

# TYPES OF MORAL BEHAVIORS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS: PAMUKKALE UNIVERSITY ETHICS RESEARCH<sup>1 2</sup>



Kafkas University  
Economics and Administrative  
Sciences Faculty  
KAUJEASF  
Vol. 13, Issue 26, 2022  
ISSN: 1309 – 4289  
E – ISSN: 2149-9136

Article Submission Date: 25.04.2022 Accepted Date: 07.10.2022

**Kamile KUZU**  
Master  
Pamukkale University  
Graduate School of Social Sciences,  
Denizli, Türkiye  
kkuzu@pau.edu.tr  
**ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0558-7341**

**Ferihan POLAT**  
Assoc. Prof. Dr.  
Pamukkale University  
Faculty of Economics and  
Administrative Sciences,  
Denizli, Türkiye  
fyildirim@pau.edu.tr  
**ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8832-0847**

**ABSTRACT** | The mentality for Turkish political morality, based on the structural diseases of the Turkish public administration inherited from the Ottoman Empire, has its own peculiarity. Studies on political and administrative ethics within the discipline of public governance in Turkey, date back to after 1980. This study aimed to explain which moral behavior that the executives exhibit in Turkish public governance. For this purpose, an questionnaire was conducted on a sample group of 110 people consisting of Pamukkale University administrators, based on the case studies of Steinberg and Austern. The results analyzed after the research were evaluated according to these analyzes, the executive personnel in Turkish public management exhibit a more duty-ridden moral attitude.

**Keywords:** Political and administrative ethics, political and administrative corruption, perverting morality, duty ethics, moralistic behavior

**JEL Codes:** Z00, Z10, Z19

**Scope:** Political science and public administration

**Type:** Research

**DOI:** 10.36543/kauibfd.2022.045

**Cite this article:** Kuzu, K. & Polat, F. (2022). Types of moral behaviors of public administrators: Pamukkale University ethics research. *KAÜİİBFD*, 13(26), 1093-1128.

<sup>1</sup> It is confirmed that the relevant ethical rules are followed in the study.

<sup>2</sup> This article was derived from the the Master Thesis of “Types of Political and Management Ethical Behaviors of Public Administrators: The Case of Pamukkale University”, which was accepted at the Graduate School of Social Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Pamukkale University.

# KAMU YÖNETİCİLERİNİN AHLAKİ DAVRANIŞ TİPLERİ: PAMUKKALE ÜNİVERSİTESİ ETİK ARAŞTIRMASI



Kafkas Üniversitesi  
İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler  
Fakültesi  
KAÜİBFD  
Cilt, 13, Sayı 26, 2022  
ISSN: 1309 – 4289  
E – ISSN: 2149-9136

Makale Gönderim Tarihi: 25.04.2022

Yayına Kabul Tarihi: 07.10.2022

**Kamile KUZU**

Uzman

Pamukkale Üniversitesi

İşletme Fakültesi,

Denizli, Türkiye

kkuzu@pau.edu.tr

**ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0558-7341**

**Ferihan POLAT**

Doç. Dr.

Pamukkale Üniversitesi

İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi,

Denizli, Türkiye

fyildirim@pau.edu.tr

**ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8832-0847**

**ÖZ** | Türk siyasal ahlakının kendine özgü

nitelikleri, Osmanlı'dan devralınan Türk kamu yönetiminin yapısal hastalıklarına dayanmaktadır. Türkiye'de kamu yönetimi disiplini içinde siyasal ve yönetsel ahlak konusunda yapılan çalışmalar 1980 sonrasında rastlamaktadır. Bu çalışma, Türk kamu yönetiminde yöneticilerin hangi tür ahlaksal davranış tipini sergilediğini açıklamayı amaçlamıştır. Bu amaçla, Steinberg ve Austern'in örnek olaylarından hareketle Pamukkale Üniversitesi yöneticilerinden oluşan 110 kişilik bir örneklem grubuna anket çalışması yapılmıştır. Araştırma sonrası elde edilen bulgular Steinberg ve Austern'in ahlaksal davranış tipolojisine göre değerlendirilmiştir. Bu değerlendirmeler ışığında, Türk kamu yönetiminde yönetici personelin daha çok görevci bir ahlaksal tutum sergilediği görülmüştür.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Siyasal ve yönetsel ahlak, siyasal ve yönetsel yozlaşma, yoldan çıkarıcı ahlak, görevci ahlak, ahlakçı davranış

**JEL Kodları:** Z00, Z10, Z19

**Alan:** Siyaset bilimi ve kamu yönetimi

**Türü:** Araştırma

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The belief of the executives within the political institution that they have the right to make decisions over the ruled, therefore the inequality inherent in politics brings with it a serious moral problem. This is because equality among people is the most basic moral value. For this reason, politics itself is morally problematic in the first place. While politicians and political events are compared, politicians are accused of immorality. It is very important to distinguish whether the immorality in question is an immorality due to the nature of politics or an immorality due to the personality of the politician. Perceiving moral problems arising from politics as moral problems of politicians reduces the prestige of politics.

In order to avoid the negative political consequences of these approaches, a third approach has developed, which develops the moral values of the state and argues that it has to comply with these rules while imposing it on the society. The essence of this approach is that values are universal. If human rights are the basis of today's democracies, it is necessary to produce political systems based on the system of humanistic morality.

It is seen that academic studies on Turkish political ethics gained intensity in the 1980s and these studies are mostly theoretical texts that make historical readings (Heper, 1993). Due to the difficulty of reaching Turkish politicians, this field study, which aims to reveal the moral quality of Genre politics, focuses on analyzing the moral behavior of public officials. For this purpose, a questionnaire was applied to the appointed public administrators at Pamukkale University. Since the sample group of the field study consisted of public administrators, the second main problematic of the study was the field of public ethics. Where politics, people and the state exist, bureaucracy and public ethics have a very important place. Because the political sphere and the public sphere are intertwined in practice (Alkan & Ergil, 1980, p. 13). Distinguish between political and administrative corruption The basic and simple distinction is the identity of the perpetrator. It is possible to create a universal ethical system in the public sphere, although the most basic of moral problems experienced in the political and administrative field varies according to the moral understanding of the individual, the time lived and the structure of the society. The behaviors that should be done and the behaviors that should not be done in line with the public purpose can be determined and created through laws (Çevikbaş, 2006).

The study is about explaining the moral behavior types of public administrator personnel in the light of evaluations related to political and administrative ethics. For this purpose, the findings obtained on the basis of the ethical behavior typology in public administration developed by Steinberg and

Austern in the example of Pamukkale University were interpreted. According to these findings, it was tried to determine whether the executive group working at Pamukkale University and sampled was a moralist, a moralist or a deviant. In the research, open-ended questionnaires containing case study questions on Moral Behavior Typology developed by Steinberg and Austern were applied and the answers to these questionnaires were evaluated by content analysis, one of the qualitative research methods.

## **2. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ETHICS, POLITICS AND GOVERNANCE**

While politics is broadly defined as the struggle for power, it is narrowly defined as the rule of some people over other people (Kapani, 2007, p. 64). The ability of the rulers to determine the fate of the ruled, with whom the rulers have no primary relationship, wraps the ruler-managed relationship in politics into a hierarchical structure (Polat & İkiz, 2015, p. 162). The moral position of the politician differs greatly from the moral position of the ordinary person. Trying to grasp this difference and contemplating its causes is imperative to reveal the specificity of the politics-morality relationship. Every discussion and solution proposal that can be made on the subject of political morality will gain meaning only by considering this specific feature (Alkan, 1993, p. 107; Pinnington, Macklin & Campbell, 2007, p. 2). The relationship between morality and politics has been a subject of many philosophic discussions since the era of ancient Greece. However, this relationship has orbited outside the realm of philosophy and after the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has become the subject of experimental studies in the light of positivism (Polat & Ayna, 2018, p. 113).

There is a moral problem arising from the existence of politics. If we consider that morality accepts equality among people, the politics that institutionalizes the inequality between the ruler and the ruled due to its existence is against morality. A wide variety of legitimacy theories have been produced, based on convincing the rulers why the ruled have the right to rule, and these theories have been among the main subjects of political science and political philosophy. Political morality, the structures, institutions, roles, thoughts and actions related to political differentiation; These are social norms that enable social life to continue as possible, harmonious, positive and productive. The scope of political morality, like the scope of morality, consists of behaviors that are not desired and behaviors that are expected to be done (Kıslalı, 1993, pp. 134-137; Polat & İkiz, 2015, p. 168). Ethical issues often require difficult choices to be made in uncertain and complex conditions. It's hard to be sure that the decisions made are the best. Also, one option may be better than the other.

