Determining the Impact of Demographics on Perceived Ethical Values of Teachers

Venus
I.K.Gujral Punjab Technical University,
Kapurthala,Punjab

Dr.Pooja Mehta
I.K.Gujral Punjab Technical University,
Kapurthala ,Punjab

Abstract

The Purpose of this paper is to study and examine the perceived ethical values of teachers from selected higher education setting of North India in relation to demographics, i.e. gender, age, income and education and this study also make stakeholders to work on effective teaching in context to teaching ethics. A self-administered survey was conducted of 120 teachers at HEI (Higher Education Institute) to determine ethical perceptions on 28 ethical values. Study demonstrates that ethical values Justice, Respect, Knowledge, Self- Motivation, Honesty, Compassion, Gratitude, Decision Making ,Love and Integrity comes out to be very high among all ethical values which further reveals that teachers overwhelmingly find these values to have contributed significantly to the ethical practices. The study further found that perceived ethical values of teachers in relation to their demographics, i.e. gender, age, income and education do not differ significantly. This study provides fruitful evidence that teachers possess ethical values meaningful to their profession. As the sample was small so results could not be generalized. The present study is therefore helpful for the teachers and educational policy makers to understand the nature and importance of ethical teaching, ethical behavior, and professionalism in an academic setting.

Keywords: Ethics, Perceived Ethical Values, Ethical perceptions and Higher Education Institute

Introduction

With an expanding pattern in violation, subject of ethics has turned into a debatable issue, picking up the consideration of scholastic, administrators, business stakeholders and even the government officials. It has been one of the most sensitive issues of any organization. Besides, with such huge numbers of instances of scams, money laundering blunders, fumble, extortion, and criminal rupture of trust, it seems auspicious to look at the moral impression of principal employees or administrators in any organization whether it is public or private.

Perception has been very important dimension of a person. Having perceptions to certain things varies from person to person. It could be belief which developed and retained in individual behaviour by virtue of various circumstances or instances of life. Impact of environment, life situations do work in modifying perceptions. Perceived Ethical

Values refer to individual' beliefs, attitudes and intentions towards practices which should be followed like what should be done. Lot of studies suggests that these perceptions can be a significant factor in employee behaviour. Perceived ethical values play significant role in the one's profession as it is associated with performance of an individual in respective profession. The present study delves into perceptions of Teachers of a higher education institute of North Indian region for the prevailing levels of ethical teaching.

Valentine et al. (2003) examined the relationship between organizational commitment and perceived ethical values. Again in recent studies it is also confirmed that there is direct relation of perceived ethical values with job satisfaction (Valentine et al., 2011). Through various studies it has been determined that employees have their perceived ethical values are consistent with their inclinations, they ought to react more favourably to a workplace that is believed to be fulfilling and improving (Hunt et al.,1989;Schwepker et al,2001; Thompson,2003) further enhancing diverse work reactions.

The study also seeks for importance of ethical values for teaching profession. Further there is a comparison of importance of ethical values of male teachers in comparison to female teachers. These considerations are accompanied with an interrogation of literature that reveals a rich variety of interlocking concepts that are apposite considerations in terms of the assessment of ethical teaching and resulting teaching effectiveness state. This firmly links the problem to previous research and provides a sound rationale for the conduct of the study.

Perceived ethical values are very much blended in everyday life, since it is the vital help to understand the conflicts which could possibly appear. Perceived ethics being fundamental has been witnessed in diverse area. Many studies have been done where perceived ethics play crucial role like Ethics in Nursing Profession (Shahriari et al, 2012) , Ethics in Hotel Industry (Cheng et al, 2013) not only in business but also in IT Industry (Jin et al, 2007).

Percevied ethical values is the view point on ethics of a teacher while imparting education. It invloves how teachers conceptualize and comprehend nature of training, nature of instructing and nature of learning while practicizing teaching.Teachers through their ethical behavior always in a powerful position to influence student behaviour . Teacher use to decide the right course of action in a given circumstance. Despite the fact that the teaching profession has no formally received code of ethics,but basic elements like knowledge, justice ,fidelity ,courage, kindness, empathy, creativity, forgiveness etc are essential as a gauge for deliberation.

With the learning sway, now a days because of direct transparency of data all through globe has marvellously influenced the teachers. In this universe of globalization and focused world, we are seeing different changes in our informational structure and in the same line step by step, the possibility of instructor and educating in like manner is changing. A teacher in this contemporary period has various commitments and obligations to play. Besides having extraordinary academic and master abilities, they should have abundant learning of professional ethics which would urge the teacher to give quality preparing and impart awesome characteristics which would appreciate their profession as a teacher. Their activity is not only to display exceptional knowledge before their students rather they have a more broad and essential responsibility to provide the education in ethical way. Educator having the sentiment of master ethics will treat their specialists with reverence, care, affection and obligation. Despite that, they would constantly ensure to make specific responsibility from their point.

Today, a teacher has been doing extensive work in the higher education institute apart from teaching. So it becomes their prime responsibility to teach effectively in spite of working in all directions. Motive behind this study is to uplift the curriculum so that to inculcate the ethical values in teachers and students as well throughout their interactions at the institute. Realization of these parameters at the ground level is needed so that quality in terms of teaching can be maintained.

This study is particularly focused on the perception of teachers regarding ethical values which are later to be adopted so as to create the education environment healthy and positive. Ethical values greatly influence the students at large through the teachers in every set up of formal education. The influence of ethical values can be seen on the students in the form respect, reverence and faith paying back to teacher.

