. This responsibility requires the administrator to maintain standards of exemplary professional conduct. It must be recognized that the administrator's actions will be viewed and appraised by the community, professional associates, and students. To these ends, the administrator subscribes to the following statements of standards.

The educational administrator:

1. Makes the well-being of students the fundamental value in all decision making and actions.
2. Fulfills professional responsibilities with honesty and integrity.
3. Supports the principle of due process and protects the civil and human rights of all individuals.
4. Obeys local, state, and national laws and does not knowingly join or support organizations that advocate, directly or indirectly, the overthrow of the government.
5. Implements the governing board of education's policies and administrative rules and regulations.
6. Pursues appropriate measures to correct those laws, policies, and regulations that are not consistent with sound educational goals.
7. Avoids using positions for personal gain through political, social, religious, economic, or other influence.
8. Accepts academic degrees or professional certification only from duly accredited institutions.
9. Maintains the standards and seeks to improve the effectiveness of the profession through research and continuing professional development.
10. Honors all contracts until fulfillment or release.

(This Statement of Ethics was developed by a task force representing the National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of Elementary School Principals, American Association of School Administrators, Association of School Business Officials, American Association of School Personnel Administrators, and National Council of Administrative Women in Education. Approved by NASSP Board of Directors, November 1973.)

CODE OF ETHICS OF THE
EDUCATION PROFESSION

Adopted by the
NEA Representative Assembly, July 1975

PREAMBLE

The educator, believing in the worth and dignity of each human being, recognizes the supreme importance of the pursuit of truth, devotion to excellence, and the nurture of democratic principles. Essential to these goals is the protection of freedom to learn and to teach and the guarantee of equal educational opportunity for all. The educator accepts the responsibility to adhere to the highest ethical standards.

The educator recognizes the magnitude of the responsibility inherent in the teaching process. The desire for the respect and confidence of one's colleagues, of students, of parents and of the members of the community provides the incentive to attain and maintain the highest possible degree of ethical conduct. The Code of Ethics of the Education Profession indicates the aspiration of all educators and provides standards by which to judge conduct.

The remedies specified by the NEA and/or its affiliates for the violation of any provision of this Code shall be exclusive, and no such provision shall be enforceable in any form other than one specifically designated by the NEA or its affiliates.

PRINCIPLE I
COMMITMENT TO THE STUDENT

The educator strives to help each student realize his or her potential as a worthy and effective member of society. The educator therefore works to stimulate the spirit of inquiry, the acquisition of knowledge and understanding, and the thoughtful formulation of worthy goals.

In fulfillment of the obligation to the student, the educator--

1. Shall not unreasonably restrain the student from independent action in the pursuit of learning.
2. Shall not unreasonably deny the student access to varying points of view.
3. Shall not deliberately suppress or distort subject matter relevant to the student's progress.
4. Shall make reasonable effort to protect the student from conditions harmful to learning or to health and safety.
5. Shall not intentionally expose the student to embarrassment or disparagement.
6. Shall not on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, national origin, marital status, political or religious beliefs, family, social or cultural background, or sexual orientation unfairly:

- a. Exclude any student from participation in any program;
 - b. Deny benefits to any student;
 - c. Grant any advantage to any student.
7. Shall not use professional relationships with students for private advantage.
8. Shall not disclose information about students obtained in the course of professional service, unless disclosure serves a compelling professional purpose or is required by law.

PRINCIPLE II
COMMITMENT TO THE PROFESSION

The education profession is vested by the public with a trust and responsibility requiring the highest ideals of professional service.

In the belief that the quality of the services of the education profession directly influences the nation and its citizens, the educator shall exert every effort to raise professional standards, to promote a climate that encourages the exercise of professional judgment, to achieve conditions which attract persons worthy of the trust to careers in education, and to assist in preventing the practice of the profession by unqualified persons.

In fulfillment of the obligation to the profession, the educator--

1. Shall not in an application for a professional position deliberately make a false statement or fail to disclose a material fact related to competency and qualifications.
2. Shall not misrepresent his/her professional qualifications.
3. Shall not assist entry into the profession of a person known to be unqualified in respect to character, education, or other relevant attribute.
4. Shall not knowingly make a false statement concerning the qualifications of a candidate for a professional position.
5. Shall not assist a non-educator in the unauthorized practice of teaching.
6. Shall not disclose information about colleagues obtained in the course of professional service unless disclosure serves a compelling professional purpose or is required by law.
7. Shall not knowingly make false or malicious statements about a colleague.
8. Shall not accept any gratuity, gift, or favor that might impair or appear to influence professional decisions or actions.

