

ETHICS OF TEACHING: BELIEFS AND BEHAVIORS

OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

Renay Ford Scales, B.S., M.A.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

March 2002

APPROVED:

Ron Newsom, Major Professor and Chair

Nancy Boyd, Minor Professor

Jessie Jones, Committee Member

Michael Altekruze, Chair of the Department
of Counseling Development and Higher
Education

M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of
Education

C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse
School of Graduate Studies

Scales, Renay Ford, Ethics of Teaching: Beliefs and Behaviors of Community College Faculty. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education) August 2002, 97 pages, 5 tables, references, 73 titles.

This study examines the ethical beliefs and behaviors of full-time community college faculty. Respondents report to what degree they practice sixty-two behaviors as teachers and whether they believe the behaviors to be ethical. Survey participants engaged in few of the behaviors, and only reported two actions as ethical: (1) accepting inexpensive gifts from students and (2) teaching values or ethics. The participants reported diverse responses to questions about behavior of a sexual nature, but most agreed that sexual relationships with students or colleagues at the same, higher or lower rank were unethical. Additional findings relate to the presence of diversity among the faculty, using school resources to publish textbooks and external publications, selling goods to students, and an expansive list of other behaviors. Findings of this study are compared to results from earlier studies that utilized the same or similar survey instrument with teaching faculty. The study has implications for organizational policy and procedure, for faculty training

and development, the teaching of ethics or values in the classroom and for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to my family for their love and support and for the extraordinary assistance from Dr. Ira Blake and James Kary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	
Statement of Problem	4
Purpose of Study	4
Research Questions	4
Hypotheses	5
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	15
Ethics of Teaching	17
Diversity and Race Issues	22
Sexual Harassment and Other Sex/Gender Issues	28
Developing and Teaching a Code of Ethics	36
Ethics in Research	38
Beliefs, Intentions, and Behaviors	39
3. PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA	44
Method	44
Instrumentation	45
Basic Assumptions	46
Sample Population	46
4. RESULTS	48
Ethical Beliefs	49

Ethical Behavior	50
Gender Differences	50
Relationship Between Beliefs and Behavior	51
Hypotheses Testing	52
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	56
Relationship Between Belief and Behaviors	56
Universal Behaviors	57
Controversial Behaviors	58
Behaviors that are Rare	59
Summary	60
Conclusions	62
Implications for Future Research	68
APPENDICES	
A. TABLES	70
Table #1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	70
Table #2 Percentage Distribution of Survey Responses	71
Table #3 Gender Differences	78
Table #4 Means for Gender Group Statistics	79
Table #5 Correlation Data	80
B. SURVEY	81
REFERENCES	90

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Across higher education in the United States, including community colleges, unanswered questions of ethics fuel conflict in college teaching. Faculty are often caught between addressing the need to interact more with students in their classes outside of the traditional classroom and protecting themselves from claims of student exploitation, claims of harassment and discrimination and other challenges that can arise from increased student contact (Holmes & Rupert, 1997). Although discussions of ethics are fashionable in professional schools, institutes, and journals, few studies attempt to describe the ethical beliefs and behaviors of teachers in academic programs and college classrooms. External influences pressure colleges to concentrate attention on areas like economic and technological challenges (Hirsh & Weber, 1999) rather than providing concrete answers to questions of ethics in the educational experience. With such pressure from outside sources and the controversy about appropriate behavior with students and others in the academic environment, it is not surprising that almost no formalization of ethical standards for teaching exists in college and university regulations across the United States.

A review of all 1993 issues of The Chronicle of Higher Education yielded numerous reports of unethical behavior in higher education. Many articles document administrative fraud, faculty and student plagiarism, sexual harassment of students, faculty and staff, and of alumni booster clubs corrupting students. In addition, faculty and staff complain of discrimination on the basis of color. There are reports of gay bashing and other behaviors that affect the quality of work life and education on campus.

In contrast, few studies exist of the ethical beliefs and commitments of college teachers toward the behaviors that cause conflict. A review of two community college journals over more than twenty years yielded only three articles on ethics (Community College Journal of Research Practices 1973-2001 and Community College Review, 1973-1997). One body of work (Anderson & Davies, 2000), for example, involves development of a decision-making model for use by college leaders when they are faced with ethical dilemmas. The model consists of six steps that serve as guidelines. Notably, only limited data document the beliefs of college and university teachers toward ethical behavior with students in classrooms and among colleagues and subordinates in academic departments.

External factors influence perceptions of value in the academy. The ethos of the business world, for example, has

intruded successfully on values that govern the educational process (Counelis, 1993). Institutions value actions that increase their ability to meet market demands more than those that raise the quality of the educational experience. Such an environment argues against facing difficult questions that require answers before the academy can reach a standardized code of ethics and ethical behavior for college teaching.

Barbara Tabachnick and colleagues call for a re-examination of the ethical state of higher education in the face of a so-called amoral educational system (Tabachnick, Keith-Spiegel, and Pope, 1991). In an article on the ethics of psychologists as teachers, these researchers note that scrutiny is evident among stakeholders; e.g., governing bodies, legislative groups, professional organizations and the public. Current students and their families, alumni, taxpayers, college boards, and local, state and federal governments now hold colleges accountable for particular performance outcomes.

Society looks to higher education to produce knowledgeable graduates who will become responsible and productive participants in their communities, the nation, and the world (Smith & Reynolds, 1990). Since college teachers play a significant role in defining appropriate professional behavior for students, a close examination of their ethical beliefs and behaviors is critical if questions of ethics are to be raised

and answered with meaningful results. The significance of faculty modeling of ethical behavior is clear considering the mission of most community colleges: to prepare students for either continued higher education or the skilled workforce.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Which of sixty-two behaviors do community college faculty perceive as ethical in teaching and to what degree do their actions agree with those perceptions?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study examines the ethical beliefs of full-time community college faculty toward sixty-two behaviors. The study also considers the degree to which faculty report engagement in these particular behaviors.

Research Questions

The preponderance of evidence supports the need for studying ethics in college and university teaching. In particular, the dynamics surrounding the interaction of faculty intentions, beliefs, and behavior led to the following questions:

1. Which behaviors toward students and colleagues do community college faculty consider ethical?
2. Which of those behaviors toward students and colleagues do faculty practice, and with what frequency?

3. Do self-reported rates of engagement in behaviors categorized as sexual in nature differ significantly by gender?
4. Is there correlation between the beliefs and behaviors of survey respondents?

Hypotheses. The results of the study (Tabachnick et. al., 1991) done earlier with psychologists as educators and the one involving graduate teaching assistants resulted in a number of hypotheses being made regarding this research. In the 1991 study (Tabachnick, et. al), all but one item was considered unethical by a significant majority of respondents. The item "teaching ethics or values to students" was rated as ethical by 48% of the respondents and as many respondents indicated that they rarely committed this behavior in their teaching.

Hypothesis #1: All sixty-two behaviors are rated as unethical ("never" or "not in most cases") by the majority of respondents.

When participants in a study are being asked to report on behavioral practices, and to share their beliefs about those same behaviors, it is important to consider the relationship between what people report as their beliefs and what they report as actions regarding those beliefs. The behavior reported by psychologist educators was generally in accordance with their ethical beliefs. The following hypothesis was also made:

Hypothesis #2: The majority of respondents' report beliefs that will correlate to their reported behaviors.

According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (1994), most sexual harassment complaints are filed by women. Women are also more likely to be the victims of a relationship gone sour, and as subordinates to their male partners, perceived as less valuable and easily dispensable by their employers (Pierce et. al., 1995). Also, in the similar study done in 1991, men more often than women reported that they were sexually attracted to students, had sexual fantasies about students, and engaged in sexual relationships with students. Based on these data the following hypothesis is also proposed:

Hypothesis #3: Male respondents will report that they have engaged in relationships of a sexual nature with students more often than female respondents.