Making decisions based on reasons and impartially and finding fair judgment by others proves our point of view is correct. Moral justification for decisions helps to make fair and good decisions (Strike, Haller & Soltis, 1988, p. 3).

An ethical dilemma is when two or more competing values come into conflict. If one of these conflicting values is protected, the other cannot be protected or it is necessary to ignore the others in order to protect one or more of them (Gortner, 1994, p. 373). The moral order that is believed to make social life harmonious with political structures, institutions and actions is called political moral order. Political morality, like other morals, consists of behaviors that are expected to be done and behaviors that are not desired to be done. Expected behaviors are fulfilling the promises of the politicians, keeping the promises made, being able to give an account of their actions in the political sense. The behavior that should not be done can be given as examples such as not deceiving the society, nepotism, ignoring the public interest for a class or interest group. Of course, although it seems to have a universal character, political moral rules vary according to the type of government and the structure of the society.

Political morality is a phenomenon that does not have a universal definition. Some behaviors may be considered unpleasant behavior in one political order, while the same behaviors may be acceptable and even desirable in another political order. Therefore, it is not possible to develop a universal political moral code. As time, place and political understanding change, political moral rules will also change (Şenel, 1993, p. 260).

In the relationship between politics and morality, sometimes the damaged party may be the rulers and the power holders. Although politicians are shown as the accused party in the face of political events, even if they are not politicians, due to the essence of politics, they have a strong connection and contradiction with morality. It is important to find the source of an immoral political event. Because presenting the problems arising from the politics itself as the personal problem of the politician can both denigrate the political structure and keep the valuable people who will enter politics away from politics (Polat & İköz, 2015, p. 165).

After politics and morals, things about relations with public administrators are important. In addition to trainings related to their own business, the public also provides training for education. In order for the public administration to be an administration with ethical values, it must act in accordance with ethical values one by one as a public official. The history of living in the public, the social environment and economic history, the religion in the society. It is not important because the value being expropriated is utilized in the significant value in question (Ural, 2004, p. 47).

A public official has to take certain decisions while performing his public duties. At the decision stage, he is affected by the laws and personal values while making his decision. The public official has to decide in the public interest in the decisions he makes through the law, because the laws protect the public interest. However, the laws are not enough to fully understand and solve every situation. In such cases, public officials act according to their own value judgments (Özdemir, 2008, p. 182). Generally, what is required from a public official is to take decisions by considering the public interest. Public officials also benefit from their moral values in order to meet this expectation. At this point, the relationship between public administration and morality gains importance. The public officer must know and internalize the values and norms that exist in public administration (Usta, 2011, p. 45).

The important point in the relationship between public administration and ethics is the existence of work ethic. In order to talk about work ethic, only individual morality is not enough, the society in which one lives is much more important. If the moral values in the society have priority, an effective and efficient public administration can be mentioned (Steinberg & Austern, 1995, p. 141).

### **3. POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE DEGENERATION**

Morality; not a substitute for law, norms and tasks in political life, but behavior necessitates their style (Dobel, 1988, p. 75). Laws states the responsibilities of both rulers and the public. Public administration ethics depends on strong legal traditions and law. When the law and enforcement of laws is an ethical indecision, it is the most important reference source of managers (Gortner, 1991, p. 52; Sinnott-Amstrong, 1985, p. 321).

The change of moral rules depends on the change of society. In Turkey, which is rapidly developing and changing, the political moral rules will also change. However, while moral rules change according to society, political moral rules do not change at the same speed. Alkan tried to explain this change by dividing political morality into two types. The type of morality accepted by the society (the governed) through official means or imposed by force, either through education or through socialization, is called official morality. On the other hand, morality that keeps up with rapidly changing economic, cultural and social events is called informal morality (Alkan, 1993, p. 20).

Official morality ensures the continuity, institutionalization and legitimacy of societies. Laws are created according to these moral rules. Politicians make their speeches according to these moral codes. Informal morality, on the other hand, is behavioral patterns that help to adapt to changing

conditions. For example, in the face of rapidly rising inflation, business ethics will be affected first in the society. Sales techniques and understanding of marketing will change. This change in business ethics will be reflected in professional and political ethics. While the informal morality changes so much, the official morality will want to continue its own rules. Situations such as war, major economic depressions, and migrations can easily change the value judgments of individuals (Alkan, 1993, p. 18).

In societies undergoing rapid change, while moral judgments keep pace with rapid change, both types of morality are intertwined in society. According to our official morality, tax is a debt of honor, it must be given. According to informal morality, everyone who finds their way should evade taxes. According to official morality, recruitment, appointment and promotion should be based on merit, while according to informal ethics, it should be done with nepotism and patronage. Two different moral behaviors of administrators in political life that diverge so far from each other in terms of hiring and promotion; it leads to corruption in the political field, to damage the political trust and ultimately to social deterioration (Alkan, 1993, p. 21).

Corruption can be defined as the use of the public day separately from the law in order to gain financial gain or to gain personal benefit without financial reason (Berkman, 1983, p. 9). The concept of corruption, on the other hand, is explained by the unlawful use of public power for private benefit, deviating from the purpose of public interest, due to the effort of providing financial gain or private benefit while performing public service (Kılavuz, 2003, p. 177). However, corruption is sometimes used to maintain political power rather than to gain wealth and status (Fombad, 2000, p. 235). While the corruption is realizing the event, whether the party holding the political power is political or the appointed public administrator determines whether the corruption is political or administrative corruption.

There are many behaviors and actions that corrupt political morality and these behaviors and actions are called political corruption. In terms of political science, the concept of political corruption is a new concept and the concepts of bribery and corruption have been used instead. Corruption expresses the narrow meaning of political corruption. Political corruption in the narrow sense; It is used as the definition of acts such as corruption, bribery, embezzlement, nepotism. Aktan corruption "contains behavior and actions involving the illegal use of public authority for material gain or private non-monetary purposes." It has been defined as in short, the violation of the rules for the sake of office or position in the public sphere is explained as corruption (Aktan, 1999a, p. 20). Political corruption in a broad sense, on the other hand, is called political corruption when

the actors (voters, politicians, bureaucrats, interest groups) taking part in the political decision-making mechanism act and act in violation of the legal, religious, moral and cultural norms in the society for the purpose of obtaining special interests. (Aktan, 1999a, p. 21).

The actors of political corruption are politicians, individuals, pressure and interest groups, students, voters, workers, public employees, those who are looking for a job and favor, and interest groups that seek export and investment support (Aktan, 1999b, p. 152). In order to talk about political corruption, there must be a political process, the existence of active voters, politicians and certain interest groups, and communication between them. Public officials, who have the power to make political decisions, are expected to abide by the existing laws and moral rules while using their power. If he uses the public power in order to benefit himself or his relatives instead of taking care of the public interest, he fulfills all the conditions for political corruption (Aktan, 1999b, p. 153). Political corruption is not only in the political field, but also spreads to the society and other areas. It is reflected in the economic field, both in the society and in the mutual relations of individuals.

It is possible to divide Political Corruption into various classes. Corruption in procedural situations such as legislative and executive in the political field can be examined. However, in this classification, the public and mass media are out of the question and reliable data cannot be obtained. A second classification is made according to role situations. Within this classification, there are voters, politicians, interest groups, in short, all participants in the political process. The disadvantage of the classification of all participants is that every moral problem is perceived as a very important problem and there is a need to put the types of political corruption in order of importance. The most important problem in political life arises from the relationship between the ruler and the ruled and the difference in having economic power in the society. As Altan stated, in order for the problem to be resolved, the political sphere and the state must disappear completely, which does not seem possible (Aktan, 1999b, p. 154). If the difference between the rich and the poor, the ruler and the ruled decreases in the society, the moral problem will also decrease. While the difference between the rich and the poor is possible with fair income distribution, the difference between the ruler and the ruled can be solved by democratization. However, even though this problem experienced by the society is not completely resolved, it always means striving for the better for political life. The improvement of the main moral problem, the distinction between the ruler and the ruled, the rich and the poor, will be the solution to the problems such as corruption, bribery, propaganda and nepotism, which we can define as secondary moral problems.



Secondary moral problems arise from basic moral problems. In a way, secondary moral rules are the reflections of basic moral rules in society (Aktan, 1999b, pp. 156-157).