PROVISIONS FOR NATIONAL ENFORCEMENT

CONSTITUTION,
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

ARTICLE VII, Section 2, a. The Review Board shall have original jurisdiction in the following cases:

1. Impeachment of an officer who is a member of the Executive Committee;
2. Alleged violations of *the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession*.

ARTICLE VII, Section 2, b. The Review Board shall have the following powers subject to the conditions as herein outlined:

1. To impeach an officer. The officer shall have the right to appeal to the Board of Directors;
2. To censure, suspend, or expel a member for violation of *the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession* . . . The member shall have the right to appeal to the Executive Committee on procedural grounds only.
3. To vacate censure, lift suspension, or reinstate a member.

ARTICLE VII, Section 4. The Review Board shall establish its rules of procedure with the approval of the Board of Directors. Due process must be guaranteed in all its proceedings.

ADHERENCE TO THE CODE

CONSTITUTION,
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

ARTICLE II, Section 2, b. Members engaged in teaching or in other educational work shall adhered [sic] to *the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession*.

ARTICLE IV, Section 6. Executive officers of the Association may be impeached for violation of *the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession*, . . .

ARTICLE VI, Section 4. Officers of the Association may be impeached for violation of *the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession*, . . .

ARTICLE VII, Section 5, a. Members of the Review Board may be impeached (by the Executive Committee) for violation of *the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession*, . . .

GLOSSARY

Action. "The state of acting or moving; exertion of power or force" (McKechnie 1983, p. 20).

Amoral. "Indifferent or does not care to abide by oral rules" (Rich 1984, p. 122).

Aretaic ethics. The study of Virtue (Pojman 1990, p. 9).

Assumptions. "Those beliefs that we take for granted, what we have faith in, and what we count on" (Brown 1990, p. 37).

Attitude. "A system of beliefs organized around a common subject" (Weaver 1981, p. 202). Attitudes are more general and more complex than a belief because they cover more areas. Attitudes develop over a longer period of time and are more difficult to change.

Autonomy. "Personal liberty" (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, p. 6). "A rational being able to regard himself or herself as a maker of universal law and does not need an external authority" (Pojman 1990, p. 106).

Bad. The opposite of good.

Belief. "A proposition that can be derived from what we say or do, which may or may not be true, but our thinking that it is true constitutes a belief. Beliefs are not always logical" (Weaver 1981, p. 202).

Character. "The sum of the principles and values that guide actions in the face of moral choices" (Branden 1981, p. 113).

Code of ethics. A code that communicates the purpose, values, and beliefs of an organization and its leadership (Blanchard and Peale 1988) and "a set of rules that established the standards or norms in matters of individual or institutional conduct" (Sockett 1990, p. 238).

Conflict. See issues and dilemma.

Conscience. "A knowing within, a guide to conduct which lies in what is understood concerning human life and its excellence" (Banner 1968, p. 20).

Consequence. "Something produced by a cause or necessarily following from a set of conditions" (Woolf 1977, p. 241).

Debatable. Open to debate (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, p. 35; Woolf 1977, p. 291).

Debate. "A contention by words or argument" (Woolf 1977, p. 291).

Decision-making. "A process in which one discovers what should be done" (Brown 1990, p. xi).

Deontological ethics. A type of ethics that places emphasis or value on the act or kind of act (Pojman 1990, p. 8).

Descriptive ethics. An approach to ethics that involves "what is . . . describes and explains behaviors . . . helps us understand ourselves and others" (Brown 1990, p. 40).

Dilemma. A disagreement presenting two or more equally conclusive alternatives against an opponent, a problem seemingly incapable of satisfactory solution (Woolf 1977, p. 319).

Egoism. The speaker or decision maker gives service to self interest (Pojman 1990, p. 40).

Egotism. Prescribes that all others are to serve me (the speaker--all are to meet my interests first (Pojman 1990, p. 41).

Ethical resisters. Synonymous to whistleblowers. "People of conscience who disclose lawless acts in the workplace" (Glazer and Glazer 1989, p. 4).

Ethics. "The science of morality . . . seeks reliable intelligent approval or disapproval of conduct and character" (Tsanoff 1955, p. 3). "A moral philosophy . . . the study of human actions in respect to their being right or wrong . . . the systematic general knowledge of right and wrong conduct" (Zeleny 1989, p. 374). "A branch of philosophy that deals with how we ought to live, with the idea of the 'good' and with such concepts as right and wrong . . . searches for wisdom and truth through rational investigation with the desired results being moral and intellectual integrity" (Pojman 1990, p. xiii). Ethics are the standards by which behaviors are measured as to "right" and "wrong" (Terry and Rue 1982).