Sexual relationships with professional cohorts can lead to feelings of intimidation and hostility in the work environment. The absence of authority over the consensual partner in these relationships, however, greatly minimizes the concern about exploitation or manipulation. In other words, there is usually no expectation of an increased or reduced benefit perceived for either partner, other employees, or students. If issues do arise, work agreements can be mediated among the faculty, staff, and students. Other than being more likely to seek a workplace

transfer than non-dating colleagues (Pierce et. al., 1995), no adverse consequences are evident. Based on this knowledge, it is probable that respondents will not view engaging in sexual relationships with colleagues of equal rank as inappropriate or unethical.

Hypothesis #4: Most respondents will report that sexual relationships with peers are ethical.

As stated earlier in this chapter, teaching faculty will communicate their views, suspicions, or beliefs through classroom lectures and discussions. As a matter of fact, all but 4% of the previous sample of educators given this survey reported teaching ethics or values to students as ethical, and 92% indicated that they taught ethics or values at some time during their teaching career. Other hypotheses, then, are:

Hypothesis #5: More than 50% of respondents will report teaching ethics or values to students as ethical, and

Hypothesis #6: More than 50% of respondents will report that they have taught ethics or values to students

Institutions of higher education continue to struggle with achieving diversity among the student, faculty, staff, and administration populations. With the recent court decisions that have struck down affirmative action in admission practices

and scholarships and other financial assistance, it will be very difficult to make advances in the representation of students of color.

Although, participants in the 1991 study reported a significant amount of confusion about whether teaching in settings lacking ethnic diversity among the faculty is ethical or not, two-thirds report this as their experience.

In spite of the demographic changes expected in the United States, the lagging economic opportunity for African Americans and Hispanics will perpetuate the low participation of these groups in higher education. Added to the economic issues are those related racism. This reality and the tone in the country today may all contribute to an increase in the belief that a more homogeneous faculty is ethical.

Hypothesis #7: A majority of respondents will report that they teach in settings that lack adequate ethnic diversity among the faculty, and

Hypothesis #8: Teaching in a setting that lacks ethnic diversity will be viewed as ethical.

Significance of the Study

Ethics deals with values, both good and bad, with right and wrong. We cannot avoid involvement in ethics, for what we do—and what we don't do—is always a possible subject of ethical evaluation (Singer, 1993).

We need moral knowledge and skills more often,

and more poignantly, than ethical knowledge of 'laws of nature' or technical skills. (Bauman, 1993, pp.16-17).

With these quotes in mind, why is it important to study ethics among community college faculty?

Ethics is, in part, an expression of values (Miller, 2000). As institutions of higher education, colleges provide a values framework from which students will amend their views of the world. Institutional culture, including the degree to which institutions make ethical choices for action, is part of that framework. Father Theodore Hesburgh, former president of Notre Dame University, expressed the importance of articulating a clear and firm institutional vision through the development of a culture that supports it (Johnson & Meyerson, 1994). For example, if a college or university aspires to be the best in the United States at preparing higher education faculty for this new millennium, it is critical that professors teach and model appreciation and value for multiculturalism (Britt & Turner, 2001).

One way colleges translate culture to students is through the values evident in the behaviors and expectations of the faculty. According to one source, no group in the higher education experience is more critical to the academic satisfaction of students than the teaching faculty (Alexitch, 1997). Alexitch (1997) states that faculty behavior influences

students' interpersonal, intellectual, educational and career goals. Referencing the Socratic view of professional responsibility, Baumgarten (1982) states that teachers in higher education have a social obligation to help students. In their role as mentors, faculty guide students toward knowledge and information that serves as a base from which they will operate as professionals. The behavior of faculty, then, serves as a model for appropriate conduct beyond the campus environment.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) maintain that shared values, or organizational culture, significantly influence the degree to which an organization achieves its mission. In a 1990 article, Business Ethics in America: A View from the Classroom, further connection is made between ethics (values, positive or negative) and organizational mission (Wall et. al., 1990). Wall suggests that if we articulate professional values, we can determine the degree to which others in the organization share those values. In addition, Fjortoft & Smart (1993) find that the degree to which employee behavior agrees with shared value influences significantly an employer's capacity for success in achieving objectives. What could be more critical, then, to a college's success than a culture of shared values in which faculty responsible for transmitting culture to primary stakeholders, students, subscribe to and uphold ethical standards of behavior?

How might the academy come to agreement on standards? Historically, colleges and universities are rooted in elitism (Altbach, 1991). This means that the earliest formation of these institutions was rooted in the notion that there were a small number of people in the world who were talented enough or advanced enough intellectually to matriculate. Elites regard themselves as the standard-bearers of culture, he says, but perceive no requirement for assistance themselves. Altbach (1991) also states, however, that institutions of higher education were also founded with society in mind. Society consists of, in this discussion, persons not categorized as the elite. In other words, the work that these talented few had to do evolved, ultimately, around identifying the needs and solving the problems that exists in society.

The data shows that colleges and universities traditionally perceive value in addressing the needs of society and its problems. Why divert resources from the needs of society to entertain professional development programs on the behavior of students, faculty and staff? Is this addressing a need or problem for colleges and universities?

Concrete data on beliefs and behaviors can appeal to the self-interests of institutions. Unethical behavior can be costly to organizations, including colleges. Concerns about inappropriate behaviors on college campuses can diminish public

trust, tarnish institutional reputations and lead to loss of funds (Trevino & Ball, 1992). Questionable behaviors might include breaching the confidentiality of students, accepting gifts from students or selling goods to students, touching students in a manner that could be considered sexual, engaging in sexual relationships with students or colleagues, plagiarism or other forms of cheating, and taking or giving unfair credit. Specific feedback on such behaviors can provide some of the data necessary to set effective employee conduct standards or guidelines.

In an immediate sense, these data can help determine if the participating institutions might focus on the quality of personal and professional development programs for students and faculty. The community college campuses involved in this study can use specific findings to assess the relationship between faculty behavior and the organizations' goals and objectives. Ultimately, for any college, this relationship helps determine whether it can achieve its mission. Report of these data can, if viewed positively, increase the trust of college stakeholders in the ethical practices of the participating institutions.

The need for data on faculty beliefs and behaviors governing interactions with students and colleagues is significant. Faculty behavior is central in the training of students as professionals. Data collection is necessary for the

identification of areas where conduct standards require discussion. Finally, and most importantly, an objective survey can help determine whether ethical standards should be established across the profession of college teaching as well as identify topics for further research.

Delimitations

Some factors may limit the ways in which results can be generalized as typical of all U.S. higher education: the collection of data only from full-time faculty drawn from a single institutional type, the use of a narrow geographic sampling, and, by the risks inherent in anonymous self-reporting.

All respondents taught undergraduate courses full-time at four institutions bearing the Carnegie classification of community or junior college. The following institutions in the State of Texas took part, Collin County Community College District, Dallas County Community College District, North Central Texas College, and Tarrant County Junior College. Conclusions drawn from data on full-time faculty beliefs and behaviors may not represent accurately the great numbers of professionals and adjunct or part-time faculty that interact with students in American higher education. Likewise, data from two-year schools may not reflect results gained from a survey of

four-year colleges and universities, or from professional and graduate schools.