Political teaching shows parallelism with the profession. Political morality is reviewing, not reviewing, not doing. It can be listed as those who hold political power in the political profession will not employ public officials, will not use them for semi-private interests in the public, and will be meritorious without assigning bribes. Politicization of the administration and its relationship with the administration are counted as the two main reasons for the relationship between politics and administrative corruption (Tutum, 1976, p. 28; Güvenç, 1993, p. 41). If partisan actions are made while public administration appointments are made, they are made manageable. The system, which can be evaluated according to value judgments that are not excluded from the system of merit, is deteriorating and corrupting. The form of otherization in public administration is the practices of power. When the restrictions of the government are considered differently, corruption occurs in public administration (Kılavuz, 2003, p. 181).

Political and administrative corruption are intertwined in the field of practice. The reason for this situation is the relationship between political power and bureaucracy at the decision-making stage. Corruption in public administration harms adherence to law, equality and human rights and freedoms. In the event that a public official uses public power for his personal benefit, it contradicts the principle of public interest in the essence of public administration and therefore equality before the law. Since citizens are directly exposed to this corruption, their trust in public officials and public institutions is shaken. On the other hand, in a public administration where there is no moral values, public employees are also adversely affected. The fact that a new official is replaced by a corrupt public official causes his/her ties to the organization to cause a loss of time both materially and morally (Kılavuz, 2003, p. 185).

#### **4. TYPES OF POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE DEGENERATION**

Political and administrative corruption are intertwined in the field of practice. The reason for this situation is the relationship between political power and bureaucracy at the decision-making stage. The types of political and administrative corruption are divided into twelve different types below.

*Bribe:* The misconduct of public officials for personal gain is called bribery. While the transaction may be made faster in favor of others in accordance with the law, it may be abused, and there may be situations where an illegal

transaction is made by a public official for the purpose of gaining benefits. In both cases, the public official abuses his power by gaining benefits (Aktan, 1999b, p. 27). In order for the bribery to take place, the public official can offer directly, as well as the beneficiary party can offer it to the public official. Even in situations where the other party has no interest, a public official may demand a bribe. Bribery takes place with the joint participation of both the public official and the beneficiary party (Berkman, 1983, p. 24; Aktan, 1999b, p. 24).

*Extortion:* It is called extortion when a public official unilaterally forces the other party to bribe. While bribery is a situation where both parties consent, extortion is the unilateral action of a public official using public power. Bribery occurs when a public official misuses his/her duty and authority for benefit based on mutual consent. The bribery party knows that his act is a crime. In embezzlement, the public official abuses his duties and powers, forcing the individual to commit a crime (Aktan, 1999b, p. 27).

*Embezzlement and Conflict:* Spending a public resource in the form of money and goods for personal use by public officials is called embezzlement. For example, it is embezzlement if a public official pays the fuel cost of his car from his office. Embezzlement is equated with theft. The Law No. 5237 defines it as embezzlement to take possession of the property that has been transferred to him or that he is responsible for the protection and supervision of himself or someone else. Besides embezzlement, it is called *ikhlas* to do this by cheating. The situations in which the public official takes actions to prevent the emergence of the crime of embezzlement are called conflict (Berkman, 1983, p. 23).

*Favouritism:* Nepotism is a type of corruption that takes place in the form of solidarity. Although nepotism is a common situation in the political and bureaucratic system, it is briefly called *torpedo*. The employment of a bureaucrat, public official or politician, who is active in the political system, regardless of their personal skills or education level in the public sector, because they are close, relatives or political supporters, explains this type of political corruption. Nepotism can also be practiced partisan. Political parties can reward their political supporters during the election period. In fact, political parties tend to employ their own party members by opening existing cadres in the public or by creating cadres for their party members when they are in power (Aktan, 1999b, p. 28). Pepper defines favoritism as a cultural phenomenon that spreads inequality-discrimination and is embraced by the society. While it is commonly seen in situations such as recruitment and promotion in public institutions, while providing services in social life, favouritism approaches are observed to family relatives, relatives, friends, members of the same political party and similar (Biber, 2016, p. 7). Since nepotism focuses on a hiring factor other than merit, it

is considered to be unfair and irrational. In some countries, anti-nepotism policies limit the number of relatives working in the same organization (Kawo & Torun, 2020, p. 54).

There are different types of nepotism. The most well-known of these is nepotism, and it is called neopotism. Considering the Turkish family culture and sense of ownership, it is natural for the idea of us and others to emerge. As a result of thinking about each other's welfare in kinship relations, it creates nepotism. Another is favouritism, and this favoritism is called cronyism. This type of nepotism is also frequently encountered in processes such as promotion in the public sector and recruitment. One of the most important is political patronage and it is called patronage. The patronage relationship is defined as staffing in political life. With the takeover of the management in the public sector, the team begins to be given to people with their own political party. In Turkish political history, patronage relations have been frequently exposed together with political affiliations (Biber, 2016, p. 31).

*Patronage and Servitude:* After the political powers hold power, they make changes in the top management staff. They place their supporters or partisans in the upper echelons one by one. In fact, this situation is quite common and common. Patronage is the most common and prominent form of political corruption. Non-serving civil servants are also common in our country. There are offices and cadres reserved for the relatives and supporters of the political power. It even has a name as “Barley” (Aktan, 1999b, p. 30). This type of corruption is a clear example of how bureaucracy and political relations are intertwined.

*Service Nepotism:* It is one of the most used types of political corruption by those who hold power. They allocate the budget to constituencies in order to invest in future elections. In short, they increase the investment in the regions where they get the most votes. It appears as a type of corruption in which public resources are transferred not equally but to regions where the political power can guarantee votes (Aktan, 1999b, p. 30; Bayrakçı, 2000, p. 137).

*Purchasing Votes:* Often this situation arises in legislative activity. Political parties within the legislature can support the proposals they have submitted to the parliament in line with their interests. Party A can promise to support Party B's offer if they support Party B's own offer. Thus, both parties use their votes to support each other in line with their own interests (Aktan, 1999b, p. 30; Bayrakçı, 2000, p. 137). When vote trading is used against each other by political parties, it causes political degeneration.

*Lobbying:* Interest and pressure groups existing in the country affect the political power in the decision-making process. Their first pressures are financial, by providing financial resources to political parties during election periods, and

in return, they provide a certain income as a result of the political party they support coming to power. They aim to have an impact on some deputies and to defend their interests in the parliament by the deputies (Aktan, 1999, p. 30; Bayrakçı, 2000, p. 135).

*Rent Seeking:* The activities that the interest and pressure groups that are influential in the country engage in with the aim of obtaining economic and social benefits from the state are called rent seeking. Interest and pressure groups can ensure that certain taxes are imposed in order to profit in the domestic market. They can lobby for taxes, concessions, licenses, import/export quotas that will be in their favor in the economic sense (Aktan, 1999b, p. 30; Bayrakçı, 2000, p. 139).

*Politic Manipulation:* Politicians mislead their voters to gain power. The first way that comes to mind is to make false promises. Parties visit their voters in order to face the election before the election. They hold meetings and make some promises in order to win the election race. There are also some unfounded promises. This is political manipulation, which is a form of political corruption. Political parties manipulate voters by making propaganda. In the interaction between the party and the voters, they use the mass and communication tools as a one-sided propaganda tool. Political parties can cover up illegal practices by giving too much information (Aktan, 1999b, p. 30; Bayrakçı, 2000, p. 139).

*Gratifying:* Nepotism and service can be evaluated as a type of favoritism. It is a type of corruption made by using the bureaucratic structure due to vote anxiety. Public tenders and privileges granted by state banks are examples of this type (Aktan, 1999b, p. 27).

*Intercession:* Due to the increase in the demand in the public service, the corruption that takes place before the service and by privileged use by the effective manager in the public bureaucracy or a person who will affect the public institution is called intermediation. Considering that not everyone can reach the said intermediary, it is thought that the person who reaches the intermediary is privileged. Most of the time, these intermediaries are from the political field (Oktay, 1983, pp. 210-211).

In a public institution, information is generally required to be kept confidential. The type of corruption in which the confidential information in question is leaked to other institutions or private individuals in order to gain benefit and financial gain is called leaking public secrets and profiteering. An example of this type of corruption is that an interest transaction to be made by the central bank is announced to some companies in return for benefits and companies gain unfair advantage.

## 5. TYPES OF MORAL BEHAVIOR IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN STEINBERG AND AUSTERN'S TYPOLOGY

A management approach that serves the public interest and public interest is the basis for ethical practices of public administration. It cannot be thought that practices that partially accept morality or that are not morally irrelevant to the public interest and interest. A management system based on moral values will work for the public good and meet the wishes of the public. There is no corruption here, even if a behavior based on moral values yields a wrong result. There are three basic behavioral patterns for both elected and appointed public officials. There are “deviant” behavior patterns that are not based on morality, neutral or relatively “duty” towards moral values, and moralistic” behavior patterns that are based on moral values and protect the public interest and interest (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 76).