Facts. Those statements that are provable or can be verified; describing how the world is (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, pp. 36-37).

Golden Mean. "The midpoint between excess and deficiency" (Pojman 1990, p. 121).

Good. "Something contributing to the health, welfare and happiness; benefit; advantage" (McKechnie 1983, p. 786).

Heteronomy. "The opposite of autonomy . . . motivated by the authority of others" (Pojman 1990, p. 106).

Hypocrisy. "A feigning to be what one is not or to believe what one does not" (Woolf 1977, p. 564).

Immoral. "Unvirtuous or contrary to morality" (Rich 1984, p. 122).

Inaction. "Doing nothing about the questions at hand . . . action based on the decision to do nothing" (Hodgkinson 1991, p. 138).

Integrity. "The basic principles that are central and deepest in our lives" (Pojman 1990, p. 83).

Intent. "The state of mind with which an act is done" (Woolf 1977, p. 601).

Issues. "A matter that is in dispute between two or more parties; a point of debate or controversy; at a point for decision" (Woolf 1977, p. 615). Issues seemingly have a possible solution.

Knowledge. "The sum of what is known; the body of truth" (Woolf 1977, p. 639).

Laws. "Primary rules . . . have coercive power and are an exercise of force by duly constituted authorities through the use of sanctions" (Rich 1984, p. 40).

Metaethics. Part of ethics that "studies the nature of ethics in terms of its language, forms of reasoning, and how moral decisions are justified . . . raises the questions as to what is the difference between good, right, and ought . . . develops theories about the nature of ethics . . . not used to develop codes but rather to justify codes that are developed" (Rich 1984, pp. 41-42).

Moral dilemma. "When two moral values conflict; conflict between public and private interests; confusion between moral values and preferences" (personal values) (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, pp. 2-4). "A situation in which any action you take will allow some evil (wrong) to occur or one in which two accepted moral principles will meaningfully conflict" (Pojman 1990, p. 15).

Moral education. "Direct and indirect intervention of the school which affects both moral behavior and the capacity to think about issues of right and wrong" (Purpel and Ryan 1976, p. 5).

Moral principles. Statements based on moral values which prescribe how the world ought to be. Moral principles are public and therefore debatable (open to debate) (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, pp. 36-37). In contrast, facts and personal values (preferences) are not open to debate.

Moral reasoning. "Applying moral principles to the facts at hand. Moral reasoning considers the justification of the principle and attempts to make decisions on that basis" (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, p. 5).

Moral values. Those values that are of moral consideration--not preferences. Moral values are public and therefore debatable (open to debate) (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, p. 36).

Morality. "A system of moral conduct based on moral principles" (Rich 1984, p. 122). "An awareness or consciousness of the range of possibility in human existence, as an experience of reflection and self-examination" (Banner 1968, p. 11).

Morally mature person. A person who "understands moral principles and accepts responsibility for applying them" (ASCD Panel on Moral Education 1988, p. 5).

Morals. Relates to the principles of right conduct in behavior and to the extent that behavior conforms to accepted principles of what is considered to be right, virtuous, and just. Morals are closer to actual practice than to ethics (Pojman 1990, p. 2; Rich 1984, p. 122; Zeleny 1989, p. 374).

Mores. "The fixed morality--binding customs of a particular group. Mores vary cross-culturally and through history" (Rich 1984, p. 122).

Motive. "Something (as a need or desire) that causes a person to act (Woolf 1977, p. 751).

Negative ethics. Tells us what not to do (Brown 1990, p. 2).

Negative responsibility. The need to not do harm (Brown 1990, p. 2).

Nonmoral. "An act which is neither moral or immoral" (Rich 1984, p. 122). See preferences.

Opinion. Precepts that are "usually narrower in focus than a belief. Opinions come and go and tend to be situational, therefore tentative beliefs" (Weaver 1981, p. 202).

Personal values. See preferences.

Positive ethics. Tells us what to do (Brown 1990, p. 2).

Positive responsibility. The need or obligation to do good (Brown 1990, p. 2).

Preferences. A personal value statements indicating what we like and enjoy. Preferences are private and therefore not debatable (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, pp. 36-37).