In addition, though respondents completed and returned surveys anonymously, the nature of subjective self-reporting carries risk. The level of candor regarding difficult subject matter such as that of the survey instrument varies among respondents. Instructions permitted respondents to answer questions based on individual perceptions of what is expected or socially desirable. Differences in values and in defining the behaviors described among respondents may account for some variation in results.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The term ethics requires further exploration. Kahn (1990) describes ethics as a set of four guiding images. The first is one of moral principles that give rise to questions, and become meaningful when applied to an individual's thoughts and actions. The second views ethics as an historical process that grounds theoretical concepts in human behaviors or the behaviors of particular organizations. Third, ethics may occur as a concept that corrects the views of individual leaders given to myopia. Fourth, ethics reflects community sentiment or the beliefs and values that an organization's members bring to a work situation.

For individuals, scholars believe ethics includes behavioral references and values-based rationale. Dill (1982) defines ethics as the basis professionals use to sort among conflicting values. According to Dill, values identity is an element of ethics. Values provide cognitive justification for an individual's actions. More recently, Miller (2000) described ethics as the system individuals use to establish the rightness, or morality, of behaviors. Primarily, then, ethics holds a theoretical mirror to an individual's moral beliefs.

Scholars divide moral theory into two classes. In the first, goodness is the primary concern. In the second,

individual rights take precedence (Goodin 1993; Davis 1993). In addition to moral theory, there are other theories about ethics. In the field of applied ethics, the focus is on the assessment of behavior in professional situations. This may be referred to also as situational ethics (Anderson & Davies, 2000). In other words, the scenario dictates what is ethical.

Since ethical beliefs change through a historical process, adults view ethics as inexact and subject to the influences of social values and public interests (Steckmast, 1982). Some researchers conclude that there is but one way to transfer desired ethical standards to behaviors: coercion. Our only recourse to behavior gone awry, they claim, is to appeal to the same self-interests that led to the ethical breach in the first place (O'Brien, 1991).

Counelis' (1993) used four approaches in his studies on ethics and moral behavior. The first, inquiry, poses a question or questions about ethics to a target population. The second, systematic study and moral reflection, mimics that practiced in psychology, as in Bandura's cybernetic social learning theory. Third, Counelis believes we might study morality in relation to the cultural, political, economic, social, and natural environment. The fourth and last is a normative science approach. Counelis recommends formal study of ethical reasoning, moral value, virtue and virtues, duties and

obligations, prudent judgments and the moral quality of their consequences, and, practical prescriptions for behavior.

To summarize, ethical practices are actions or behaviors representative of values. For the purposes of this study, then, ethics is defined as a direct reflection of individual moral values. The researcher uses an approach consistent with that recommended in Counelis's analysis of approaches appropriate to the study of moral behavior.

Ethics of Teaching. One of the objectives of 20th Century academic tradition in public colleges and universities was to provide a so-called value-free education (Brown & Krager, 1985). A value-free education is free of discussions of morals and values. Toward the end of that century, one ethics researcher maintained that all institutions of higher education drifted from moral responsibility and infrastructure toward the sanctioning self-interests (Laney, 1990). According to Laney, self-interests are not negative per se, but some system must assure that the lures of power and money do not harm the integrity of the academic environment. In the publish or perish environment of the academy, however, teaching performance is not a high-ranking evaluation criterion. If higher education is to fulfill its ethical obligations to society, this new century ought to include discussion of values. A practical starting

place is the interaction between faculty and students (Brown & Krager, 1985).

Acknowledging the need for standards, Larry Churchill and David Dill (1982) initiated a colloquy to identify value conflicts and ethical issues for faculty in higher education. They concluded that ethical codes of conduct address situations such as research related to human subjects and failure to attribute student work or other forms of plagiarism. Codes do not identify appropriate behaviors in classroom teaching or other faculty roles, nor do they consider questions of service to the profession. Absent, too, are recommendations in more controversial categories; e.g., fitness for duty, diversity issues, racism, sexual harassment and other forms of sex discrimination, and fundraising and handling public and private funds (May, 1990).

Behavioral codes such as those of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) identify certain activities as unacceptable for faculty. AAUP codes primarily address academic freedom, conditions for attaining tenure, and expectations for institutional behavior. Chambers (1983) cites other areas in need of standards. Faculty ought to enjoy individual freedom to advance knowledge, but not without restrictions. Teachers should self-regulate the quality of their professional services, but minimal standards should apply. Further, ethical conduct

related to collegiality with academic colleagues and across the discipline in general require codification.

To adopt the individual role of teacher is an ethics-driven undertaking. Since individuals in academia equate gaining knowledge with gaining power, one aim of teaching is to empower students to accept responsibility for the situations in their lives and the lives of others (Bacchetti, 1990). A faculty member's effective handling of respect and civility issues can catapult her from instructor to a mentor or role model.

Churchill (1982) delineates four values definitive of teaching. First is respect for the ways in which students differ from the teacher and from each other. The array of cultures, ethnicities, and life and learning styles in a college classroom can pose challenges to college teachers. For example, suppose a professor fails to provide assistance on an assignment or concept he feels should be within the realm of student understanding. The professor frames his attitude from a particular cultural idea of student experience and knowledge. However, the individual student arrived in class with the necessary intelligence but lacks the background resources that combine to produce understanding. Teachers who receive student concerns at face value, without discounting or degrading, bridge gaps created by difference.

The second of Churchill's values is an instructor's commitment to objectivity. College and university faculty sometimes transmit personal suspicions, hunches or opinions as fact. This manipulative behavior impairs a student's ability to draw sound conclusions about subject matter.

Third, teachers must commit to integrity of inquiry. Teaching requires precautions to ensure fidelity of inquiry. Churchill cites the following example. In a faculty meeting, an instructor suggests that students receive performance marks of "satisfactory" because he and his colleagues have difficulty presenting the course material consistently from class to class. He argues the faculty's failure to meet the challenge should not disadvantage students. Here, Churchill maintains that line of accountability for the teachers is pre-empted.

The final teaching value is enablement. Teachers must be facilitators rather than indoctrinators if they are to challenge students to critically examine ideas. Enabling students to think is the teacher's ethical as well as academic objective.

A logical extension of Churchill's values is the recognition that values identity occurs, as previously stated, as part of the ethical decision-making process. Everett Wilson (1982), for example, addressed challenges to core teaching values by posing the following questions. Is it proper to alter our standards of research behavior based on the characteristics

of our subjects? Should we, for instance, misrepresent ourselves or the purpose of our research when working with criminals? Does the use of public funds disarm or otherwise alter our inquiry? Do we exploit graduate students for unpaid labor or young undergraduates for sex? Many such decision-making opportunities arise during the careers of college faculty; this study collects data on numerous, similar situations.

Other ethical decision points pose tough challenges because they occur in a guise not recognized as falling in the realm of ethics. According to Wilson (1982), administrators, frequently former faculty themselves, seldom notice or acknowledge the ethical implications of issues like disparity in power or confusion of purpose. Administrators can easily dispel such worries as mere nuance, attending instead to larger issues; e.g., appeals to legislators and governing boards, appeasement of faculty demands for parking, and the crafting of diversions for alumni.

Krager and Brown (1985) organized ethical questions faced in college teaching according to four faculty roles. As advisors, for example, college instructors should provide students with autonomy in decision-making processes. Advisors must recognize that students vary in their needs for flexibility and freedom in structuring their academic plans. In short,

advisors advise individuals, not a homogeneous student body. Other faculty roles include those of instructor, planner, researcher, and mentor. Student autonomy is key to these roles as well, especially for the focused study characteristic of graduate school. Add to universal faculty concerns for efficiency, expediency, structure, and consistency, a mandate to consider the scholarly potential of individual students.

Any progress toward standardized codes of ethical conduct in college teaching must take into account that university teaching emerged as a distinct profession only recently considering the long history of higher educational institutions. Debate continues among some institutions of higher education (Baumgarten, 1982). What is the legitimacy of graduate programs that teach professors to teach? If these teaching programs are of questionable value, at what point in its evolution does the new profession formulate standard codes of ethics?