### 5.1. Immoral Behavior (Duty)

The behavior of perverts was not influenced by moral or spiritual values. This person has no rules or principles. As soon as he gets the opportunity, he will evaluate it and try to provide personal benefits. corrupt public officials; They engage in immoral and illegal practices. They lie and destroy information and documents. They aim to benefit themselves by taking advantage of other people's weaknesses and poor morals. They complicate the lives of those who embrace moral values and act accordingly, and those who expose illegal events. They want to take advantage of the vulnerabilities by cheating against the laws and rules. They use the public power in their hands as their own power. They use their position and duties in the state to increase their personal material and moral gain. In solving problems such as injustice and inefficiency in society, instead of following the laws, he tries to find a solution by considering his own interests. He does not refrain from arranging the management approach in public office on behalf of himself and his relatives, and does not see it as wrong (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 79).

### 5.2. Objective Behavior Towards to Values (Attendants)

This person, on the other hand, acts impartially or adapts to the situation in order to adapt to the changing social structure. Even if the people in the duty structure realize the wrong, they do not oppose the authority in power. Even if they feel personal discomfort, they do not break the unity with the authority. Public officials who adopt a sense of duty; It does not get involved in any illegal act or transaction and does not involve others. Nor does it reveal the authority that committed the illegal act. If it will not make a big profit without risk, no individual or collective immoral action or transaction will be taken. It does its job

exactly. It obeys the laws and rules, does not want problems. When he encounters the moral problems of the public officials he works with, he takes a neutral position towards them and does not become a troublemaker. Shares public information at a minimum level. Hides information about the task. For the public servant who adopts the missionary approach, he considers the data, not the quality of the public service given by considering the public interest (the workload per employee or the receipts of the fines...). He hides those who come to work late and those who extend their smoking break, in accordance with the principle of loyalty to the institution (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 81).

### **5.3. Protecting the Public Interest (Moralists)**

In this type of behavior, the public official believes that ethical practices are fundamental in management. They believe in the principle of do not do to others what you do not want others to do to you. This is the most basic principles of life; health, freedom, righteousness and equality before the law. Ultimately, this public official believes that the public interest and benefit should be pursued. Public officials who adopt a moralist understanding; does not lead himself or others to actions and actions against moral values. Nor does it condone those who engage in illegal acts and transactions. It reveals the behavior of public officials who disregard moral values. He does his public service to the best of his ability. He encourages his fellow public servants to act in the same way. It defends and supports those who do their duty well. It provides an open and honest communication. It hides information that should be hidden when there is law and moral need. Doing this when given an immoral and illegal duty. One can say no to it. It aims at a free society and free public administration (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 82).

## **6. PAMUKKALE UNIVERSITY ETHICS RESEARCH**

Based on the typology developed by Steinberg and Austern on the problem of moral dilemmas for public officials and their work, the questionnaire prepared from twelve case studies was conducted to a group of 110 executives in order to measure the approaches of Pamukkale University administrative units' administrators, who serve as top managers in public service, to these moral dilemmas. They were asked to answer yes or no to the questions and to explain the reasons for their answers. Twelve case studies asked in the questionnaire will be examined below.

### **6.1. Methodology**

In addition to theoretical knowledge, field research was carried out in the research. Based on the questionnaire technique used in the field research, the

answers to the open-ended questions were subjected to a qualitative evaluation. In the research, open-ended questionnaires containing case study questions related to the Moral Behavior Typology developed by Steinberg and Austern were applied and the answers to these questionnaires were evaluated with content analysis, one of the qualitative research methods.

### **6.2. Demographic Information on Research Participants**

The sample of the research consists of one dean, one general secretary, one assistant general secretary, eight heads of departments, one legal adviser, six institute secretaries, fifteen faculty secretaries, eighteen college secretaries, thirty-eight branch managers and thirty-two chiefs at Pamukkale University. applied to administrative managers consisting of individuals.

### **6.3. Research Findings**

The findings of the research conducted between 17.04.2019 and 24.05.2019 on 110 senior public officials working at Pamukkale University are given below.

#### **6.3.1. Responses to case study 1**

*“You are the governor of your province. The management of the Chamber of Industry and Commerce is organizing a trip to a hotel this weekend. The tour includes a cocktail, dinner and also various entertainment. In addition, there are sessions during the day where the last year will be reviewed and the next year will be discussed. Your provincial administration contributes 100,000 TL to the Chamber every year. You have been invited for this weekend trip to be paid by the room for all your expenses, will you go?”*

The moral dilemma problem related to case 1 includes types of political corruption such as bribery, nepotism and abuse of power in the Turkish political morality level. In addition, Case 1 demonstrates the principles of non-abuse of duty, impartiality of a public official, awareness of public service in the fulfillment of the duty, commitment to the purpose and mission, avoidance of conflict of interest, non-use of duties and authorities for benefit, prohibition of receiving gifts and benefits, use of public goods and resources. is also questioning.

For the dilemma question in Case 1, 56% of the respondents and 44% of the respondents gave charitable services. While rewarding this admiration, he does not act positively towards people by being a moralist, deviating from the public courtesy type. The reason is the participation of the public administration in a tour organized through the management of the Chamber of Industry and Commerce, and the independence of the public may be unthinkable by the chamber. Of course, there are also IM accounts for some of the room users. However, this meeting is not for entertainment purposes. Last year will be

reviewed and plans will be made for next year. The inclusion of the chamber in this fair may support the plans of the chamber as a public (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, s. 14).

**Table 1:** Distribution of Responses to Case Study 1 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	48	56
Attendants	62	44
Duty	-	-

According to Table 1, 56% of the managers who participated in the survey answered "yes" and it was concluded that they had a "duty" morality. When the qualified answers of the people who would answer yes and participate in the trip were examined, they thought that the governor should attend the trip since the past year would be evaluated and the next year would be planned at the trip meeting. Public administrators, who have a sense of duty morality, do not see meeting the expenses of the tour as a "bribe" given to public administrators, since the purpose of participating in the tour organized by the Chamber of Commerce is to fulfill their public duties. In Turkish culture, if an invitation is offered, it is not appropriate not to accept it. Public administrators accepted the invitation with the effect of this cultural value. The differentiation of morality from culture to culture is proven by the qualified responses to case study 1.

According to Table 1, 44% of the respondents who answered "No" conclude that they have a "moralist" moral understanding. When the reasoned answers of those who gave no answer were examined, they stated that it was not appropriate for them to participate in a trip that the chamber of commerce paid their income as a top manager. Some of those who gave no answer stated that they could participate in the trip organized by the Chamber of Commerce on the condition that they pay their own expenses. Public officials who answered no, on the other hand, answered in their qualified answers that the biggest drawback of participating in a trip welcomed by the Chamber of Commerce is "bribery". The issue emphasized by the executive group that gave both answers is the evaluation of the past year and the planning of the next year.

### 6.3.2. Responses to case study 2

*"You are an elected mayor of the town you live in. A nice business center has been planned for the town, but you are not at the economic level to buy the planned land. The owner of a construction company comes to you and tells you that he can buy the land in question and donate it to the business center project*



*of the municipality, and in return he wants to make the construction higher than the floor limit. The offer was made directly to you. Can you take this to city council?"*

The moral dilemma problem related to case study 2 includes types of political corruption such as bribery, rent seeking and nepotism in Turkish political morality. In addition, among the ethical behavior principles of public officials in the regulation mentioned in case study 2, impartiality of public officials, not using their duties and powers for benefit, public service awareness, public service awareness, honesty and impartiality, avoidance of conflict of interest, prohibition of receiving gifts and providing benefits, and It also questions the principles of accountability.

To the dilemma question in Case Study 2, 33% of the respondents answered yes and 67% answered no. In the responses to case study 2, those who consider taking the proposal to the parliament are defined as "moralists", and those who do not consider taking the proposal to the parliament are defined as "deviant". While making this definition, it is not right for the mayor to hide information from the council, and at the same time, it is not appropriate to take a decision on his own in a situation that concerns the city (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, pp. 16-17).

**Table 2:** Distribution of Responses to Case Study 2 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	36	33
Attendants	0	0
Duty	74	67

According to Table 2, when the political conditions of our country are evaluated, a different result emerges in this question of Steinberg and Austern, who say that 67% of the respondents who answered "no" have a "deviant" moral understanding. In our country, it is not considered appropriate to bring an illegal proposal to the parliament. For this reason, when the qualified responses of the respondents were examined, most of them did not accept the offer by saying no to this offer, since it would be illegal for the construction to be built to exceed the floor limits. For the rulers of our country, no answer is not a pervert, but an indication that they have a "duty" morality. According to Steinberg and Austern, public administrators who answered no, abused their positions by not taking the proposal to the parliament. In our country, the situation is quite different. People

found it immoral to bring an inappropriate proposal to the parliament and considered it moral behavior not to bring it to the parliament.