Primary rules. "Equated with laws . . . regulates matters such as property and persons" (Rich 1984, p. 40).

Private behavior. Those matters which effect only the person making the judgment (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, p. 34).

Public behavior. Those matters which effect persons other than those making the judgment (Strike, Haller, and Soltis 1988, p. 34).

Purpose. "The mission of the organization (or individual), particular road to travel" (Blanchard and Peale 1988, p. 42).

Rational. "Based upon or derived from reasoning" (McKechnie 1983, p. 1496).

Reasonable. "Able to reason; having faculty to reason; endowed with reason" (McKechnie 1983, p. 1502).

Responsibility. "An individual of any social sense would be guided by beliefs concerning the probable consequences of his actions upon those who are likely to be affected by what he does" . . . reaches beyond family, friendship, and occupation to include community and society (Banner 1968, pp. 18-19).

Right. "In accordance with justice, law, and morality, etc; upright, virtuous" (McKechnie 1983, p. 1561).

Secondary rules. Rules about rules (Rich 1984, p. 40).

Self-esteem. The degree to which, by one's own judgment, one's behavior meets one's standards of behavior--self worth, self respect, self confidence (Branden 1981, p. 114).

Society. "An enduring and cooperating social group whose members have developed organized patterns of relationships through interaction with one another" and may be a community or nation (Woolf 1977, p. 103).

Teacher autonomy. "Consists in a liberal society, of the freedom to teach the young to be their own persons in accordance with the principles of integrity, competent practice, informed decision-making, and fair access" with implied ethical responsibilities (Bull 1990, p. 119).

Teleological ethics. A type of ethics that "places emphasis or value on the outcome or consequence of the act" (Pojman 1990, p. 8).

Truth. "The body of real things, events, and facts" (Woolf 1977, p. 1256).

Values. Precepts that are "usually more enduring than beliefs because they relate to the way we conduct our lives and to the goals we set for ourselves." Values are central to who we are . . . influence our communications and behaviors (Weaver 1981, p. 202). Pojman (1990, p. 57) indicates two possible definitions: (1) synonym for "good," or (2) "the whole range from the highest good through indifferent to the worst evil"--the latter taking into consideration, for example, those who value inflicting excessive pain on others.

Virtue. "Those characteristics that enable individuals to live well in communities" (Pojman 1990, p. 120). "Virtue is the goal or end in terms of which one measures human existence and is primarily in the individual as the shape or thrust of his character and secondarily in the behavior which sustains or alters the individual's character and affects the character of others" (Banner 1968, pp. 11, 13-14).

Whistleblowing. "People of conscience who disclose lawless acts in the workplace" (Glazer and Glazer 1989, p. 4).

Wisdom. The "accumulated philosophic or scientific learning; the ability to discern inner qualities and relationships . . . characterized by deep understanding, keen discernment, and a capacity for sound judgment" (Woolf 1977, p. 1345).

Wrong. Opposite of right.