Background and Hypothesis Formulation

It is very important to know ethical perception of the teachers in education environment, as the results of unethical behaviour may prove very disheartening to the fellows as well can greatly impact the students. Various researches and studies have been put forward evidences of personal characters influencing the perceived ethical values of individuals (Jones,1991; Hunt and Vitell,1986). Perceived ethical values not only enhance the overall personality of an individual but also earn a lot of respect from peers and fellows and also greatly impactful on the pupils in education sector. (Arens et al, 2007)

Perceived Ethical Values in Teaching

Perceived Ethical Values are more or less concerned with the disposition of an individual to differentiate between the wrong and right with respect to his /her profession (Jones,1991; Singhapakdi ,2000; Hunt S. A,1993). In similar way, Karande et al (2002)stated that in deontological logic, there is some all inclusive good standard that is total in deciding right from wrong. Perceived Ethical Values also play vital role in profession and same was strongly advocated by Cohen (2001) who emphasized on the moral character which is depicted from behaviour of an individual while performing duties. In align to grounded theories; Strike (1998) interestingly stated that the personality of a person is well demonstrated by the perceived ethics he adopts. Similarly at professional front, teachers are required to show ethical conduct in their profession and it is claimed as teaching is undeniably a moral activity (Sockett, 1993). In a profession, moral codes undoubtedly possess undetectable place. In this support Frankel (1996)studied that driving inspiration of an ethics code is to enable one to develop professionalism in job. A second explanation behind an ethics code is its master socialization work. A report reflecting the general characteristics and measures gives which is expected from people following ethical codes. A third inspiration driving an ethics code is to expand open trust by showing that Teachers are expected to have ethical prerequisites. An ethics code for Teachers is to act to the best favourable position of student learning and institutional respectability. Valentine & Barnett (2003) proposed that morals codes which may prompt larger amounts of hierarchical duty by expanding the conviction that their associations have solid moral qualities, as long as the presence of morals codes are satisfactorily imparted. Lin et al (1998) conducted survey with a questionnaire, where 94 teachers in Taiwan and 140 in the United States judged and which points among 20 moral issues identified with religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, human services, wrongdoing, liquor, tobacco, gambling, firearms, government debasement, contraception, thinking about the elderly, and television programming. Educators offered help in making of their decisions, would push student to make wise choices, would enthusiasm for students, and would speak to a quiet approach to confront social issues.

More studies have been done to acknowledge the same facts. Carr(2005)and Gordon&Sork (2001) demonstrated through their observational research that the experienced teachers accepted that there ought to be a code of morals so that to control the individuals in profession. On the same note,Campbell&Rozsnyai(2002) refers to the expert moral code which is required for taking up the issues that

educators look in their regular work with students, guardians, and partners. However,Fenstermacher (2001) contends that it is hard to confine teaching from its moral underpinnings, as children do not show up what the basically required from ideal point of view so moral development is the foremost important task which is to be taken by the teachers to shape and to empower children to make human excellences in them.

In this regard Nash (2002) explained rules, principles, character, and basic belief which can be brought to bear on ethical issues and professional practices. Aspirational Principles for an Ethics Code for Academics, APA (2002) focuses on various aspects and suggest stronghold on ethical values like Concern for Others' Welfare, Fidelity and Social Responsibility, Integrity, Justice and Respect for People's Rights and Dignity. In the continuation of supporting the same,Campbell (2001) studied the profound moral nature of their work requires that educators be moral individuals. We need moral instructors not just in light of the fact that we might want them to show our kids ethics, for example, trustworthiness and decency however more significantly in light of the fact that we need them to instruct idealistically.

According to Klaassen (2007), the teacher with the 'restricted professionally' falls short in a moral sense. The teacher with 'Extended Professionalism' is also active in the moral area. In this context, Krishnaveni et al(2007) stated that teacher's professional characteristics are the fundamental tenets of teacher's code of ethics. The code of ethics does not only guide higher education teachers to adopt professionalism in teaching and learning activities but also assure quality in higher education settings. Thus, ensuring quality in higher education settings is dependent on higher education teachers 'professional characteristics that compose teacher's code of ethics. In all dimensions of their work, then, teachers continuously engage in a highly moral activity. Quality education includes assisting students to learn the course contents among others. Offering quality education requires that faculty members are aware of the code of ethics to perform their tasks in their workplace. Osguthorpe (2008) supported the theory that educators who train high minded will think about their students, treat them decently, and regard their distinctive perspectives and feelings. Researcher concluded with the moral dispositions as the necessary dimensions of the teaching along with content knowledge and methodological skill. In the same context, Lishchinsky, O. (2011) stated that "the multifaceted nature of ethical dilemmas requires critical thinking, not blind compliance". Trustworthiness, honesty, and demonstrable skills are regarded as attributes of ethical conduct (Kuther, 2003).

Morals can be seen as a 'Theory of ethical quality' as it manages must and musts not (P. Mahony, 2009). It very well may be viewed as prescriptive rather than engaging since morals is worried about 'what we must do'.

Relationship between Demographics and Perceived Ethical Values

Age: Kohlberg (1981) gives establishment to the conviction that a person's moral qualities are melded with the age and the general movement is toward higher moral qualities. Rawwas (1998),Muncy and Vitell (1992), Erffmeyer et. al. (1999) and Fullerton (1996) demonstrated that youthful consumers (Muncy, 1992) were less followers of ethical values as compared to elder ones. McCabe et al(1994) and Sidani et al(2009) also demonstrated that age factor is directly related to ethics i.e. elder students are more ethical.