According to Table 2, 33% of the respondents have a "moralist" understanding by answering "yes". When the reasoned answers of the respondents were examined, they wrote that the decisions concerning the municipality could not be taken alone and it would be appropriate to take the decision by taking the matter to the municipal council.

### 6.3.3. Responses to Case Study 3

*“Mr. Hakan is the editor-in-chief of the district police department that you are in charge of. He does his duty diligently and astonishingly well and neatly. One day, you learned that Mr. Hakan had told a secret information in the coffee house. Will you fire Mr. Hakan?”*

The moral dilemma problem related to Case Study 3 includes bribery and extortion, which are types of political corruption in Turkish political morality. In addition, among the ethical principles of public officials, the principles of prestige and trust, binding explanations and false statements, not using duties and authorities for profit, and avoiding extravagance are questioned.

While the leaked information is seen as a valid reason to fire the public official when the leaked information is leaked for economic purposes, it is thought that sharing a confidential information outside without an economic purpose does not harm the state as much as corruption. At the same time, it should not be frequently reminded to the public official that an information is confidential. Because the confidential information is more interesting and may be in an effort to explain it to our spouses, public officials, friends and colleagues. Those who fired Hakan have a "duty" attitude, while those who did not fire him have a "moralist" understanding. The reason why they are moralists is that in such crimes, a public official can be warned or condemned, and other employees can be reminded not to share confidential information (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, pp. 17). To the dilemma question in Case 3, 51% of the respondents answered yes and 49% answered no.

**Table 3:** Distribution of Responses to Case Study 3 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	54	49
Attendants	56	51
Duty	0	0

According to Table 3, 51% of the respondents answered "yes" and those who fired Mr. Hakan have a "duty" morality. When the reasoned answers of those who answered yes were examined, they stated that revealing the state's confidential information would put the state in a difficult situation and that irreparable consequences could arise. Considering the political life of our country, the disclosure of confidential business-related information is considered an unforgivable crime.

According to Table 3, those who answered "no" at the rate of 49% have a "moralist" moral understanding. When the reasoned answers are examined, some of them think that Hakan should be investigated and given a warning and reprimand, while other participants think that a change of location should be made. At the same time, almost all of those who answered no wondered why they shared confidential information. Participants who answered no, wrote in their qualified answers that they did not want to lose a hardworking officer like Hakan.

In case study 3, Mr. Hakan did not share the confidential information with the aim of obtaining an economic benefit. Therefore, it does not establish a relationship of bribery and extortion. Instead of dismissal, warning and reprimand may be given for acting contrary to the principle of respect and trust that a public official should have.

#### **6.3.4. Responses to case study 4**

*"Turgay has been working at the Provincial Police Department for 19 years and has successfully risen in his job to become the Superintendent. One day, two officers working for him arrested the mayor's son for exceeding the speed limit, and they found drugs in his car. When Mr. Turgay arrived at the scene, the mayor was also there. The mayor threatened to dismiss Superintendent Turgay and the officers from their jobs. Fearing to lose his job, the Superintendent ordered the police officers to release the mayor's son. This event has come before you; Will you fire Mr. Turgay?"*

The moral dilemma problem related to case study 4 includes favoritism, one of the types of political corruption, in the Turkish political morality plane. In addition, public officials question the principles of public service awareness, public service awareness, compliance with service standards, honesty and impartiality, respectability and trust, duty, notification to the competent authorities, and not using the authorities for benefit in the performance of their duties, which are among the ethical behavior principles.

To the dilemma question in Case 4, 48% of the respondents answered yes and 51% answered no. In our case, Mr. Turgay is the person who gave the order to the other police officers after the Mayor's release of his son, an event that can

be considered as an "unlawful order" when we look at the laws of our country. According to Steinberg and Austern (p. 18), superiors are given more authority and money than subordinates. It is Turgay who should be held responsible for the situation and fired. If the case is compared with case 3, Mr. Turgay's case is heavier than Hakan's case. Because Mr. Turgay exhibits an "obstructive of justice" behavior. Those who answer yes to this question should be regarded as "moralists" and those who answer no as "deviant" (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, pp. 18).

**Table 4:** Distribution of Responses to Case Study 4 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	52	48
Attendants	0	0
Duty	55	51

According to Table 4, it is observed that 48% of the respondents have a "moralist" moral understanding. When the qualified answers of the public administrators who fired Mr. Turgay were examined, they stated that the mayor's son was discriminated against and stated that everyone was equal before the law, and that this behavior of Turgay ignored the concept of "equality" and harmed the concept of justice by not treating the citizens equally.

According to Table 4, it is observed that 51% of those who answered the survey have a "deviant" moral understanding of public administrators. When the qualified answers of those who answered no are examined, some of them stated that an action should definitely be taken against Turgay and they would start an investigation and request a change of office, while others stated that he actually did his job right, but was afraid of the mayor's threat and could not take a sound decision, with the fear of dismissal from the mayor's office. They wrote in their qualified replies that they did not take action against their son. It can be seen that the officer who shared confidential information in our country is not forgiven, but it is thought that an investigation should be opened against an officer who favors, not dismissal. Contrary to the theory of Steinberg and Austern, confidential information is considered a more qualified crime than nepotism in our country. Nepotism in public administration is one of the most obvious examples of corruption in public administration. Mr. Turgay did not act impartially while fulfilling his duty, and even used his powers for his own benefit. By not treating citizens equally, it also damaged the respect and trust of public officials.

### 6.3.5. Responses to case study 5

*“Ms. Burcu has been working in your unit for a long time and is seen as a hardworking, regular and honest employee by all her friends. He's never late, he's the last to leave work. However, because he wanted everyone to be like him, he always complained about his slow-moving friends who took long lunch breaks. Recently, Ms. Burcu told you about some of the officers who use the copier of the apartment unnecessarily and illegally. Moreover, these officers used the flat's phone for their private conversations. You have also issued a circular warning on these issues. Thereupon, Ms. Burcu was declared "persona non grata". After a while, a top manager was needed in your unit. Can you raise Ms. Burcu?”*

The moral dilemma problem related to case study 5 includes nepotism, which is a type of corruption in the Turkish political plane. The principles of honesty and impartiality, reporting to the competent authorities, courtesy and respect, dignity and trust, commitment to purpose and mission, use of public goods and resources, and avoidance of extravagance are questioned among the ethical behavior principles of public officials.

To the dilemma question in Case Study 5, 48% of the respondents answered yes and 51% answered no. In the answers given to case study 5, it is seen that those who answer yes have a "moralist", and those who answer no have a "duty" moral understanding. Raising Ms. Burcu shows that you expect the same behavior from other employees. (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 23) At the same time, it is not necessary to be a popular civil servant for the top duty. Burcu acted as an informant by complaining about her other colleagues to her supervisor. By raising Burcu lady, informing is encouraged. Although whistleblowing is important in removing immoral situations, it is often the whistleblowers who get hurt when the situation goes wrong. When the informants are protected, the events may come to light. Therefore, Ms. Burcu should be prevented from being declared an unwanted person (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 126).

**Table 5:** Distribution of Responses to Case Study 5 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	87	79
Attendants	23	21
Duty	0	0

According to Table 5, it is seen that 79% of the respondents have a "moralist" moral understanding by deciding to raise Burcu lady. When the

qualified answers that they justify the yes answer are examined, it is seen that the main idea of most of them is the same. They stated in their answers that if they had the opportunity to upgrade, Ms. Burcu was an honest, hardworking and disciplined employee. At the same time, Ms. Burcu was appreciated and appreciated by the administrators for protecting and protecting public property.

According to Table 5, 21% of the respondents show that they have a "duty" morality. When the reasons of those who answered no are examined, some of them do not find it appropriate to promote an unpopular person in the institution. Some of them wrote that if there is to be an upgrade, they believe that it should be done under certain conditions, and that raising Ms. Burcu would be contrary to the principle of "merit". Some of those who answered no see complaining about their co-workers as disruptive. We can consider the moral behavior type of public administrators, who think that they should be qualified while promoting, as "moralistic".