REFERENCES

Books

- Adams, Robert M. 1973. A modified divine command theory of ethical wrongness. In Religion and morality: A collection of essays, ed. Gen Oulka and John P. Reeder, pp. 525-37. San Angelo, TX: Anchor.
- Aronowitz, Stanley, and Henry Giroux. 1985. Education under siege: The conservative, liberal, and radical debate over schooling. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Banner, William Augustus. 1968. Ethics: An introduction to moral philosophy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Barnett, Bruce G., Frank O. McQuarrie, and Cynthia J. Morris. 1991. The moral imperatives of leadership: A focus on human decency. Memphis: National Network for the Innovative Principal.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. 1978. Moral education. In Moral education: Five lectures, pp. 85-107. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blanchard, Kenneth, and Norman Vincent Peale. 1988. The power of ethical management. New York: Fawcett Crest.
- Blau, Peter M., and Richard A. Schoenherr. 1971. The structure of organizations. New York: Basic Books.
- Blumberg, Arthur. 1989. School administration as a craft. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bramson, Robert. 1981. Coping with difficult people. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Branden, Nathaniel. 1981. The psychology of self-esteem: A new concept of man's psychological nature. New York: Bantam.
- Brown, Marvin T. 1990. Working ethics: Strategies for decision making and organizational responsibility. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bull, Barry L. 1990. The limits of teacher professionalization. In The moral dimensions of teaching, ed. John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, pp. 87-129. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Caplow, Theodore. 1954. The sociology of work. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Clark, Christopher M. 1990. The teacher and the taught: Moral transactions in the classroom. In The moral dimensions of teaching, ed. John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, pp. 251-65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Corwin, Ronald. 1967. The school as an organization. New York: John Wiley.
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihalyi. 1990. The psychology of optimal experience. New York: Harper Collins.
- Cullen, John B. 1978. The structure of professionalism: A quantitative examination. New York/Princeton: Petrocelli Books, Inc.
- Dewey, John. 1934. A common faith. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dunham, Barrows. 1971. Ethics dead and alive. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1964. Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Feinberg, Walter. 1990. The moral responsibility of public schools. In The moral dimensions of teaching, ed. John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, pp. 155-87. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Fenstermacher, Gary D. 1990. Some moral considerations on teaching as a profession. In The moral dimensions of teaching, ed. John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, pp. 130-54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Fingarette, Herbert. 1969. Self deception. New York: Humanities Press.
- Frankena, William. 1973. Ethics. 2d ed. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Freidson, Eliot. 1970a. Profession of medicine. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company.
- _____. 1970b. Professional dominance. New York: Altherton.
- French, Peter. 1984. Collective and corporate responsibility. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Glasser, William. 1969. Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Glazer, Myron Peretz, and Penina Migdal Glazer. 1989. The whistleblowers: Exposing corruption in government and industry. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Goodlad, John. 1990. The occupation of teaching in schools. In The moral dimensions of teaching, ed. John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, pp. 3-34. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Gorton, Richard A. 1983. School administration and supervision: Leadership challenges and opportunities. 2d ed. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Company.
- Gorton, Thomas, and Noel Burch. 1974. T.E.T.: Teacher effectiveness training. New York: Peter Wyden Publishing Company.
- Greenfield, Thomas B. 1991. Foreword to Educational leadership: The moral art, by Christopher Hodgkinson. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Greenleaf, Robert. 1977. Servant leadership. New York: Paulist Press.
- Gustafson, James M. 1978. Education for moral responsibility. In Moral education: Five lectures, pp. 11-27. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Guy, Mary E. 1990. Ethical decision making in the everyday work situation. New York: Quorum Books.
- Hare, Richard M. 1952. The language of morals. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, Thomas A. 1969. I'm ok--you're ok. New York: Avon Books.
- Herzberg, Frederick. 1966. Work and the nature of man. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Hill, Napoleon, and W. Clement Stone. 1977. Success through a positive mental attitude. New York: Pocket Books.
- Hirschman, Albert O. 1978. Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hobbs, Thomas. 1651. Leviathan. New York: Wadsworth.
- Hodgkinson, Christopher. 1991. Educational leadership: The moral art. With a Foreword by T. B. Greenfield. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hume, David. 1957. An inquiry concerning human understanding. New York: Liberal Arts Press.
- Immogart, Glen L., and John M. Burroughs, eds. 1970. Ethics and the school administrator. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers and Publishers Inc.
- Jackson, Philip W., Robert E. Boostrom, and David T. Hansen. 1993. The moral life of schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1956. Critique of practical reason. Translated by Lewis W. Beck. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- _____. 1959. Foundations of the metaphysics of morals. Translated by Lewis W. Beck. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

- Keniston, Kenneth. 1978. Youth and violence: The contexts of moral crisis. In Moral education: Five lectures, pp. 109-31. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kierkagard, Soren. 1959. Either/or. Vol. 2. Translated by Walter Lowrie. San Angelo, TX: Anchor Books.
- Kindred, Leslie W., Don Bagin, and Donald R. Gallagher. 1984. The school and community relations. 3d ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. 1978. Education for justice: A modern statement of the platonic view. In Moral education: Five lectures, pp. 57-83. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kronenwetter, Michael. 1988. Journalism ethics. New York: Franklin Watts.
- Ladd, John. 1973. Ethical relativism. New York: Wadsworth.
- Lewis, Hunter. 1990. A question of values. With a Foreward by M. Scott Peck. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Maltz, Maxwell. 1976. The search for self-respect. New York: Bantam Books.
- McGinnis, Alan Loy. 1985. Bringing out the best in people. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Press.
- McKechnie, Jean, gen. supv. 1983. Webster's new universal unabridged dictionary. Cleveland: Dorset and Baber.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1863. Utilitarianism. New York: Wadsworth.
- Moore, George E. 1903. Principia ethics. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Newton, David. 1987. Science and ethics. New York: Franklin Watts.
- Peck, M. Scott. 1990. Foreward to A question of values, by Hunter Lewis. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Peters, Richard S. 1978. Concrete principles and the rational passions. In Moral education: Five lectures, pp. 29-55. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pojman, Louis P. 1990. Ethics: Discovering right and wrong. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Power, F. Clark, Ann Higgins, and Lawrence Kohlberg. 1989. Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Purpel, David, and Kevin Ryan, eds. 1976. Moral education...It comes with the territory. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Purpel, David E. 1989. The moral & spiritual crisis in education. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