Diversity and Race Issues. The literature on higher education further reveals that any study of faculty beliefs and behaviors must include questions related to issues of diversity and race. Demographic indicators funnel attention toward the subject of cultural diversity at institutions of higher education. One study noted that within the next few years, one-third of the population of the United States will be non-white, and that 40% of high school graduates will come from backgrounds

traditionally labeled with the term *minority* (Nkomo & Cox, 1990). Also, more than half of these graduates will enroll in full or part-time higher education courses (Lynton, 1989).

The Seattle Post (June, 2000) reports that at present, many students of color begin higher education at community colleges. Other data confirms this report. In a geographical study of community colleges in the United States, Andrew and Fonseca (1998) find that the ratio of minority students to total enrollment at community colleges is significantly higher than that of four-year colleges and universities. Texas in particular, as part of the southern rim where percentages of minority populations exceed national averages, has large proportions of African Americans and Latinos. Here, these groups account for 23% of total community college enrollment. The literature therefore supports the study of teachers on the front line at community colleges. These are the faculty who currently address populations of students whose minority representation is closer than most to the norms of America's future.

These data also support an examination of beliefs and behaviors of college teachers about other categories of diversity. These areas include gender, ability, sexual orientation and other differences that occur across faculty and student populations. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended,

led a number of organizations to open their doors or, in some cases, eliminate barriers to women, minorities, disabled veterans, older persons and people of various faiths and national origins. Most universities and colleges claim commitment to equal opportunity and diversity. However, these institutions continue to significantly underrepresent minorities, in comparison to the market of qualified employees and students. To explain this dynamic further, urban areas of the United States, in particular, are graduating large numbers of African American and Latino students who are not proportionately represented in the enrolling freshman classes of American colleges and universities. Nor are the students of color who matriculate, graduating from colleges and universities at the same rate as their white counterparts (Black Issues in Higher Education (BIHE), 2001). Similar under-representation exists for faculty and staff. An article on *Gaps in America* (BIHE, 2001) shows, for example, that 4.9 percent of full-time faculty United States colleges and universities are Black, Non-Hispanic, yet many institutions in the United States are awarding 10% or more of their doctorates to members of this population (Black Issues in Higher Education (BIHE), 1998).

Affirmative action programs, required of most institutions of higher education for more than two decades, produced some increases in diversity among faculty and student

bodies across the nation. It is important to note, however, that following several well-known challenges to affirmative action, the nation is re-evaluating the efficacy and appropriateness of these types of diversity programs.

Action by the U.S. Supreme Court leaves affirmative action, argued for the past quarter-century in state and lower courts, unresolved for public colleges and universities. One case challenged the University of Maryland's Benjamin Banaker Scholarship for its designation as an African-American-only award. The Hopwood Case in Texas attacked race-based preference in college admissions and scholarships. In California, the Civil Rights Initiative eliminated the state's affirmative action programs in public higher education institutions. The Supreme Court's decision not to hear an appeal on Hopwood puts case law stemming from the Texas case at odds with the earlier 1978 Supreme Court decision in *Bakke v. University of California* (Rodriquez, 1996).

As public institutions phase out affirmative action programs, private campuses may offer an attractive alternative to minority students and others who consider affirmative action programs not only necessary, but also vital to educational parity. Occidental College, for example, espouses the belief that diversity happens when excellence meets equity (Wallace, 1996). Occidental's organizational culture includes stated goals

to achieve a more diverse faculty and student body through programs targeted toward minorities.

Critics express concern that diversity programs give female and minority students and faculty an unfair advantage over white males. Such programs produce so-called reverse discrimination; i.e. they deny individual white males opportunities in favor of institutional goals of diverse student bodies or inclusive workforces.

An article in Higher Education and National Affairs (American Council on Education, May 1997) describes a survey of campus diversity programs in the State of Washington. More than 70% of the respondents indicated that diversity is positive for students and the entire campus relative to educational and professional development. Seventy-eight percent agreed that diversity on campus is as important to prepare students to succeed in a diverse world as is the teaching of academics. Despite this recognition of the instructive value of diversity, more than half of the respondents did not favor the classroom teaching of the culture and histories of various populations. Respondents expressed concern that such coursework or lectures might produce divisions and conflict.

However, to understand the scope of the diversity challenge to any study of ethics in teaching, it is important to understand the students' traditions and history, values, and

what they want their futures to look like (Blake et. al., 1990). The family income of students, for instance, reveals differences among students attending colleges and universities in the United States. Blake and colleagues (1990) estimated the family incomes of most African Americans, Chicanos, and Puerto Ricans students at below \$30,000 per year. In contrast, the incomes of most white and Asian Americans tallied at \$50,000 or more per year. Economic background, then, immediately separates these student populations on entry to campus life. Financial needs dictate to a large degree how students apportion their time among classes, employment, friends, family, and extracurricular activities. This produces a classroom environment in which individual students experience higher education in widely divergent ways. Add to this factor, differences in language and culture, styles of communication, and issues of racism or internationalism, and it becomes clear that faculty must participate to achieve an environment of parity. Logically, it follows that for all four faculty roles previously referenced, a one-approach-fits-all response to student concerns will not be effective.

Other issues of diversity center on how the organizational culture addresses groups or individual group members. How do faculty state references to gender or race? Is there an effort to pronounce ethnically unfamiliar student names correctly? Do

faculty display disdain or disregard for concerns regarding diversity? Faculty, as mirrors of organizational values, set a tone of sensitivity and appreciation for diversity or disdain for difference.

Fear of difference like that exhibited in the Washington State survey and in classroom avoidance of diversity discussions, if left unattended, creates an environment of hostility and confusion. West (1993) states that individual differences often become the basis for xenophobia against minorities that in turn escalates into some form of contemporary terror. The results include ineffective cross-cultural communication, or at worst, serious harm to individuals. One approach known to motivate students toward openness, toward acceptance and appreciation of diversity, is the design and implementation of campus policies that reinforce a welcoming climate (Terenzini, et. al., 1996). In all, there is no doubt that any examination of ethics in college teaching must include questions relating to campus diversity.

Sexual Harassment and other Sex/Gender Issues. Faculty interaction with colleagues as well as students requires examination. Sexual harassment claims, for instance have more than doubled since Professor Anita Hill testified on Capitol Hill (Wiley, 1993) against her former boss, an agency director charged with enforcing anti-discrimination laws. The Hill-Thomas

clash sparked an already contentious debate in this country. Higher education newsletters, practitioner magazines, and scholarly publications provided numerous analyses within the last several years.

In reaction to Hill-Thomas, sexual harassment continues in the spotlight (Cooper et. al, 1997). Massive public attention to the incidents surrounding the Navy's Tailhook scandal, allegations leveled against U.S. Sen. Robert Packwood, Paula Jones's lawsuit against President Clinton, and Clinton's liaison with intern Monica Lewinsky, contributed to the issue's appearance on campus. Many colleges and universities have since enacted anti-sexual harassment and sexual discrimination policies. Sexual harassment refers to verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature that denies, limits, or otherwise represents different and sometimes harmful treatment (Dey et. al., 1996). Even with policies in place, the problem is more prevalent and more complex than previously assumed (Mangan, 1993).

Mistreatment based on sex or gender may occur at all levels in the organizational hierarchy. Venus Longmire, clergywoman in charge of the campus ministry at Alabama State University, filed a lawsuit claiming she was sexually harassed by the school's president (Leatherman, 1993). Even political conservatives like Ceil Pillsbury, a tenure-track instructor in the College of Business at the University of Wisconsin in Green Bay, find they

have no recourse but to coerce ethical behavior through lawsuits. Pillsbury sued when the college retaliated after she complained of inappropriate comments by colleagues. Colleagues as well as students experience inappropriate comments about their clothing, marital status, gait and other personal or physical characteristics (Magner, 1993).