#### **6.3.6. Responses to case study 6**

*"Every day for a while now, police officers from two close patrols have been meeting for a tea break at a coffee house near the intersection of the three patrols' missions. They usually consume tea, coffee and toast. You have just been assigned to one of these patrols. After the tea break on the first day, when you walked to pay the bill to the owner of the cafe, the owner of the establishment said to you, "You don't have an account, sir, we are happy that our state officials are around." Other officers leave without paying. Will you pay the bill?"*

The moral dilemma problem related to case study 6 includes bribery, which is one of the types of political corruption in Turkish political morality. Public officials question the principles of respect and trust, the use of duties and powers for benefit, the prohibition of receiving gifts and benefits, awareness of public service in the fulfillment of their duty, commitment to the purpose and mission, and the use of public goods and resources.

The state provides civil servants in return for payment of money to the civil servant. Although tea, coffee and toast may seem small, the unpaid money here is a bribe. Although it may seem insignificant, small bribes lead to big bribes. In the example case, paying the money was defined as "moralistic", and not paying the money was defined as "deviant" (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 126). To the dilemma question in Case Study 6, 48% of the respondents answered yes and 51% answered no.

**Table 6:** Distribution of Responses to Case Study 6 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	107	98
Attendants	0	0
Duty	3	2

According to Table 6, 98% of the public administrators who responded to the survey indicated that they would pay the money if they were police officers, indicating that they have the "moralistic" moral behavior type. When their qualified answers were examined, they wrote that the shopkeeper bribed the police officers and that it is clearly a crime for public officials to receive money in this way. Some of those who answered yes also stated that the business that did not receive the account could then ask the police officers to turn a blind eye to other situations.

According to Table 6, it is seen that 2% of the public administrators who answered the survey have "duty" morality. While one of the answers stated that it was necessary to comply with the other police officers, the other manager, who answered no, wrote in his qualified answer that the citizen might want to be offered a treat out of respect for the police profession.

#### 6.3.7. Responses to case study 7

*"You and Mr. Meriç have been close friends for many years. You graduated from the same high school and finished the same department at the university. You witnessed each other's weddings and your spouses are good friends too. For over ten years, Mr. Meriç and his wife have been taking you and your wife to dinner on your birthday, and this has now become a tradition. Mr. Meriç is able to meet this expense because he is the owner of one of the largest infrastructure companies operating in your city and does business with the municipality in your city for over 10 million liras every year. You have been an insurance agent throughout your business life. You ran for city council three years ago and were elected. Currently, you are appointed as the chairman of the commission responsible for material tenders within the scope of infrastructure works of the Municipal Assembly. Mr. Meriç's company is among the companies participating in these tenders every year. You have a birthday in a few weeks and Mr. Meriç called you and told you that he had reserved a place for your birthday in a newly opened restaurant, which is very popular in the city. Would you accept the invitation?"*

The moral dilemma problem related to case study 7 includes bribery and nepotism, which are types of political corruption in Turkish political morality. The principles of transparency and participation, accountability of the manager, avoidance of conflicts of interest, honesty and impartiality, and not using duties and authorities for profit are examined among the ethical behavior principles of public officials.

To the dilemma question in Case Study 7, 52% of the respondents answered yes and 44% answered no. In our case study, those who accepted Mr. Meriç's offer were evaluated as "moralists", and those who refused to attend the invitation were evaluated as "dutiful moralists". Being an elected and appointed public official does not mean that he will give up his friendships. Although being a public servant requires being self-sacrificing in many issues, it does not require being self-sacrificing in this regard. When you go to Mr. Meriç's invitation, you can guess how negative a news might be if it is viewed by a local newspaper. However, in order to have a friendship based on the past and to prevent gossip to be talked about, all negativities will be eliminated when this celebration is held in public and shared with the account. The behavior expected from you as a member of the parliament is that you can remain neutral and unbiased on issues related to Mr. Meriç's company in the parliament (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 15).

**Table 7:** Distribution of Responses to Case 7 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	59	52
Attendants	48	44
Duty	0	0

According to Table 7, 52% of the public administrators who participated in the survey agreed to attend Mr. Meriç's invitation. According to Steinberg and Austern, it is seen that they have a moralistic understanding of morality. When we look at the qualified answers of those who accepted to go to the invitation, the common point of all the reasons is the idea that business and friendship are different and that they will accept the invitation within the friendship relationship that has been going on for years.

According to Table 7, 44% of the public administrators who participated in the survey answered no. These managers have a "duty" morality. They did not accept such a meeting before the bidding, stating that when their qualified



answers, for which they justified their no, are examined, it would be misunderstood if they were heard and seen having fun together, and they would be thought to have rigged the tender.

#### **6.3.8. Responses to case study 8**

*"Ms. Emine is a valuable employee. This lady has worked with you in your municipality for years and is someone you can trust and ask to put in the effort with overtime when needed. He is there for almost every problem and knows how to get past the uncomfortable situations for you. You owe him a lot for this and many other reasons. Recently, Ms. Emine came to you and told you that she has been "borrowing" money from the municipality's aid fund for a while and that she has been tampering with the aid given to hide them. The money he transferred was not much, it was usually 30-40 liras, and he paid back the money he received each time. However, he had to explain the situation because his subconscious mind was bothering him so much. According to your personnel policies, his action is clearly grounds for dismissal from his job at the municipality. Are you going to fire him?"*

The moral dilemma problem related to case study 8 includes embezzlement, which is one of the types of political corruption in Turkish political morality. In addition, among the ethical behavior principles of public officials, the principles of dignity and trust, not using duties and powers for benefit, public service awareness, commitment to purpose and mission, honesty and impartiality, prohibition of receiving gifts and providing benefits, use of public goods and resources are questioned.

To the dilemma question in Case Study 8, 33% of the respondents answered yes and 65% answered no. Ms. Emine in our case study has two irregularities. The first is to take money from the fund and the second is to patch irregularities in the records. The only thing I do worse than embezzling Ms. Emine is playing with the records. Thus, it paves the way for playing with records for larger amounts in the future. Although it may seem appropriate to dismiss Ms. Emine at first, it will be difficult to find an employee with the characteristics of Ms. Emine. It would be a more correct approach to give a warning to Ms. Emine and take the responsibility of the safe from her hand. In this way, those who are fired become "workers" and those who do not fire them become "moralists" (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 21).

**Table 8:** Distribution of Responses to Case Study 8 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	71	65
Attendants	36	33
Duty	0	0

According to Table 8, 33% of the public administrators who participated in the survey show that they have a "duty" morality. When their qualified answers, which they justified as yes, were examined, they deemed it appropriate to dismiss Ms. Emine, on the grounds that she received a small amount of money from the safe and that she could repeat it later and increase the amount.

According to Table 8, 65% of the public administrators who participated in the survey have a "moralist" sense of morality. When their qualified answers were examined, it was stated that they would initiate an investigation about Ms. Emine and take on the task of dealing with the safe, perhaps changing her place of duty. In a few of the answers, the managers gave the answer out of their own pocket to meet the needs of Ms. Emine and then to employ her in another task. Those who did not fire Ms. Emine from her job considered it as honesty that Ms. Emine told this out of conscience and described this behavior as exemplary behavior.

### 6.3.9. Responses to case study 9

*"You worked as an auditor in the municipality for six years and supervised purchases with contracts worth millions of lira. At the end of six years, you left your job in the municipality after receiving a job offer from a private company that was very difficult to refuse, but due to processes that developed beyond your control, your job at the company did not go well and you left your job and remained unemployed for six months. Afterwards, the owners of the company you left were asked to return as a consultant to get the company back together, you accepted the offer, but you could only work for one week in this way. Unexpectedly, it was announced that you would be recruited for your old job in the municipality, and you were hired by applying and passing the necessary steps. About a year later, you took part in a property purchase announcement, similar to the one you watched before, in your department. Shortly after that, one of the new owners of your old firm, of which you were a consultant, phoned you to see how things were going. In the framework of the speech, he asked about this procurement business and said that his own companies are also considering participating in the tender. You told him you couldn't discuss it, and he didn't*

*push too hard. Will you resign from your position on the Purchasing Commission?"*

The moral dilemma problem related to case 9 includes political corruption types such as bribery and nepotism in Turkish political morality. The principles of honesty and impartiality, avoidance of conflicts of interest, compliance with service standards, respectability and trust, not using duties and powers for benefit, transparency and participation in providing information, and public service awareness in the fulfillment of duty are also questioned among the ethical behavior principles of public officials.

To the dilemma question in Case 9, 14% of the respondents answered yes and 84% answered no. The public servant in our case has worked in the public sector after working in the private sector. There is a tender made by the administration where the public officer works. In this tender, his former firm, which he consulted, will participate. The company wanted to get information by phone and you stated that this situation would not be appropriate, and you stated that if the incident was heard, it would not be appropriate. It would be appropriate for him to leave his position in the purchasing commission due to the business relationship you have established with the company participating in the tender. However, it would be appropriate for him to state that he left because of the disagreement, since it would cause doubt to show the private company as the reason for leaving. Thus, those who find it appropriate to leave their job are considered "moralists", and those who do not find it appropriate are considered "deviant" (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 21-22).