- Quinton, Anthony. 1973. Utilitarian ethics. New York: Macmillan.
- Rachale, James. 1986. The elements of moral philosophy. New York: Random House.
- Rand, Ayn. 1957. Atlas shrugged. New York: Random House.
- Rich, John Martin. 1984. Professional ethics in education. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Ruggiero, Vincent R. 1988. The art of thinking. 2d ed. New York: Harper Collins.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1956. Being and nothingness. Translated by Hazel Barnes. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Scheffler, Isreal. 1976. The moral content of American public education. In Moral education: It comes with the territory, ed. David Purpel and Kevin Ryan, pp. 20-29. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. 1992. Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Shane, Harold. 1976. Foreword to Moral education...It comes with the territory, by David Purpel and Kevin Ryan, eds. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Sharp, Frank C. 1928. Ethics. New York: Appleton-Century.
- Sirotnik, Kenneth A. 1990. Society, schooling, teaching, and preparing to teach. In The moral dimensions of teaching, ed. John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, pp. 296-328. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sizer, Nancy F., and Theodore R. Sizer. 1978. Introduction. In Moral education: Five lectures, pp. 3-9. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sockett, Hugh. 1990. Accountability, trust, and ethical codes of practice. In The moral dimensions of teaching, ed. John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, pp. 224-50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Soder, Roger. 1990. The rhetoric of teacher professionalization. In The moral dimensions of teaching, ed. John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, pp. 35-86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Spring, Joel. 1976. The sorting machine: National educational policy since 1954. New York: David McKay Company.
- Strike, Kenneth A. 1990. The legal and moral responsibility of teachers. In The moral dimensions of teaching, ed. John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, pp. 188-223. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Strike, Kenneth A., Emil J. Haller, and Jonas F. Soltis. 1988. The ethics of school administration. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Strike, Kenneth A., and Jonas F. Soltis. 1985. The ethics of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Summner, William G. 1906. Folkways. Needleham, MA: Ginn & Co.
- Swain, Bruce. 1979. Reporters ethics. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Taylor, Paul. 1978. Problems of moral philosophy. Huntington, WV: Dickenson.
- Taylor, Richard. 1970. Good and evil: A new direction. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Terry, George R., and Leslie W. Rue. 1982. A guide to supervision. Homewood, IL: Learning Systems Company.
- Thomas, Bruce R. 1990. The school as a moral learning community. In The moral dimensions of teaching, ed. John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik, pp. 266-95. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Thompson, William I. 1970. At the edge of history. New York: Harper and Row.
- Tsanoff, Radoslav. 1955. Ethics. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Uris, Auren. 1978. Executive dissent. New York: Amacom.
- Watkins, James. 1976. Forming a value curriculum: Two philosophical issues to consider. In Moral education...It comes with the territory, ed. David Purpel and Kevin Ryan, pp. 11-19. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Weaver, Richard L. II. 1981. Understanding interpersonal communication. 2d ed. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Weber, Max. 1968. Economy and society. New York: Bedminister.
- Weinberg, George. 1969. The action approach: How your personality developed and how you can change it. New York: The New American Library, Inc.
- Weiss, Ann. 1985. Bioethics: Dilemmas in modern medicine. Hillside, NJ: Enslow Publishers Inc.
- Wolf, Henry Bosley, ed. 1977. Webster's new collegiate dictionary. Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam Company.
- Zeleny, Robert O., ed. 1989. World book encyclopedia. Chicago: World Book Inc. "Ethics," by James Collins.