Gender:Hunt and Vitell (1986) explained ethical perceptions using various moral philosophies and also studied that various personal attributes are responsible for having perceptions of ethical values. There has been much discussion by Walker (1986) on whether gender differences are significant in ethical issues. Gilligan (1993) emphasized females sensed more moral behaviour than males. Sidani et al (2009) addressed that females were more delicate than guys to issues of moral nature. Gismondi (2006) argued how males are more unethical than females and also addressed the gap between perceived and actual realities regarding moral development and current technology in higher education.

Landry et al (2004) inspected moral view of Hispanic students by breaking down contrasts between accounting and non-accounting students and also between males and females students. Peterson et al (2001) examined how ethical beliefs and external factors affecting ethical beliefs are related to age and gender of business professionals.

Education:A lot of work has been done to relate qualification of teacher with other aspects like job satisfaction, emotional intelligence but no literature found which supports the relation of qualification with the perceived ethical values. Experience of an educator has always been proved significant role in possessing ethics in work (Chuan-bao, 2006).

Income:James et al(2011) reveals a generally positive relationship between ethics and happiness generated out of income. Zabid & Alsagoff(1993) also studied variation among the managers in terms of perceived ethical values by virtue of income of the business organization and found Malaysian managers have high ethical values.McKinney et al (2007) gathered information on ethical attitudes of

respondent's with respect to income.

Plethora of studies have been conducted on ethical issues in various industry like in business, finance marketing, mining industry, consultancy while examination of perceived ethical values in higher education institutes, is little done. Moreover the studies have been taken into consideration by taking either 1 or 2 personal characteristics while none of the researchers has taken into account four personal characters in examining perceived ethical values of teachers of HEI. The purpose of this paper is to fill the gap by exploring how demographics characteristics like age, gender and education are evaluated in regard to perceived ethical values.

Methodology

Sample Design

Area of the investigation has been taken as advanced education establishment in north Indian region which has student quantity in excess of 30 thousand in single campus. Universe of the study is all the teachers which are approx. 2000 of the selected higher education institute of the north Indian region. This investigation included testing edge of 120 Teachers drawn from different division of HEI based on multistage purposive sampling. Structured questionnaire was given to 120 teachers but finally 101 complete responses without any missing values were received.

Instrument

Primary Data was gathered through astructured questionnaire to conduct the study. A scale to Judge ethical values such as caring, honesty, fairness, responsibility, and respect for self and others was used to measure the responses. The scale to measure Perceived Ethical Values has been adapted from Mercader(2006). It consists of 28 items. As per their perception, respondents gave the rating from 1 to 10 for each ethical value. Thus, the maximum score for the statement is 10 and the minimum is 1. An individual's total score on a Teachers Professional Ethics Scale is the sum of his/her ratings on all items. The total maximum score for the scale is 100 and the total minimum score for the scale is 10.The value of Cronbach's alpha (0.997) comes out to be satisfactorily thus reliability of the scale is confirmed. Moral issues in this examination were taken care of with due consideration by guaranteeing respondents that their personal information would be safeguarded.

Results and Findings

In this section , using appropriate statistical tables and descriptive analysis was applied to test the significance of

differences for verification of various hypotheses. Scores from all the scales collected from all the samples were analysed separately. The descriptive analysis of the study has been carried on followed by the difference of mean analysis of the respondents of different demographic profiles.

Perceived Ethical Values

Thecurrent study seeks to establish the relation between various demographic variables and Perceived Ethical Values. Table I shows the mean values of 28 perceived ethical values under study. The table shows that Justice (7.21) followed by Respect(7.18), Self-motivation(7.16),Knowledge(7.15),Decision making(7.14),Honesty(7.13) and Integrity(7.10)turn out to be the most important ethical values as perceived by the teachers. The results reveal that teachers overwhelmingly find these values to have contributed significantly to the ethical practices.

Table I Perceived Ethical Values

Ethical Values	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Communication	1	10	6.99	3.600
Kindness	1	10	6.70	3.394
Comprehension	1	10	6.58	3.334
Courage	1	10	6.88	3.422
Creativity	1	10	6.80	3.501
Decision Making	1	10	7.14	3.662
Enthusiasm	1	10	6.88	3.564
Justice	1	10	7.21	3.494
Compassion	1	10	7.02	3.518
Friendly	1	10	6.99	3.567
Diligence	1	10	6.56	3.396
Generosity	1	10	6.48	3.368
Self-Discipline	1	10	6.91	3.651
Preservance	1	10	6.98	3.501
Gratitude	1	10	7.06	3.540
Integrity	1	10	7.10	3.536
Honesty	1	10	7.13	3.652
Humility	1	10	6.91	3.555
Humour	1	10	6.77	3.321
Knowledge	1	10	7.15	3.600
Patience	1	10	6.96	3.596
Respect	1	10	7.18	3.673
Responsibility	1	10	7.03	3.785
Self Motivation	1	10	7.16	3.730
Service	1	10	7.08	3.579
Tolerance	1	10	6.81	3.520
Objectivity	1	10	6.93	3.643
Love	1	10	7.01	3.633

In higher education setup, Perceiving and fortifying positive practices is a standout amongst the best approaches to deliver positive activities in students. Current scenario is totally changed; now a day's students expect professional interactive communication in friendly way and demands equity from all aspects nurtured with compassion. Our observations thus proved that teacher understands the current scenario and inculcating the ethical behaviour in the right direction to create productive and positive learning environment. The results revealed that most of the teachers considered professional qualities as the ethical attitudes.