**Table 9:** Distribution of Responses to Case 9 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	16	14
Attendants	0	0
Duty	91	84

According to Table 9, 14% of the public administrators who answered the questionnaire indicate that they have a "moralist" approach by answering that they will resign from their jobs. When the qualified answers of the public administrators were examined, it was thought that it would be appropriate to withdraw from the task, since the reasons may be a misunderstanding about the tender. The reasoning of some of those who answered yes was that they could not remain impartial due to their former workplace, and they found it appropriate to leave the tender commission.

According to Table 9, it is seen that 84% of the public administrators who answered the questionnaire have a "duty" moral understanding. When the qualified answers of the public administrators who participated in the survey and answered no were examined, they did not see this as a sufficient reason for leaving the job, and even stated that they would not establish close relations with the former workplace about the tender and would maintain their impartiality.

**6.3.10. Responses to case study 10**

*“You have been an administrator in the University administration for ten years. You have excelled in this task and have been promoted to the General Secretary. There is a Presidential election recently and your wife told you that she wants to be a candidate. If your spouse takes the job, will you be able to keep your job?”*

The moral dilemma problem for case study 10 includes nepotism, one of the types of political corruption, in the Turkish political morality plane. In addition, the principles of honesty and impartiality, which are among the ethical behavior principles of public officials, are questioned.

As women start to take part in business life, the probability of encountering this situation frequently in the public and private sectors increases. Since the Secretary General is the authority that will be accountable to the Rector, it has a moral dilemma in terms of public administration. The view that public service cannot be limited to one member of the family is considered appropriate. Spouses may adopt and defend opposing views on public service. In the example case, those who give the answer that I can continue the task have a "moralist", and those who answer that I cannot continue have a "duty" moral understanding (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 16). To the dilemma question in Case Study 10, 62% of the respondents answered yes and 37% answered no.

**Table 10:** Distribution of Responses to Case 10 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	68	62
Attendants	39	37
Duty	0	0

According to Table 10, 62% of the public administrators who answered the survey showed that they have a "moralist" moral understanding. When the qualified answers of the managers were examined, they stated that marriage does not prevent maintaining a subordinate relationship in the same institution, and that the house stays at home and the work relationship can stay at work.

According to Table 10, 37% of the public administrators who answered the questionnaire showed that they have a "duty" moral understanding. They stated that when their qualified answers are examined, speculation may arise, and even if there is no problem, they will not continue their duty on the grounds that they will be open to misunderstanding and rumors by third parties. Considering the political environment in our country, the frequent occurrence of nepotism and patronage, not paying attention to the principle of merit while coming to public office, leads public administrators to answer no.

### 6.3.11. Responses to case study 11

*"Your favorite brand of coffee is LOS PLANES, but you don't get it often because it's so expensive. You talked about this situation during the conversation with the owner of the market where you bought the coffee. Recently, the owner of the market has started to have problems with his license. You are a mid-level public official in your province and there is nothing you can do about the license. But the next time you shop for coffee, would you take back your favorite, unpaid Los Planes brand of coffee in your bag, coffee?"*

The moral dilemma problem for case study 11 includes bribery, which is one of the types of political corruption in Turkish political morality. Public officials are among the ethical behavior principles of not using their duties and powers for benefit, the prohibition of receiving gifts and benefits, dignity and trust, honesty and impartiality, compliance with service standards, awareness of public service in the fulfillment of duty, awareness of service to the public, commitment to purpose and mission, conflict of interest. principles of evasion are questioned.

To the dilemma question in Case Study 11, 83% of the respondents answered yes and 14% answered no. In the example case, giving a gift to a public official is examined. If you are in public service, there is no rule that you cannot receive gifts, gifts can be received from spouses, relatives, friends and family, but if the purpose of the gift changes, if a privilege is requested in the performance of a public service, the public officer should definitely not accept this gift and return it immediately. In short, returning the gift is "moralistic", and accepting the gift is "deviant" (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 19).

**Table 11:** Distribution of Responses to Case Study 11 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	92	83
Attendants	0	0
Duty	15	14

According to Table 11, 83% of the managers who responded to the survey show that they have a "moralist" moral understanding. When the qualified answers of the public administrators were examined, they stated that they would consider the coffee as a "bribe" offered to the public official and would take it back immediately. While they stated in their qualified answers that it would be immoral to buy the coffee, they wrote that it would be correct to give it back, considering that the owner of the market who gave the coffee as a gift may ask for concessions from the public official in the future.

According to Table 11, 14% of the managers who responded to the survey show that they have a "duty" moral understanding. Very different answers came from the managers who participated in the survey and answered no. While one manager replied, "I would accept the gift and blame him for bribing a public official by showing the gift as evidence", another manager replied, "Because I love coffee so much, I will not return it because he may have thought of giving a gift without being related to my job". As it is clearly stated in our country's penal code regarding bribery of public officials, this is a punishment and has certain sanctions. According to the survey answers, it is observed that the public administrators of our country are very sensitive about bribery.

#### **6.3.12. Responses to case study 12**

*"The municipality needs 20 new vehicles, of which 15 will be used in the police department and 5 in general services. According to the tender law, it is necessary to buy from the lowest bidder. It was decided to buy Ford sedan vehicles. While a car dealer in your municipality gave a total price of 1,222,177,00 TL for 20 cars, a car dealer 100 km away gave a price of 1,111,440,0 TL. Can you buy the cars from the car dealer in your Municipality who gives a higher price?"*

The moral dilemma problem for case study 12 does not include a distinct type of political corruption in the Turkish political morality plane. Among the ethical behavior principles of public officials, the use of public goods and resources, avoidance of extravagance, awareness of public service in the fulfillment of duty, awareness of service to the public, commitment to purpose and mission, honesty and impartiality, compliance with service standards, and avoidance of conflicts of interest are questioned.

To the dilemma question in Case Study 12, 8% of the respondents answered yes and 89% answered no. The idea of supporting a local vendor in the case is believed to be appropriate. Having the shuttle services of the cars in the same place may even cost less from a distant place with a low price. Thus, by picking up cars nearby, the savings to be made when cars need service in the

future can now pay off. The moral dilemma in the question is the criteria we would apply to choosing if we didn't have to buy from the lowest bidder (considering the other terms of the auction). Public administrators who buy from such local vendors have a "duty" moral understanding, while those who do not buy "moralists" (Steinberg & Austern, 1996, p. 20).

**Table 12:** Distribution of Responses to Case Study 12 by Moral Behavior Types of Public Administrators

Type of Moral Behavior	Number of People Who Answered	Percentage
Moralists	7	8
Attendants	98	89
Duty	0	0

According to Table 12, 8% of the public administrators who participated in the survey have a "moralist" sense of morality. When their qualified answers are examined, other costs such as service and transportation between far and near are also included in the account and they decide to buy from the nearest one. In the explanations justified by the yes response of these managers, the effort to evaluate the other conditions of the tender and get the most suitable one draws attention.

According to Table 12, 89% of the public administrators who participated in the survey have a "duty" morality. When the qualified answers are examined, they are divided into two. Some of them wrote the answer, "I will make the rules directly", saying that they should be bought from the company that offers the lowest price in accordance with the tender legislation. The other part said no, but in the explanation part, they wrote that the other conditions of the tender should be looked at and when the costs are calculated, the service and similar situations can be examined and they can be obtained from the remote company. It is understood from the qualified answers that these managers adopt the "moralist" moral understanding, like the managers who answered "yes". Although the answers given to this question alone are not sufficient to measure the morality of managers, they measure their perspectives on a certain issue.

**6.3.13. Case study 1 to 12 score evaluation of the answers to steinberg and austen's moral dilemmas**

By scoring the yes and no answers given to the moral dilemma questions of Steinberg and Austern, it is determined which moral understanding the morality has from the moralistic moral understanding, the duty moral understanding and the perverting moral understanding. In the study, instead of scoring the answers of Pamukkale University public administrators who were

surveyed one by one, all Pamukkale University public administrators who participated and answered the survey were evaluated as a single individual. The table below gives the scoring of each question according to yes and no answers. A score of “1” among these points indicates that a superior moral understanding is mastered. It is seen that societies with a high "1" score in the answers attach great importance to moral values. These societies have strong moral laws and laws are followed at the highest level. If the sum of the scores is between 14-18, Pamukkale University public administrators have a "moralistic understanding of morality".