Periodicals, Magazines, and Newspapers

- Achter, Chuck, and Dan Pelowski. 1986. Ethics and the duplication of computer software--One district's approach. NASSP Bulletin 70 (April): 15-17.
- Adler, Jerry, Mark Starr, Farai Chideya, Lynda Wright, Pat Wingert, and Linda Haac. 1990. Taking offense. Newsweek, 24 December, pp. 48-54.
- ASCD Panel on Moral Education. 1988. Moral education in the life of the school. Educational Leadership 45 (May): 4-8.
- Berney, Karen. 1987. Finding the ethical edge. National Business 3 (August): 18-21.
- Boothe, James W., Leo H. Bradley, T. Michael Flick, Kathrine E. Keough, and Susanne P. Kirk. 1992. Questions of ethics. The Executive Educator 14 (February): 17-24.
- Brennan, Alison D. H., and Robert J. Brennan. 1988. The principal, ethics, and special education decisions. NASSP Bulletin 72 (December): 16-19.
- Bryant, Miles, and Marilyn Grady. 1990. Where boards cross the line. The American School Board Journal 177 (October): 20-21.
- Calabrese, Raymond L. 1988. Ethical leadership: A prerequisite for effective schools. NASSP Bulletin 72 (December): 1-4.
- _____. 1990. The school as an ethical and democratic community. NASSP Bulletin 4 (October): 10-15.
- Clavin, Thomas. 1991. The high price of high ideals. Woman's Day, 24 September, pp. 44, 50-51.
- Cannon, Mark W. 1981. The critical role of principals in strengthening society's value system. NASSP Bulletin 65 (November): 76-86.
- Cavazos, Lauro. 1990. Teaching ethics in the public schools. NASSP Bulletin 74 (October): 1-4.
- Cotton, C., W. Patterson, P. Browne, and E. G. Cotton. 1979. Marginability and the school principal. The Educational Forum 43 (January): 221-27.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda. 1989. Teacher professionalism and accountability. The Education Digest 55 (September): 15-19.
- DeBruyn, Robert L. 1989. You can't be cynical about ethics. The Master Teacher, 13 March, pp. 1-2.
- Demsey, Dennis, Al Burr, Joan Grady, Thomas Perry, and Robert Gaucher. 1988. Ethics and the principal: Five vignettes. NASSP Bulletin 72 (December): 21-25.
- Diegmuller, Karen. 1991. Teaching our teachers. Education Week, 13 February, pp. 11-16.

- Doggett, Maran. 1988. Ethical excellence for school-based administrators. NASSP Bulletin 72 (December): 6-8.
- Duffy, Michael. 1991. On a slippery slope. Time, 6 May, pp. 20-22.
- Edgar, Jim. 1988. Government, ethics, and the classroom. NASSP Bulletin 72 (December): 26-28.
- Egan, Kathrine. 1990. Ethical codes: A standard for ethical behavior. NASSP Bulletin 74 (October): 59-62.
- Elson, John. 1991. Academics in opposition. Time, 1 April, p. 68.
- Faily, Anwar. 1980. Effective administrative behavior. NASSP Bulletin 64 (February): 30-36.
- Foster, Gregory D. 1981. Legalism, moralism, and bureaucratic morality. Public Personnel Management Journal 10 (Spring): 93-97.
- Freitas, David J. 1991. Successfully resolving ethical dilemmas in school. NASSP Bulletin 75 (January): 86-90.
- Gauthier, David. 1967. Morality and advantage. Philosophical Review 76 (October): 460-75.
- Gibbs, Nancy. 1991. Starving the schools. Time, 15 April, pp. 32-33.
- Godfrey, Drexel E., and Elliot Zashin. 1981. Integrity in work and interpersonal relations: A perspective for the public manager. Public Personnel Management Journal 10 (Spring): 110-18.
- Goodgame, Dan. 1991a. Fly free or die. Time, 13 May, pp. 16-18.
- _____. 1991b. Who stabbed Sununu? Time, 6 August, pp. 22-23.
- Gordon, Susan J. 1991. Work ethics. Family Circle, 5 November, p. 176.
- Greenfield, Meg. 1990. The handiwork of believers. Newsweek, 1 October, p. 78.
- Greenfield, William D. 1990. Five standards of good practice for the ethical administrator. NASSP Bulletin 74 (October): 32-37.
- Greenfield, William D., Jr. 1985. The moral socialization of school administrators: Informal role learning outcomes. Educational Administration Quarterly 21 (Fall): 99-119.
- Harden, G. Daniel. 1988. The principal's ethical responsibility and the parent's right to know. NASSP Bulletin 72 (December): 12-14.
- Harmin, Merrill. 1988. Value clarity, high morality: Let's go for both. Educational Leadership 45 (May): 24-30.
- Hechinger, Fred M. 1990. About education. New York Times, 7 November, p. B14.