Relationship between Perceived Ethical Values and Demographics

The present study attempts to find the perceived ethical values of teachers of higher education institute in relation to certain demographic variables namely, gender, age, education and salary.

Gender and Perceived Ethical Values: In order to determine the differences in the perceived ethical values in relation to gender of the teachers, t test was employed. T-values of both sub groups have been calculated for all perceived ethical values. Here it is hypothesize that:

H01: There is no significant difference in perceived ethical values of male and female teachers

Results of the analysis are reported in table II.

Table II: Perceived Ethical Values in Relation to Gender

Group Statistics							
Perceived Ethical Values	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	p Value	Significance Level
Communication	Male	40	6.25	3.671	.580	0.0525	Insignificant
	Female	61	7.44	3.524	.451		
Kindness	Male	40	5.83	3.404	.538	0.0199	Significant
	Female	61	7.25	3.320	.425		
Comprehension	Male	40	5.63	3.387	.536	0.0108	Significant
	Female	61	7.18	3.202	.410		
Courage	Male	40	5.95	3.471	.549	0.0142	Significant
	Female	61	7.48	3.305	.423		
Creativity	Male	40	5.90	3.586	.567	0.0201	Significant
	Female	61	7.36	3.367	.431		
Decision Making	Male	40	6.20	3.811	.603	0.0206	Significant
	Female	61	7.72	3.484	.446		
Enthusiasm	Male	40	5.85	3.620	.572	0.0103	Significant
	Female	61	7.52	3.414	.437		
Justice	Male	40	6.18	3.686	.583	0.0525	Insignificant
	Female	61	7.85	3.245	.415		
Compassion	Male	40	5.85	3.641	.576	0.0037	Significant
	Female	61	7.75	3.269	.419		
Friendly	Male	40	5.88	3.777	.597	0.0060	Significant
	Female	61	7.69	3.279	.420		
Diligence	Male	40	5.55	3.366	.532	0.0084	Significant
	Female	61	7.20	3.306	.423		
Generosity	Male	40	5.48	3.382	.535	0.0077	Significant
	Female	61	7.13	3.248	.416		
Self Discipline	Male	40	5.88	3.646	.576	0.0116	Significant
	Female	61	7.56	3.547	.454		
Preservance	Male	40	5.98	3.620	.572	0.0103	Significant
	Female	61	7.62	3.317	.425		
Gratitude	Male	40	6.18	3.679	.582	0.0235	Significant
	Female	61	7.61	3.378	.432		
Integrity	Male	40	6.20	3.757	.594	0.0216	Significant
	Female	61	7.66	3.311	.424		
Honesty	Male	40	6.15	3.745	.592	0.0163	Significant
	Female	61	7.74	3.502	.448		
Humility	Male	40	5.90	3.608	.570	0.0115	Significant
	Female	61	7.54	3.414	.437		
Humour	Male	40	5.68	3.331	.527	0.0037	Significant
	Female	61	7.48	3.165	.405		

Knowledge	Male	40	6.08	3.710	.587	0.0084	Significant
	Female	61	7.82	3.403	.436		
Patience	Male	40	5.95	3.823	.604	0.0123	Significant
	Female	61	7.59	3.334	.427		
Respect	Male	40	6.13	3.838	.607	0.0109	Significant
	Female	61	7.84	3.451	.442		
Responsibility	Male	40	6.00	3.961	.626	0.0149	Significant
	Female	61	7.67	3.567	.457		
Self Motivation	Male	40	6.30	3.897	.616	0.0341	Significant
	Female	61	7.69	3.566	.457		
Service	Male	40	6.08	3.675	.581	0.0125	Significant
	Female	61	7.70	3.412	.437		
Tolerance	Male	40	5.75	3.550	.561	0.0074	Significant
	Female	61	7.49	3.379	.433		
Objectivity	Male	40	5.95	3.843	.608	0.0159	Significant
	Female	61	7.54	3.414	.437		
Love	Male	40	5.98	3.799	.601	0.0113	Significant
	Female	61	7.66	3.410	.437		

Independent 't' tests were conducted to examine gender differences in perceived ethical values. The results of t-test reveal considerably significant gender differences in almost all the perceived ethical values except communication. It is important to note that female teachers obtained higher mean scores for all ethical values as compared to male teachers. From the results, it may be inferred that female teachers tend to possess more ethics and values in comparison to male teachers. The findings are consistent with the findings of Alleyne (2012); Landry et. al. (2004); Gilligan (1993). Hence the research hypotheses H01 is rejected and it is concluded that perceived ethical values of male teachers and perceived ethical values of female teachers do differ significantly.

Age and Perceived Ethical Values

In line with the objective of the present study,in order to determine the differences in the perceived ethical values in relation to the age of the teachers, following null hypothesis is formulated:

H02: There is no significant difference in perceived ethical values with respect to the age of the teachers.

To determine the noteworthy difference in the perceived ethical values in context to the age of the teachers, ANOVA was employed. 'F' values of all sub groups have been calculated for all perceived ethical values.