Sexual discrimination and sexual harassment claims come from women against men and vice versa, but also by males and females against same-group members. A few years ago, a female director of a women's studies program at Emory University relinquished her post after charges of sexual discrimination from the program's female associate director (Leatherman, 1993).

Both sexism and sexual harassment are present in the environment of students, too, in higher education. As early as 1980, Wittig noted a missed opportunity in his review of studies by Hirschberg and Itkin. The two failed to address an alarming statistic: females entered doctoral programs with higher qualifications than male counterparts, but only 35% completed PhDs, compared to 68% of the males. Wittig (1980) relegated the disparity, at least in part, to the lack of acceptance and support that female graduate students experienced in male-dominated academic departments.

Seventeen years ago, it was estimated that of the six million students entering college, one million would experience

mistreatment based on sex by someone on campus before they graduated (Dzeich & Weiner, 1984). According to Dzeich and Weiner (1984), 20% to 30% of undergraduate females experienced various kinds of sexual harassment during their campus experience. One might assume that anti-harassment policies eradicated such behavior; however, a study conducted several years ago found that nearly one of every seven female college faculty experienced sexual harassment at work, compared to one out of thirty-three male faculty (Dey et. al., 1996). Another study (Paludi, 1996) reports that 30% of all undergraduate women experience sexual harassment by at least one professor during their four years in college. When the definition of harassment specifies comments or gestures of a sexual nature, the incidence rises to 70%. A significant challenge beyond harassment itself is the decision whether to report the behavior. Many women describe ineffective institutional response systems (Shields, 2000), illuminating a gap between campus policy and an organizational culture that supports unethical behavior of individual faculty.

Add to harassment woes concerns about dating. Workplace romances among faculty and between faculty and students cause stress for the individuals themselves and for cohorts (Mainiero, 1986). Such relationships can intimidate and create hostile environments for the subordinate if the relationship ends, or

for the cohorts who perceive unfair attention or privilege. Those around the relationship worry about the potential for exploitation and manipulation.

In 1994, women of African American heritage working in academia held a conference to discuss the double bind of racism and sexism. For these women sexual harassment was not of primary concern; however, mistreatment based on color and gender was of overwhelming significance. In Code of Conduct: Race, Ethics, and the Color of our Character, Karla Holloway (1995) probes the lives and narratives of African-American women for ethical and ethnical standards. She describes the group's internalization of mistreatment as self-loathing. She also notes that these women pass elements of sexism and racism to their male children. Thus, it is important to examine the ways that sexism and genderism, racism and other family and cultural training affect the ethics of college and university teachers.

In Newsweek (Gates, 1993), one writer maintains that white males today, from the classroom to faculty meetings, are surrounded by feminists, multiculturalists, political correctness policepersons, affirmative action employers, Native Americans, and Eastern fundamentalists. He referred to the current era as a "weird time to be a white man". If weirdness includes the necessity of sharing power and careers in the academy with a diverse group of others whom one must make an

effort to understand, it is indeed a weird time to be a white man. It is also true, however, that diversity requires adjustments in belief and behavior on the part of all groups.

Some dilemmas that face white male faculty fit Schaef's four myths of the White Male System (1985). Following are the myths and his explanations.

The first myth recognizes the White Male System as the only acceptable standard. The perpetuation of this myth excludes women and men who believe and behave outside white male expectations of university culture. Men who dare to be different in their pedagogy, or in their level of sensitivity to students and other people can be systematically and professionally castrated, cut-off from the people who are key to their success.

The second myth is that the White Male System is superior. This, of course, does not follow logically on the first; if the System is the sole code, to which code is the system superior? Although those who support the System acknowledge that alternative systems exist, the White Male System operates as if it is the sole model of reality. Again, any white male who does not belong to this club is by definition, as an "other", inferior.

The third myth is that the System knows and understands everything. Women who live by this myth can be oppressors of

white men. On one hand, white men must take responsibility for the many ills of society. At the same time they must act as authorities to dispense advice and solve problems. This pattern reproduces itself when white men feel guilt about their prejudices yet feel incompetent for the job of leading the multitudes.

The last myth of the White Male System is the belief that it is possible for a man to be totally logical, rational, and objective. This myth entraps male faculty who promote the importance of bringing feelings of students and colleagues to the table. At the time of tenure and promotion, such white men may learn of their failure to act logically or rationally in teaching situations. The written code governing research, including the rules of objectivity, becomes an unwritten code applied to human interactions. This unreasonable standard is a poor substitute for an ethical code based on interpreted data and discussion across the academy.

Moral and ethical debates about social and political issues like race, sex and gender equity are not that simple. Witness the varied and inconsistent decisions rendered in lawsuits on sexual harassment and sexual and racial discrimination. In an article on the value of pluralism and political liberalism, Galston (1996) suggests a standard: the right thing to do. The right thing could serve as a compromise point for competing

claims in a pernicious legal system where win/lose is the only outcome.

The literature includes a monograph, Ethics in Higher Education by May (1990), and several articles that consider the parameters of ethical behavior. The contributing authors, however, make arguments without benefit of empirical data drawn from faculty.

Only limited research examines existing beliefs and practices of college teachers with the aim of designing standards for appropriate sexual conduct. No research specifically examines race in this regard. Tabachnick and colleagues (Tabachnick, et. al, 1991) analyzed beliefs and behaviors of psychologist-educators. They queried nearly 500 teaching psychologists about attitudes and actions on the job. Educators ranked a number of behaviors as controversial, notably those related to sex. According to study findings, the APA code of ethics fails to provide a clear reference for the academy, its teachers, and students.

The study that most closely relates to the current study of community college teachers is that of Branstetter and Handelsman (2000), which builds on the work of Tabachnick (et. al, 1991) to examine graduate assistants' ethical beliefs and practices. These researchers distributed a questionnaire adapted from Tabachnik to graduate assistants from APA-accredited psychology

programs in Arizona, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Montana, Nevada, Nebraska, Kansas, and Idaho. Results showed that graduate assistants taught material they had not mastered, ignored cheating, dated undergraduate students, and overlooked the unethical behavior of faculty. In addition, these professionals-in-training insulted students in their presence, engaged in sexual relationships with faculty, inadequately supervised students, and failed to update lecture material. In general, graduate assistants at the beginning of their appointments and those advanced in their studies agreed on the unethical nature of a number of the behaviors included in the survey. However, more advanced graduate assistants reported higher rates of engagement in the same behaviors. Additionally, males generally rated as acceptable a greater number of sexual behaviors. Male respondents also practiced the behaviors more often than females.

Developing and Teaching a Code of Ethics. Callahan (1982) explored whether or not there should be an academic code of ethics. He pointed to concern about the ethical example being set by the university itself and the kinds of morals professors manifest. He summed up his opinion about teaching an established code of ethics with two reservations: 1) that other codes have not been the salvation of the profession (for example, the Code of Hippocrates in the medical profession) 2)

how difficult it would be to develop an acceptable and adequate code. Many precise definitions would have to be set out in such a code where it is clear what is meant by *effective teaching* and other significant terms.

In an article on teaching business ethics in management education (David et. al., 1990), the debate about where business ethics should be taught was discussed. In that debate, a clear distinction was made between personal ethics and professional ethics, the latter being the more common reference in ethics dialogues.

The Dean of the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University argued that ethics is learned at home. Kenneth Andrews (1989) agreed and stated that most ethics are learned through actual life experiences. David et. al. (1990) concludes after their study that, in this case, business ethics instruction should be an integral part of management education.