- Henry, William A. III. 1991. Upside down in the groves of academe. Time, 1 April, pp. 66-69.
- Hill, Douglas Roman. 1990. Keep an eye on operations. The American School Board Journal 177 (October): 22-23.
- Honig, Bill. 1990. Teaching values belongs in our public schools. NASSP Bulletin 74 (October): 6-9.
- Hostetler, Karl. 1986. Ethics and power: Implications for the principal's leadership. NASSP Bulletin 70 (March): 31-36.
- _____. 1989. Who says professional ethics is dead? A response to Myron Lieberman. Phi Delta Kappan 7 (May): 723-25.
- Kalish, Judith, and David Perry. 1992. Setting ethical standards. The Executive Educator 14 (February): 24-26.
- Keough, Katherine. 1992. Question of ethics. The Executive Educator 14 (February): 17-26.
- Leo, John. 1988. The crimson copycat. U.S. News and World Report, 12 December, p. 90.
- Lickona, Thomas. 1988. How parents and schools can work together to raise moral children. Educational Leadership 45 (May): 36-38.
- Lieberman, Myron. 1988. Professional ethics in public education: An autopsy. Phi Delta Kappan 70 (October): 159-60.
- _____. 1989. A reply to Karl Hostetler. Phi Delta Kappan 70 (May): 726-27.
- Lockwood, Alan T. 1990. Central Park East secondary school. Focus on Change 2, no. 3: 9.
- McDowell, Kristi. 1991. Are student ethics in decay? U.: The National College Newspaper 4 (May): 1.
- Natale, Jo Anna. 1990. School board ethics: On the ice? The American School Board Journal 177 (October): 16-19.
- Nelson, Frank C. 1988. What evangelical parents expect from public school administrators. Educational Leadership 45 (May): 40-42.
- O'Reilly, David. 1991. An initiative from educators: Bring values back to the class. Grand Forks Herald, 28 November, p. 6A.
- Paul, Richard. 1988. Ethics without indoctrination. Educational Leadership 45 (May): 10-19.
- Raspberry, William. 1991. Teach by example. Family Circle, 15 October, p. 202.
- Rein, Lowell G. 1980. Is your (ethical) slippage showing? Personnel Journal 59 (September): 740-46.

- Rizzo, Marie A., and Thomas J. Patka. 1981. The organizational imperative and supervisory control: Their effects on managerial ethics. Public Personnel Management Journal 10 (Spring): 103-09.
- Ryan, Kevin. 1986. The new moral education. Phi Delta Kappan 68 (November): 228-33.
- Sarason, Seymour. 1990. Forging the classroom constitution. Education Week, 24 October, p. 36.
- Seldin, Clement. 1988. Ethics, evaluations, and the secondary principal. NASSP Bulletin 72 (December): 9-11.
- Senge, Peter M. 1990. The leader's new work: Building a learning organization. Sloan Management Review 32, no. 1: 7-23.
- Shapiro, Jonathan Z. 1985. Where we are and where we need to go. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 7 (Fall): 245-48.
- Stinchombe, Arthur L. 1959. Bureaucratic and craft administration of production: A comparative study. Administrative Science Quarterly 4 (September): 168-87.
- Strike, Kenneth A. 1988. The ethics of teaching. Phi Delta Kappan 70 (October): 156-58.
- Summy, Joe. 1986. Wheeler dealers: Vital for education's creative future. NASSP Bulletin 70 (March): 21-25.
- Sweers, Carolyn. 1988. Teaching students to examine their lives. Educational Leadership 45 (May): 20-22.
- Thayer, Fred C. 1981. Civil service reform and performance appraisal: A public disaster. Public Personnel Management Journal 10 (Spring): 20-28.
- Thomas, M. Donald. 1986. Why aren't women administering our schools? NASSP Bulletin 7 (March): 90-92.
- Tifft, Susan. 1991. Scandal in the laboratories. Time, 18 March, pp. 74-75.
- Tivnan, Edward. 1992. Life and death decisions: Part I. Family Circle, 10 March, pp. 99-102.
- Weiner, Tim. 1990. The "doomsday" debacle. Grand Forks Herald, 18 December, pp. 1A, 7A.

Other

- Donahue, Ann Marie. 1989. Ethics in politics and government. Publication of The Reference Shelf Series, vol. 61, no. 2. New York: The H. W. Wilson Co.

Greenfield, William D. 1984. Sociological perspectives for research on educational administrators: The role of the assistant principal. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, 23-27 April.

Henry, Kenneth. 1984, November. Ethics. Unpublished term paper.

Smith, Arthur E., Paul D. Travers, and George J. Yard. 1990. Codes of ethics for selected fields of professional education. ERIC, ED 318 736.