Table IIIANOVA for Perceived Ethical Values i n relation to Age of teachers

ANOVA							
Ethical Values		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Level of Significance
Communication	Between Groups	174.038	5	34.808	2.924	0.017	Significant
	Within Groups	1130.873	95	11.904			
Kindness	Between Groups	146.901	5	29.380	2.750	0.023	Significant
	Within Groups	1014.961	95	10.684			
Comprehension	Between Groups	122.039	5	24.408	2.322	0.049	Significant
	Within Groups	998.792	95	10.514			
Courage	Between Groups	121.115	5	24.223	2.170	0.064	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1060.212	95	11.160			
Creativity	Between Groups	179.711	5	35.942	3.241	0.010	Significant
	Within Groups	1053.497	95	11.089			
Decision Making	Between Groups	126.265	5	25.253	1.959	0.092	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1224.310	95	12.887			

Enthusiasm	Between Groups	178.740	5	35.748	3.089	0.013	Significant
	Within Groups	1099.320	95	11.572			
Justice	Between Groups	132.170	5	26.434	2.289	0.052	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1097.256	95	11.550			
Compassion	Between Groups	103.459	5	20.692	1.720	0.137	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1142.541	95	12.027			
Friendly	Between Groups	89.187	5	17.837	1.422	0.223	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1191.724	95	12.544			
Diligence	Between Groups	122.520	5	24.504	2.237	0.057	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1040.529	95	10.953			
Generosity	Between Groups	90.312	5	18.062	1.627	0.160	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1054.876	95	11.104			
Self Discipline	Between Groups	131.249	5	26.250	2.060	0.077	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1210.553	95	12.743			
Preservance	Between Groups	146.536	5	29.307	2.553	0.033	Significant
	Within Groups	1090.375	95	11.478			
Gratitude	Between Groups	120.808	5	24.162	2.012	0.084	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1141.034	95	12.011			
Integrity	Between Groups	99.524	5	19.905	1.630	0.159	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1159.842	95	12.209			
Honesty	Between Groups	137.878	5	27.576	2.172	0.064	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1205.924	95	12.694			
Humility	Between Groups	148.564	5	29.713	2.513	0.035	Significant
	Within Groups	1123.238	95	11.824			
Humour	Between Groups	77.457	5	15.491	1.422	0.223	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1034.840	95	10.893			
Knowledge	Between Groups	131.163	5	26.233	2.122	0.069	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1174.164	95	12.360			
Patience	Between Groups	126.681	5	25.336	2.049	0.079	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1174.963	95	12.368			
Respect	Between Groups	146.472	5	29.294	2.294	0.051	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1212.994	95	12.768			
Responsibility	Between Groups	150.095	5	30.019	2.206	0.060	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1292.895	95	13.609			
Self Motivation	Between Groups	141.365	5	28.273	2.131	0.068	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1260.694	95	13.270			
Service	Between Groups	129.075	5	25.815	2.113	0.070	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1160.568	95	12.217			
Tolerance	Between Groups	124.702	5	24.940	2.105	0.071	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1125.338	95	11.846			
Objectivity	Between Groups	154.714	5	30.943	2.488	0.037	Significant
	Within Groups	1181.484	95	12.437			
Love	Between Groups	128.962	5	25.792	2.042	0.080	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1200.029	95	12.632			

From table III, it is found that there is no significantdifference in perceived ethical values of teachers across different age groups. Hence, age turns out to be insignificant determining variation in perceived ethical values of teachers. Hence the hypothesis H02 is accepted and it is concluded that perceived ethical values of teachers in relation to their age do not differ significantly.

Education and Perceived Ethical Values:

Similarly in order to determine the difference in the perceived ethical values of teachers with regard to their level of education, following null hypothesis is formulated:

H03: There is no significant difference in perceived ethical values of teachers with different level of education.

To determine the marked difference in the perceived ethical values in context to the education level of the teachers, ANOVA was employed. 'F' values of all sub groups have been calculated for all perceived ethical values.

Table IV-ANOVA for Perceived Ethical Values in relation to education of teachers

ANOVA							
Ethical Values		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Level of Significance
Communication	Between Groups	40.173	3	13.391	1.027	0.384	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1264.738	97	13.039			
Kindness	Between Groups	32.781	3	10.927	0.939	0.425	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1129.081	97	11.64			
Comprehension	Between Groups	21.176	3	7.059	0.623	0.602	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1099.656	97	11.337			
Courage	Between Groups	17.202	3	5.734	0.478	0.698	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1164.125	97	12.001			
Creativity	Between Groups	24.599	3	8.2	0.658	0.58	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1208.609	97	12.46			
Decision Making	Between Groups	36.841	3	12.28	0.907	0.441	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1313.733	97	13.544			
Enthusiasm	Between Groups	51.366	3	17.122	1.354	0.262	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1226.694	97	12.646			
Justice	Between Groups	54.577	3	18.192	1.502	0.219	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1174.849	97	12.112			
Compassion	Between Groups	28.14	3	9.38	0.747	0.527	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1217.86	97	12.555			
Friendly	Between Groups	26.305	3	8.768	0.678	0.568	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1254.606	97	12.934			
Diligence	Between Groups	21.07	3	7.023	0.597	0.619	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1141.979	97	11.773			
Generosity	Between Groups	29.733	3	9.911	0.862	0.464	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1115.455	97	11.5			
Self Discipline	Between Groups	29.484	3	9.828	0.726	0.539	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1312.318	97	13.529			
Preservance	Between Groups	24.572	3	8.191	0.655	0.582	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1212.339	97	12.498			
Gratitude	Between Groups	31.41	3	10.47	0.825	0.483	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1230.432	97	12.685			
Integrity	Between Groups	18.725	3	6.242	0.488	0.691	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1240.642	97	12.79			
Honesty	Between Groups	28.018	3	9.339	0.689	0.561	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1315.783	97	13.565			
Humility	Between Groups	35.191	3	11.73	0.92	0.434	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1236.611	97	12.749			
Humour	Between Groups	27.651	3	9.217	0.824	0.484	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1084.646	97	11.182			
Knowledge	Between Groups	44.376	3	14.792	1.138	0.338	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1260.951	97	12.999			
Patience	Between Groups	39.929	3	13.31	1.023	0.386	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1261.715	97	13.007			
Respect	Between Groups	22.155	3	7.385	0.536	0.659	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1337.31	97	13.787			
Responsibility	Between Groups	39.596	3	13.199	0.912	0.438	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1403.394	97	14.468			
Self Motivation	Between Groups	24.511	3	8.17	0.575	0.633	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1377.548	97	14.202			
Service	Between Groups	17.227	3	5.742	0.438	0.726	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1272.416	97	13.118			
Tolerance	Between Groups	28.488	3	9.496	0.754	0.523	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1221.551	97	12.593			
Objectivity	Between Groups	34.225	3	11.408	0.85	0.47	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1301.973	97	13.422			
Love	Between Groups	21.72	3	7.24	0.537	0.658	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1307.27	97	13.477			