O'Brien (1991) states in his study that teaching ethics is not the answer to the ethics crisis. He concluded that liberalism in education is the only effective pathway to education on ethics. He further stated that choices that have a lasting impact on people come as much from the heart as from the head—*the conscience as well as the conscious*. The liberalists' arguments boils down to whether we want to simply train students in our classrooms or to educate them. To educate them requires

addressing values, beliefs, and behaviors in the classroom dialogue.

Ethics in Research. As teachers and scholars actively engage in scholarship, words and ideas become vulnerable to misuse, distortion or theft (Fass, 1990). Although rules about plagiarism are not always written, sensitivity to these violations becomes a matter of academic ethics.

Part of the problem with the theft of words and ideas is that students do not always understand what is meant by the term, *plagiarism*. They simply continue doing what they have done in writing papers in junior high or high school. During those formative writing years, the encyclopedia or other general reference material was often the source of choice. Unfortunately, not much emphasis is placed on credit being given to the source of information at this level of their education. To address cheating, stealing or misrepresenting theories, facts, or other information sufficiently in determining whether research is conducted in an ethical fashion will not only require clarification for academic professionals, but for scholars-in-training as well. For example, specifically outlining the details of the extent to which a faculty member can use any research conducted by their students without formal credit being given will be necessary.

Another area of concern regarding ethics in research is the handling of proprietary and classified research. Where more work is being done to protect public safety and human subjects, other issues exist for those studies in which the harmful elements are not apparent. Steneck (1990) reported four criticisms on how universities have focused on openness (means-oriented policy) rather than taking responsibility in limiting the type of research conducted (ends-oriented policy). The criticisms of the universities which have focused on means-oriented policies are: 1) they compromise academic freedom for reasons that may not be justified; 2) they assume, without reflecting on past experience, that institutional judgments should take precedence over individual judgments; 3) they fail to explore other, less burdensome approaches to maintaining openness; and 4) they reflect a very conservative approach to institutional responsibility. On the other hand, too much secrecy on campuses can be problematic. These criticisms represent yet another dilemma for ethics among college faculty.

Beliefs, Intentions and Behaviors. The ethics of a teacher are the most fundamental rules by which the person operates (Pastin, 1986). Ethics is not just beliefs and intentions, but actions taken and the impact on others. Ajzen and Fishbein's (1980) Theory of Reasoned Action (TORA) better explains the relationship of intention on behavior. TORA has extensively

shown that an individual's attitude toward performing a behavior (Aact) and the subjective norm (SN) which represents the overall perception of what relevant others should and should not do, work together to determine intention to perform behavior (BI) (Netemeyer et. al., 1991). BI is the only direct antecedent and will predict behavior accurately if three boundary conditions hold: 1) the intention and behavior measures correspond in specificity of action, target, context, and the time frame; 2) intention does not change in the interval between assessment of BI and assessment of B; and 3) the behavior in question is under the actor's volitional control; i.e. the actor can decide at will to perform or not to perform the behavior.

TORA was developed primarily in response to the frustration which resulted from repeated failure to predict behavior from traditional measures of attitude (Grathoff, 1970). Prior to its development, belief was thought to be a component of attitude, and, thus, any change in belief was a component of attitude, and that any change in belief would be accompanied by a change in attitude (Terry, et. al., 1993). Fishbein and Raven (1961) developed an instrument that independently measured beliefs and attitudes. Rather than being highly correlated, the two were relatively independent.

There are numerous studies that have looked at the relationship between beliefs and behavior. Since the 1960s,

psychologists have been writing about cognitive dissonance. Cognitive dissonance, simply defined, is the condition of conflict resulting from inconsistency between one's belief and one's actions, such as opposing the slaughter of animals and eating meat (Microsoft Encarta, 1995). Cognitive dissonance theory is best known among psychologists who examine internal mental processes and social scientists because of its capacity to yield both hypotheses concerning specific observational data and inherently related measures to judge these data (Grathoff, 1970). Festinger believes that behavior is under the control of each individual, and that it can also be seen as an antecedent condition which leads to activity oriented toward dissonance reduction (Festinger, 1957).

Burnes disagrees with Festinger's theory (Grathoff, 1970). He states that behavior is not under the sovereign creative control of the individual; that there are often other dynamics related to the ego states that are at play. Awareness, spontaneity, and intimacy are essential to live an autonomous existence.

The TORA is particularly useful in understanding the relationships between behavioral intentions and actions. As earlier stated, there are a number of external considerations that are incorporated into the value system (i.e. resulting in

culture) of institutions of higher education. If faculty perceive that they have volitional control over their actions, they (their actions) will mirror intentions. If, on the other hand, faculty perceive that they cannot act at will they may alter actions in disagreement with what their intentions are.

Added to this explanation of decisions, in this case, about ethical or unethical behavior, is another about the nature of the relationship between a person's beliefs and behaviors. Since the two are relatively independent, it is important to inquire about each.

Cognitive dissonance theory similarly supports this approach. Not only are beliefs and behaviors independent, they may be incongruent. Whether one agrees with Festinger or Burnes, it has been shown in the Tabachnick study that respondents will 1) see an action as ethical, yet not perform it in teaching and 2) see an action as unethical, yet commit it at some time during their teaching experience.

Again, given the limited data on beliefs and behaviors about ethical teaching, this investigation yields evidence or descriptive data that adds value to the existing body of research on ethics in teaching. We can expect to find, during the study, some difference in beliefs and behaviors, and fully acknowledge that variables external to the respondent's

intentions may be interacting to produce untruthfulness in reporting or actions inconsistent with beliefs or intentions.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION OF DATA

Method

The questionnaire used was adapted for community college faculty from a similar instrument used by Tabachnick et al. (1991) to examine the beliefs and behaviors of psychologists as university teachers. Part one asked respondents to report how frequently they had practiced sixty-two behaviors in their duties as faculty on a five-point scale with 1 as *never*, 2 as *not very often*, 3 as *sometimes*, 4 as *often* and 5 as *always*. Part two asked respondents to evaluate how ethical they believed the same behaviors to be using a five-point scale with 1 as *never*, 2 as *not in most cases*, 3 as *sometimes*, 4 as *in most cases*, and 5 as *completely*. The demographics section queried gender, race, age, years of teaching in community college(s), faculty rank, and tenure status.

The questionnaire used by Tabachnick et al. (1991) contained sixty-three questions relating to eight distinct areas relating to teaching: 1) course content 2) evaluation of students 3) education environment 4) conduct related to fitness for duty 5) research and publication issues 6) financial and material transactions 7) social relationships with students and 8) sexual relationships with students and coworkers. The only question omitted was about insulting or ridiculing a student in

his or her absence. In a trial run of the questionnaire with members of a college teaching faculty at one of the regional institutions represented in this study, the question received numerous narrative comments about faculty members' need to give evaluative comments that might be considered insulting. One example given was the comments made by faculty involved in assessing students' ability to perform during internships. It was expressed that students may need to hear unfavorable evaluative comments in the presence of others to the benefit of overall learning. Because of the concern about this question, and resultant narrative comments, it was removed from the survey.

Instrumentation

In accordance with a letter of consent from the authors of the original instrument, the survey has been adapted from that used in a comparison study of psychologists as educators (Tabachnick, et. al., 1991) to better query community college faculty. Participants were asked to rate each of 62 behaviors in two ways. First, participants indicated to what extent they have engaged in the behavior in their work as teachers. Participants could rate the behavior's occurrence in their academic activities as *not at all*, *not very often*, *sometimes*, *often*, *all of the time*. Second, participants indicated to what extent they consider the behavior ethical.