A score of “2” in the answers indicates that they have a moral sense of duty. In these societies, the rules are very careful and the laws are not violated. On the other hand, no action is taken against those who act against the law. If the sum of points is between 19-24, Pamukkale University public administrators have a "duty moral understanding".

A score of “3” in the answers indicates that you have a perverting morality. It is understood that these societies have quite a problem in terms of moral understanding. The laws are not obeyed and those who try to comply are blocked. These societies do not care about moral values and are the ones in which unimportant behaviors are exhibited very intensely. If the total points are 25 and above, Pamukkale University public administrators have a "deviant morality".

**Table 13:** Case Study 1 to 12 Moral Dilemma Score table

Case Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
“Yes” Score	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	15
“No” Score	1	3	1	3	2	3	2	1	3	2	3	2	26
PAU Public Managers' Score	2	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	21

In the study, the moral behavior types of the public administrator personnel in the example of Pamukkale University were investigated and the moral dilemma questions developed by Steinberg and Austern and the questionnaire questions applied to the public administrators were evaluated with the scoring system of Steinberg and Austern, and the type of moral behavior was determined. In the scoring system developed by Steinberg and Austern, the yes and no answers given by Pamukkale University public administrators to moral dilemmas were calculated using the score table in Table 13 and determined as 21 points. The 21 points of Pamukkale University public administrators show that



the public administrators working at Pamukkale University have a "duty moral understanding".

## **7. CONCLUSION**

In the 20th century, in the public administration, which grew in terms of organization and function, the intensifying corruption in Turkey and in the world attracted the attention of both the citizens and the academic environment. The inadequacy of existing legal regulations due to administrative and political corruption necessitates the establishment and dissemination of moral standards regarding the behavior of public officials in the provision of public services. Due to this necessity, it has become even more important to examine the moral behavior types of public personnel.

This study is about explaining the moral behavior type of the personnel in the managerial position in public administration. For this purpose, open-ended moral dilemmas questions were asked to public administrators of Pamukkale University with the questionnaire method, which is one of the qualitative data collection techniques, on the basis of the moral behavior typology developed by Steinberg and Austern. Every public administrator at Pamukkale University is a part of the public organization. When all managers are considered as a whole, a general conclusion is reached about the moral value understanding of Pamukkale University public organization. When the answers given by the administrators to the case studies are obtained by scoring one by one, it is understood that the moral value judgment of the organization, which consists of Pamukkale University public administrators, has a "duty" moral understanding according to the moral behavior typology based on Steinberg and Austern. It can be said for the public administrators in this organization that they are meticulous in obeying the laws, they try to protect the existing established order, but they do not take any effective sanction in the face of a behavior that will disrupt the established order. In addition to these, it is understood from the qualified answers that a management approach that is strictly adhered to social moral values and traditions is dominant.

It has been determined that Pamukkale University public administrators, in their qualified answers to moral dilemma questions, strictly adhere to the existing laws and pay attention to the right behavior in the face of case studies according to the society they live in. Therefore, when we look at the agenda of political morality, which consists of behaviors that should not be done and behaviors that are expected to be done, it is observed that political morality largely changes depending on the form of the established social and political order.

As a result, although it is accepted that moral values will change according to the society and time, the claim that universal moral behavior patterns can be formed and adopted in the field of public administration is confirmed in the sample group included in this study area. However, it is not possible for this study, which was conducted on a small public manager in a limited area, to claim universality. For this reason, it is expected that the study will set an example for researchers who focus on issues related to political and administrative ethics and will be developed in future studies.

#### **8. CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT**

There is no conflict of interest between the authors.

#### **9. FUNDING ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

No funding or support was used in this study.

#### **10. AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

FP: The idea;

FP: Design;

KK: Collection and / or processing of resources;

KK: Empirical Analysis and / or interpretation;

KK: Literature search;

FP: Writer.

#### **11. ETHICS COMMITTEE STATEMENT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COPYRIGHTS**

Ethics committee principles were followed in the study. There has been no situation requiring permission within the framework of intellectual property and copyrights.

#### **12. REFERENCES**

- Aktan, C. C. (1999a). *Ahlaki yeniden yapılanma toplam ahlaka doğru: 3-siyasal ahlak*. İstanbul: Arı Düşünce ve Toplumsal Gelişim Derneği Yayınları.
- Aktan, C. C. (1999b). *Kirli devletten temiz devlete*. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları.
- Akyüz, Ü. (2009). Siyaset ve ahlak. *Yasama Dergisi*, 11, 93- 129.
- Alkan T. (1993). *Siyasal ahlak ve siyasal ahlaksızlık*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Alkan T., & Ergil, D. (1980). *Siyaset psikolojisi*. Ankara: Turhan Kitapevi.
- Bayrakçı, B. (2000). Siyasal yozlaşma ve ekonomik gelişmeye etkileri. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16, 133-163.

- Berkman, Ü. (1983). *Az gelişmiş ülkelerde kamu yönetiminde yolsuzluk ve rüşvet*. Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları.
- Biber, M. (2016). *Kamunun etik çıkmazı: Kayırmacılık*. Ankara: Adalet Yayınevi.
- Çevikbaş, R. (2006). Yönetimde etik ve yozlaşma. *Kırıkkale Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(1), 265-289.
- Dobel, J. P. (1998). Political prudence and the ethics of leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 58(1), 74-81.
- Fombad, C. M. (2000). Endemic corruption in Cameroon: Insights on consequences and control. K. R. Hope, B. C. Chikulo (Ed.) *Corruption and development in Africa*. In (pp .234-260). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gortner, H. F. (1991), *Ethics for public managers*. New York: Praeger.
- Gortner, H. F. (1994). Values and ethics. T. L. Cooper (Ed.) *Handbook of administrative ethics* in (pp. 509-527). New York: Marcel Dekker Incorporated.
- Güvenç, B. (1993). Türkiye’de siyasal ahlak sorunu. T. Alkan (Ed.) *Siyasal ahlak ve siyasal ahlaksızlık* içinde (ss. 400-412). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Heper, M. (1993). Türkiye’de siyasal ahlakın tarihsel boyutları. T. Alkan (Ed.) *Siyasal ahlak ve siyasal ahlaksızlık* içinde (ss. 369-383). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Kapani, M. (2007). *Siyaset bilimine giriş*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Kawo, J.W., & Torun, A. (2020). The relationship between nepotism and disengagement: the case of institutions in Ethiopia. *Research Journal of Business and Management (RJBM)*, 7(1), 53-65.
- Kılavuz, R. (2003). *Kamu yönetiminde etik ve bir sorun alanı olarak yozlaşma*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Kışlalı, A. T. (1993). Önce eleştiri ve duyarlılık. T. Alkan (Ed.) *Siyasal ahlak ve siyasal ahlaksızlık* içinde (ss. 440-450). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Oktay, C. (1983). *Yükselen istemler karşısında Türk siyasal sistemi ve kamu bürokrasisi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Özdemir, M. (2008). Kamu yönetiminde etik. *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(7), 179-195.
- Pinnington, A., Macklin, R., & Campbell, T. (2007). Introduction: Ethical human resource management. A. Pinnington, R. Macklin, & T. Campbell (Ed.) *Human resource management: ethics and employment* içinde (pp. 1-20). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Polat, F. & İkiz, Ö. (2015). *Çatışma ve uzlaşma bağlamında siyasetin psikolojisi*. Çanakkale: Paradigma Akademi.

- Polat, F., & Ayna, O. (2018). Moral behavior types of prospective public administrators: a case study in the department of political sciences and public administration at Pamukkale University. N. Bilici, R. Pehlivanlı, & D. Zorlutuna (Ed.) *Inovation and Global Issues with Multidisciplinary Perspectives* içinde (pp.113-130). Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Sinnot-Armstrong, W. (1985). Moral dilemmas and incomparability. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 22(4), 321-329.
- Steinberg, S. & Austern, D. (1996). *Hükümet ahlak ve yöneticiler*. Ankara: Türkiye ve Ortadoğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü.
- Strike, K. A., Haller, E. J., & Soltis J. F. (1988). *The ethics of school administration*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Şenel, A. (1993). Siyasal ahlak: kapsamı – açmazları – tipolojisi. T. Alkan (Ed.) *Siyasal ahlak ve siyasal ahlaksızlık* içinde (ss. 257-272). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Ural, Ş. (2004). Epistemolojik açıdan değerler ve ahlak. *Doğu Batı*, 4, 45-53.
- Usta, A. (2011). Kuramdan uygulamaya kamu yönetiminde etik ve ahlak. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(2), 39-50.