From the table IV, it can be observed that p-value of all of the perceived ethical values of teachers does not significantly vary in relation to their education. Hence, the hypothesis H03 is acknowledged and it is inferred that perceived ethical values of teachers in connection to their education do not differ significantly.

Income and Perceived Ethical Values:

To further examine the difference in the perceived ethical values with respect to the income of the teachers following hypothesis was formulated:

H04: There is no significant difference in perceived ethical values of teachersacross different income groups.

To determine the noteworthy difference in the perceived ethical values of teachers across different income groups, ANOVA was employed. 'F' values of all sub groups have been calculated for all perceived ethical values.

<div align="center">

Table V-ANOVA for Perceived Ethical Values in relation to Income of teachers

</div>

ANOVA							
Ethical Values		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Level of Significance
Communication	Between Groups	30.11	3	10.037	0.764	0.517	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1274.801	97	13.142			
Kindness	Between Groups	46.927	3	15.642	1.361	0.259	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1114.935	97	11.494			
Comprehension	Between Groups	49.435	3	16.478	1.492	0.222	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1071.397	97	11.045			
Courage	Between Groups	79.571	3	26.524	2.335	0.079	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1101.756	97	11.358			
Creativity	Between Groups	29.3	3	9.767	0.787	0.504	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1203.908	97	12.411			
Decision Making	Between Groups	25.899	3	8.633	0.632	0.596	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1324.676	97	13.656			
Enthusiasm	Between Groups	41.269	3	13.756	1.079	0.362	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1236.79	97	12.75			
Justice	Between Groups	47.68	3	15.893	1.305	0.277	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1181.746	97	12.183			
Compassion	Between Groups	53.07	3	17.69	1.438	0.236	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1192.93	97	12.298			
Friendly	Between Groups	55.026	3	18.342	1.451	0.233	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1225.885	97	12.638			
Diligence	Between Groups	20.52	3	6.84	0.581	0.629	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1142.529	97	11.779			
Generosity	Between Groups	35.599	3	11.866	1.037	0.38	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1109.589	97	11.439			
Self Discipline	Between Groups	7.59	3	2.53	0.184	0.907	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1334.212	97	13.755			

Preservance	Between Groups	19.086	3	6.362	0.507	0.679	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1217.825	97	12.555			
Gratitude	Between Groups	18.199	3	6.066	0.473	0.702	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1243.642	97	12.821			
Integrity	Between Groups	23.643	3	7.881	0.619	0.605	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1235.724	97	12.739			
Honesty	Between Groups	25.178	3	8.393	0.617	0.605	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1318.624	97	13.594			
Humility	Between Groups	50.591	3	16.864	1.339	0.266	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1221.211	97	12.59			
Humour	Between Groups	43.658	3	14.553	1.321	0.272	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1068.639	97	11.017			
Knowledge	Between Groups	20.84	3	6.947	0.525	0.666	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1284.487	97	13.242			
Patience	Between Groups	12.892	3	4.297	0.323	0.808	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1288.752	97	13.286			
Respect	Between Groups	12.036	3	4.012	0.289	0.833	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1347.43	97	13.891			
Responsibility	Between Groups	13.921	3	4.64	0.315	0.815	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1429.069	97	14.733			
Self Motivation	Between Groups	17.917	3	5.972	0.419	0.74	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1384.142	97	14.27			
Service	Between Groups	31.581	3	10.527	0.812	0.49	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1258.062	97	12.97			
Tolerance	Between Groups	49.773	3	16.591	1.341	0.266	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1200.266	97	12.374			
Objectivity	Between Groups	28.511	3	9.504	0.705	0.551	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1307.687	97	13.481			
Love	Between Groups	46.158	3	15.386	1.163	0.328	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1282.832	97	13.225			

By statistically comparing calculated 'F' ratio of perceived ethical values of teachers with regard to their income, insignificant results (Table IV) appeared. Hence, hypothesis H04 is accepted.

Discussion and Conclusion

This present study aimed to show that the teachers in higher education institutes bear high level of perceived ethical values namely, Fairness, Justice, Respect,Self-motivation, Decision making and Honesty. The results are which are in line with findings of previous studies (Rawls,1971; Gilligan, 1993; Landry et al,2004) and thus echoes that teachers really care about the justice and fairness at the professional front.