They chose from five responses: *not at all, not in most cases, sometimes, in most cases, and completely.*

Respondents were asked to provide information about their own age, race, gender, and years of teaching experience.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the survey instrument is valid for investigation of community college faculty beliefs and practices. The instrument was designed for use with psychologists. The minor rewording of two items is not considered to significantly interfere with the validity or the reliability of the tool. Item #1 was changed from "Using school resources to create a 'popular' psychology trade book" to "Using school resources to create an external publication" since psychologists were not being surveyed in this study. Item #41 was also adjusted from "Inadequately supervising teaching assistants" to "Inadequately supervising student assistants." This more appropriately represents roles in a community college environment.

It is also assumed that participants would differ in age, race, ethnicity, and discipline. Where discipline is not discussed in this study, these assumptions were made based on the demographic data on faculty at the campus where the study was piloted.

Sample Population

First, a list of full-time faculty at the four community college district campuses participating was obtained. These campuses include rural and urban sites. A table of numbers was run to select a fifty percent random sample. Each member of the sample population was sent a questionnaire, cover letter from the dissertation committee chairperson and graduate student explaining the nature of the study, an *Anonymous Demographic Information* form, ethics questionnaire parts A and B, and a self addressed stamped envelope. A total of 763 questionnaires were distributed to targeted faculty. After receiving the less than satisfactory rate of fifty-four responses to this solicitation, the same sample population was contacted a second time with an added cover letter from an administrator within the respective districts. Ninety-three additional responses were received after the second contact.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

A total of 147 (19%) questionnaires were returned. Of 147, 133 contained usable data. Demographic characteristics of the participants are summarized in Table #1. [See Appendix A, page 80]. The majority of respondents are female (53%), Caucasian (87%) and forty years of age or older (78%). The highest degree held of participants is a doctorate, with the majority of respondents having completed the highest degree at the master's level (66%).

Years of Teaching

The distribution of years of teaching among the respondents is spread across one to more than twenty years. Approximately one third (33.6) of the participants have been teaching eleven to twenty years, with over one fourth (26.3) teaching in community colleges for over twenty years. 38% have taught between one and ten years. Overall, respondents' teaching experience in community colleges represents a bimodal or S curve as the frequency is shown across five categories: 5 years or less, 5-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, and over 20 years.

Rank and Tenure

The rank of respondents is similar to the percentage distribution of age. Seventy-four percent report their rank as Associate Professor or Professor (compared to 78% age 40 or

older). Forty-one percent of respondents are tenured. This indicates that the majority of the community college faculty participants are untenured. It is important to note, however, that some campuses do not offer tenure, and that the existence and definition of rank and tenure on community college campuses differs from that of four-year colleges and universities.

Age and Highest Degree Held

Overall, the respondents are older (40+), untenured and Caucasian. They primarily hold master's degrees or higher (89%) and have been teaching in community colleges for at least fifteen years, with a noticeable drop off in the experience category between fifteen and twenty years of service.

Ethical Beliefs

Respondents reported that forty of the sixty-two behaviors are unethical ("never"). [For percentage distribution of survey responses, see Table #2 in Appendix A, page 81]. This response represents 65% of the total items queried. If "not in most cases" is combined with "never" to represent those behaviors that are believed to be ethical only in rare situations, the percentage of behaviors reported as unethical climbs to 89% (or fifty-five of the items). The only items that do not receive a majority rating by the survey participants as unethical and thus are considered ethical are:

1) *Using school resources to publish an external document*, 2) *Teaching full time while working another job at least 20 hours a week*, 3) *Hugging a student*, 4) *Accepting an inexpensive gift from a student (worth less than 5\$)*, 5) *Teaching in a setting lacking adequate ethnic diversity among the faculty*, 6) *Teaching ethics or values to students*, and 7) *Encouraging competition among students*. Of the behaviors identified above as ethical ("sometimes to completely"), only teaching ethics had more than two thirds (72.9%) of the respondents rating it as sometimes to completely.

Ethical Behaviors

Only two behaviors are reported as more universal among the participants in the study (often rated *sometimes* to *always*). [See Table #2, Appendix A, page 81]. They are *accepting an inexpensive gift from a student* and *teaching ethics or values to students*. Neither is practiced, however, by one third of respondents.

Gender Differences

Of the 131 participants who identified their gender, 47% are male, and 53% are female. A Paired Samples T-Test ($p < .05$) was used to examine the difference in beliefs and behaviors of male and female respondents on ten behaviors of a sexual nature. [See Table #3, Appendix A, page 88]. These items are: 1) *Dating a student* 2) *Hugging a student* 3) *Telling a student: "I'm*

sexually attracted to you.” 4) Becoming sexually involved with a student 5) Being sexually attracted to a student 6) Making deliberate or repeated sexual comments, gestures, or physical contact that is unwanted by student 7) Engaging in sexual fantasies about students 8) Engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member within your department who is the same rank 9) Engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member who is of higher or lower rank than you 10) Becoming sexually involved with a student after he or she has completed your course and the grade has been filed.

The ten behaviors considered to be sexual were selected a priori based on the results of the Tabachnick et al. (1991) study. In their study, the data showed the majority of difference in teaching practice for males and females in this category (i.e. behavior of a sexual nature).

The mean responses on the likert scale of 1-5 with 1 = never to 5= always, were overall quite low. [See Table #4, Appendix A, page 89]. There were only three items that showed average ratings at the 2.0. or higher level. Most averaged slightly above the 1.0 level (i.e. “never”) by both groups. Using a T-Test for independent samples ($p < 05$). the data showed eight of the ten behaviors as significantly different. Interestingly, in all of the instances of significant difference except on the item, *hugging a student*, women reported more often

engaging in these behaviors. The only behaviors showing no difference between male and female respondents are *hugging a student* and *engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member within your department who is of the same rank*.

Relationship Between Belief and Behaviors

A Pearson's Correlation (2-tailed) was conducted to determine the relationship between beliefs and behaviors using the two scales, teaching practice (tp) and ethical belief (eb). Fifty-one of the sixty-two teaching practices and ethical beliefs questioned were shown to have positive correlation. [See Table #5, Appendix A, page 90]. Five of the practices and beliefs that are not correlated are those grouped as sexual in nature. Specifically, the items from that group are: *Telling a student, "I'm sexually attracted to you," becoming sexually involved with a student, making deliberate or repeated sexual comments, gesture, or physical contact that is unwanted by student, engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member within the department who is of the same rank, and engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member who is of higher or lower rank*.

Other practices and beliefs that are not correlated include *teaching under the influence of alcohol, teaching that certain races are intellectually inferior, accepting undeserved authorship of a student's paper, teaching while under the*

influence of cocaine or other illegal drugs, requiring students to use aversive procedures with research subjects, and teaching in a building which does not accommodate physically challenged students.

Hypothesis Testing

The study tested a number of hypotheses about the results of this survey. The data provided support for only half of them. Hypothesis #1, for example, stated that all sixty-two items would be rated unethical ("never" or "not in most cases"). The majority of respondents rated 90% of the items as never ethical or not ethical in most cases. This leaves 10% of the items, however, reported by the majority of the respondents as ethical sometimes, in most cases or completely ethical. Another example is the result of examining gender differences in reported behaviors. Women engaged in behavior of a sexual nature more often than men. As previously noted, hugging students was the only behavior not practiced most often by women in the study. All other behaviors including dating students, informing students of sexual attraction to them, being sexually involved with students, being [without stating to the student] sexually attracted to students, making intentional sexual comments, gestures or physical contact that are unwelcomed by students, engaging in fantasies of a sexual nature about students, engaging in a sexual relationship with colleagues of

higher or lower rank, and becoming sexually involved with students after they have finished taking the class taught by the faculty member and the grade has been registered were reported as more often being practiced by female respondents than by male respondents. Based on the literature reviewed prior to the study, this was a surprising result.