In this study various inferences are drawn with regard to demographic variables in relation to perceived ethical values of teachers. H01 stated that there is no significant

difference in perceived ethical values of male and female teachers and results depicted that there is significant difference in possession of perceived ethical values among male and female teachers of higher education institute which is consistent with the observation by other scholars (Alleyne,2012;Landry et. al.,2004; Gilligan,1993) who found that females are generally more ethical than the males. This highlights that female teachers are probably more strong at ethical front as compare to male counterparts.

H02 postulated that there is no significant difference in perceived ethical values with respect to the age of the teachers. Several past studies revealed that experience and the age matters most in possession of ethical values (Kohlberg,1981; Rawwas,1998;Muncy and Vitell,1992; Erffmeyer et al,1999 ; Fullerton,1996)whereas, a couple of studies advocated insignificant relationship of age with ethical values (Callan, 1992; Marta et. al, 2004).The present study inferred that few ethical values like communication, kindness, comprehension and preservance vary with age while rest other ethical values are do not significantly differ with age of teachers.

H03 asserted that there is no significant difference in perceived ethical values of teachers with different level of education. Usually, it is been known that education imparts important role in grooming of an individual, the more the knowledge more the wisdom and also more ethics(Chuan-bao, 2006) but, unexpectedly it is denied in current study which found no significant difference was found in ethical values of teachers with different levels of education.

Furthermore, the study found that there is no significant difference in perceived ethical values of teachers with different level of Income. Income is usually proportional to the designation in any organization. Higher designation draws more income. In a higher education institute, teachers possess higher income as per designation and experience. Although, no significant difference is found, the current findings revealed that regardless of education and income status, teachers of high education institutes generally possess perceived ethical values

Our results are consistent with the past literature which states that work ethics i.e. ethical teaching is prime requirement in education sector especially in higher education institutes where teaching is a profession. A significant number of teachers stated that ethical attitude is depicted by following good teaching practices with good behaviour and with proper professional attitude. Studies have demonstrated that most of teachers follow ethical attitude to make their teaching more effective. Hence, the study confirms that there is a significant contribution of ethical teaching and professionalism on effective teaching of higher education institute teachers.

Managerial Implications

The findings of present study have implication for the stakeholders, researchers, teachers and educational policy makers to understand the nature and importance of ethical teaching, ethical behavior, and professionalism in significant relationship with effecting teaching. The study clearly emphasize that stakeholders can develop the ethical values among the teachers and other stakeholders through intentional inductions and trainings and thus encouraging teachers through recognition reward giving programs (Alleyne, 2010). The future researchers need to look into and concentrate more in this area so as to find out the strategies in order to overcome the obstacles which comes in the way of developing effective and ethical teaching skills on the part of educators. This study offers useful suggestions to authorities to conduct orientation programs during induction period which would influence their professional front. Educators should be encouraged to inculcate the ethics and adopt ethical professionalism for further creation of inspirational education at higher education setting.

References

Alleyne, P. (2010). The influence of individual, situational and team factors on auditors' whistle-blowing intentions. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Bradford, Bradford, UK.

Alleyne, P., & Persaud, N. (2012). Exploring undergraduate students' ethical perceptions in Barbados. Journal of International Education in Business.

Arens, A. A., Best, P., Shailer, G., Fiedler, B., Elder, R. J., & Beasley, M. (2007). Auditing and assurance services in Australia: an integrated approach. Pearson Education Australia.

Boon, H. (2011). Raising the bar: Ethics education for quality teachers. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36(7), 76-93.

Callan, V. J. (1992). Predicting ethical values and training needs in ethics. Journal of Business ethics, 11(10), 761-769.

Campbell, C., & Rozsnyai, C. (2002). Quality Assurance and the Development of Course Programmes. Papers on Higher Education.

Campbell, E. (2001). Let right be done: Trying to put ethical standards into practice. Journal of Education

Policy, 16(5), 395-411.

Cheng, P. Y., Yang, J. T., Wan, C. S., & Chu, M. C. (2013). Ethical contexts and employee job responses in the hotel industry: The roles of work values and perceived organizational support. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 34, 108-115.

Chuan-bao, T. (2006). On change of concepts: From teacher's occupational ethics to professional ethics. Frontiers of Education in China, 1(3), 439-446.

Cohen, J. R., Pant, L. W., & Sharp, D. J. (2001). An examination of differences in ethical decision-making between Canadian business students and accounting professionals. Journal of Business Ethics, 30(4), 319-336.

Carr, D. (2005). Professionalism and ethics in teaching (Vol. 2). Routledge.

Erffmeyer, R. C., Keillor, B. D., & LeClair, D. T. (1999). An empirical investigation of Japanese consumer ethics. Journal of Business Ethics, 18(1), 35-50.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (2001). On the concept of manner and its visibility in teaching practice. Journal of curriculum studies, 33(6), 639-653.

Frankel, M. S. (1996). Developing Ethical Standards for Responsible Research: Why? Form? Functions? Process? Outcomes?. Journal of dental research, 75(2), 832-835.

Fullerton, S., Kerch, K. B., & Dodge, H. R. (1996). Consumer ethics: An assessment of individual behavior in the market place. Journal of Business Ethics, 15(7), 805-814.

Gilligan, C. (1993). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Harvard University Press.

Gismondi, A. (2006). The downside of the internet: Cheating and technology in higher education. Journal of College and Character, 7(5).

Gordon, W., & Sork, T. J. (2001). Ethical issues and codes of ethics: Views of adult education practitioners in Canada and the United States. Adult Education Quarterly, 51(3), 202-218.

Hunt, S. D., & Vitell, S. (1986). A general theory of marketing ethics. Journal of macromarketing, 6(1), 5-16.

Hunt, S. D., & Vitell, S. J. (1993). The general theory of marketing ethics: A retrospective and revision. Ethics in marketing, 775-784.

James, Jr, H. S. (2011). Is the just man a happy man? An empirical study of the relationship between ethics and subjective well being. Kyklos, 64(2), 193-212.

Jin, K. G., Drozdenko, R., & Bassett, R. (2007). Information technology professionals' perceived organizational values and managerial ethics: An empirical study. Journal of Business Ethics, 71(2), 149-159.

Jones, T. M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. Academy of management review, 16(2), 366-395.

Karande, K., Rao, C. P., & Singhapakdi, A. (2002). Moral philosophies of marketing managers. European Journal of marketing.

KLAASSEN, C. (2007). Changes in Teachers' Moral Role from Passive Observers to Moral and Democratic Leaders. D.Alt and R.Reingold (eds.), 13–29.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development moral stages and the idea of justice.

Krishnaveni, R., & Anitha, J. (2007). Educators' professional characteristics. Quality Assurance in Education.

Kuther, T. L. (2003). Teaching the teacher: Ethical issues in graduate student teaching. College Student Journal, 37(2), 219-224.

Landry, R., Moyes, G. D., & Cortes, A. C. (2004). Ethical perceptions among Hispanic students: differences by major and gender. Journal of Education for Business, 80(2), 102-108.

Lishchinsky, O. (2011). Teachers' critical incidents: Ethical dilemmas in teaching practice. Teaching and teacher education, 27(3), 648-656.

Lin, H. Y., Davidman, P., Petersen, G., & Thomas, R. M. (1998). Teachers' Views of Moral Education Topics–Taiwan and the USA. International review of education, 44(1), 65-85.

Marta, J. K. M., Singhapakdi, A., Attia, A., & Vitell, S. J. (2004). Some important factors underlying ethical decisions of Middle Eastern marketers. International Marketing Review.

Mahony, P. (2009). Should 'ought'be taught?. Teaching and teacher Education, 25(7), 983-989.

McCabe, D. L., Dukerich, J. M., & Dutton, J. E. (1994). The effects of professional education on values and the resolution of ethical dilemmas: Business school vs. law school students. Journal of Business Ethics, 13(9), 693-700.

McKinney, J. A., & Moore, C. W. (2008). International bribery: Does a written code of ethics make a difference in perceptions of business professionals. Journal of Business Ethics, 79(1-2), 103-111.

Mercader, Victor, "Study of the ethical values of college students" (2006). Graduate Theses and Dissertations. A v a i l a b l e   a t : http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/2629

Muncy, J. A., & Vitell, S. J. (1992). Consumer ethics: An investigation of the ethical beliefs of the final consumer. Journal of business Research.

Nash, R. J. (2002). " Real World" ethics: frameworks for educators and human service professionals. Teachers College Press.

Osguthorpe, R. D. (2008). On the reasons we want teachers of good disposition and moral character. Journal of Teacher Education, 59(4), 288-299.

Peterson, D., Rhoads, A., & Vaught, B. C. (2001). Ethical beliefs of business professionals: A study of gender, age and external factors. Journal of Business Ethics, 31(3), 225-232.

Rawls, J.: 1971, A Theory of Justice (Harvard University Press, The Belknap Press).

Rawwas, M. Y., & Singhapakdi, A. (1998). Do consumers' ethical beliefs vary with age? A substantiation of Kohlberg's typology in marketing. Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 6(2), 26-38.

Singhapakdi, A. a. (2000). Some important factors underlying ethical decision making of manager in Thailand. Journal of business ethics, Vol.27,pp.271-84.

Sockett, H. (1993). The moral base for teacher professionalism. Teachers College Press, 1234 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, NY 10027.

Strike, K. A. (1988). The ethics of teaching. The Phi Delta Kappan, 70(2), 156-158.

Schwepker Jr, C. H. (2001). Ethical climate's relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the salesforce. Journal of business research, 54(1), 39-52

Sidani, Y., Zbib, I., Rawwas, M., & Moussawer, T. (2009). Gender, age, and ethical sensitivity: the case of Lebanese workers. Gender in Management: An International Journal.

Shahriari, M., Mohammadi, E., Abbaszadeh, A., Bahrami, M., & Fooladi, M. M. (2012). Perceived ethical values by Iranian nurses. Nursing ethics, 19(1), 30-44.

Thompson, F. E. (2003). The practice setting: site of ethical conflict for some mothers and midwives. Nursing Ethics, 10(6), 588-601.

Valentine, S., & Barnett, T. (2003). Ethics code awareness, perceived ethical values, and organizational commitment. Journal of personal selling & Sales Management, 23(4), 359-367.

Valentine, S., Godkin, L., Fleischman, G. M., & Kidwell, R. (2011). Corporate ethical values, group creativity, job satisfaction and turnover intention: The impact of work context on work response. Journal of Business Ethics, 98(3), 353-372.

Walker, L. J. (1986). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A rejoinder to Baumrind. Child Development, 522-526

Zabid, A. R. M., &Alsagoff, S. K. (1993).Perceived ethical values of Malaysian managers.Journal of Business Ethics, 12(4), 331-337.