In addition to the failed hypothesis regarding responses of men and women participants on their rating of behavior of a sexual nature, another hypothesis was proven incorrect. It was hypothesized that sexual relationships with peers (faculty members at the same rank) would be reported as ethical. Sixty-one per cent (61%) reported that such relationships were *never* ethical or not ethical in most cases. Only 14.3% rated these relationships as *completely ethical* or ethical *in most cases*.

The remaining hypothesis that failed to be supported by these data relates to teaching in an environment that lacks ethnic diversity among the faculty. The deduction from the outcome of the earlier study was that most respondents would report that they have taught in settings that lack such diversity. The majority (54.2) in this study, however, reported otherwise. Where this is barely a majority, the data refutes the conjecture about the lack of ethnic diversity among colleagues, at least based on the reported experiences of this community college faculty.

The other hypotheses were supported by survey participants. The majority of respondents report beliefs that positively correlate to their reported behaviors. Additionally, most respondents teach ethics and values and rated doing so as **sometimes** to **completely** ethical to use the actual rating options they most often reported in the survey. Seventy-three percent (73%) made this judgment.

The next estimation involved determining whether the respondents would view teaching in a setting that lacks adequate ethnic diversity among the faculty as ethical or not. The majority of respondents reported that such conditions were *sometimes (scale response #4)* to *completely (scales response #5)* ethical.

Chapter V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Data from this study can be compared to psychologists studied ten years ago in the Tabachnick study (et. al, 1991). Additionally, new research with graduate students has been developed and published since this survey, and will offer further comparison and enhance the conclusions made.

To understand the conclusions set out in this chapter, it is essential to have three terms defined: Universal Behaviors, Controversial Behaviors, and Rare Behaviors. Universal behaviors, using the determination in the Tabachnick study as a guide, refers to those actions that at least 90% of respondents indicate they have engaged in at some point. This category, then, covers responses, "not very often," "sometimes," "often," and "always." Controversial behaviors refer to those actions that received ratings diversely distributed across the scale by the participant population ($SD > 1.25$). Rare behaviors are those actions that were engaged in "not very often" or "never" by a total of 90% or more respondents.

Relationship Between Belief and Behaviors

Both the community college faculty in this study and psychologists show congruence between what respondents report as ethical beliefs and report as teaching practice (51 out of 62,

82% community college faculty v. 53 out of 63, 84% for psychologists). Beliefs and behaviors that are not correlated for both psychologists and community college faculty are: teaching that certain races are inferior; accepting undeserved authorship of a student's paper; teaching under the influence of alcohol; sexual relationships with both same rank and higher or lower ranked faculty.

The study on graduate assistants (Handelsman, 2000) did not specifically report on the correlation of beliefs and behaviors, but made a general observation that there were actions that upon query, participants in their study reported beliefs that conflicted with the reported behavior. They were reported as the following categories of behavior: a) teaching preparation and classroom issues; b) administrative, equity, veracity, and management issues; and c) supervision issues. For example, almost 80% had taught without adequate preparation, while only one fourth of respondents rated such behavior as ethical.

Universal Behaviors

Tabachnick's (1991) study done with psychologists showed three behaviors to be common. This means that 90% engagement was reported as rare to very often. These behaviors were: teaching without adequate preparation, teaching without mastery of material, and teaching ethics and values to students. Only one behavior in this study appears to be relatively widespread

or universal (81% report engage in to some degree) among community college faculty. Teaching ethics or values to students was reported as behavior 83% of the time. Given the definition set by the earlier study for universal behavior, these two behaviors are more closely matched. Neither of these, however, is consistent with the outcome of the Tabachnick study (1991) study. The study on graduate students does not report any specific behaviors as common, but generally reports a broad array of reported behavior.

Controversial Behaviors

Behaviors determined as controversial ($SD > 1.25$) are shared across the three studies. This study reports the three following behaviors as controversial: (1) encouraging students to participate in your research projects; (2) engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member who is of higher or lower rank than you; and (3) becoming sexually involved with a student after he or she has completed the course and grade has been filed. The two latter behaviors were also found controversial among psychologists in Tabachnick's study. As a matter of fact, half of the behaviors reported as controversial in the Tabachnick study were sexual in nature.

Of the behaviors reported as controversial in this study, one was common to the results of the study of graduate assistants. Both report that, "encouraging students to

participate in your research projects" received a more divided response among survey participants.

Behaviors that Are Rare

The survey of community college teachers yielded a large number of rare behaviors in comparison to the study done with psychologists. The two groups share some common reports. Behaviors noted in both studies as rare are: (1) telling a student that you are attracted to him or her; (2) making deliberate or repeated sexual comments or engaging in other behavior of a sexual nature; (3) teaching under the influence of alcohol; (4) teaching that a certain race is inferior; (5) accepting for yourself a publisher's monetary rebate or (6) accepting for your department a publisher's monetary rebate; (7) accepting a student's offer for wholesale prices, etc.; and (8) including false or misleading information in a student recommendation letter.

A total of twenty-eight behaviors were found rare among community college respondents. This represents close to half of the items queried. Other behaviors reported between 1% and 8%, as *sometimes, often* or *always* in this study include: (1) ignoring cheating (2) *giving easy courses to ensure popularity with students* (3) *dating a student* (4) *accepting an expensive gift from a student* (5) *becoming sexually involved with a student* (6) *accepting undeserved authorship of a student's paper*

(7) using a grading procedure that does not adequately measure what students have learned (8) teaching content in a nonobjective or incomplete manner (9) teaching while under the influence of cocaine or other illegal drugs (10) using profanity in lectures (11) engaging in a sexual relationship with a same rank faculty member (12) engaging in a sexual relationship with faculty of higher or lower rank (13) requiring students to use aversive research procedures (14) criticizing all theoretical orientations except those you prefer (15) using cocaine, and other illegal drugs in your personal life (16) insulting, ridiculing, etc. a student in the student's presence (17) using films to reduce class time or your teaching work without regard for educational value (18) assigning students to carry out work for you which has little educational value for the student (19) privately tutoring students in the department for a fee and (20) becoming sexually involved with a student after he or she has completed your course and the grade has been filed.

Summary

Overall psychologists in the 1991 study and community college faculty respondents in this study show conclusively that making deliberate or repeated sexual comments, gestures, or physical contact that is unwanted by student is not practiced in

teaching and viewed as unethical. American Psychological Association (APA) quotes this statement verbatim, according to one source (Tabachnick et. al., 1991), in its 1981 *Ethical Principles of Psychologists*. These words or similar language is also used in organizational sexual harassment policies and procedures (Lindemann & Kadue, 1997). These factors contribute to the firm resolution of these respondents about this behavior.

Community college teachers who participated in this study provided controversial reports on their engagement in some sexual behaviors. Where psychologists in the Tabachnick study reported more than twice the number of behaviors that community college respondents reported as controversial, some were commonly shared. Graduate assistants in the 2000 study (Branstetter & Handelsman) also reported some sexual behaviors as controversial. No other commonality was determined between their responses and those of the members of this survey.

Community college participants in this study and psychologists in the earlier study report few universal behaviors. Universal behaviors of the psychologists relate more to teaching preparation and teaching content compared to community college faculty's' one universal behavior of accepting an inexpensive gift from a student. Rare behaviors reported by the groups, however, showed a large degree of difference in number. Community college respondents reported twenty-eight

(28) teaching behaviors as practiced *not often* to *never* compared to only ten (10) rare teaching practices reported by psychologists. Of the behaviors reported as rare by psychologists, nine were also rarely (not often) to never practiced by community college respondents in this study.

Community college faculty participants in this study were more conservative in their report of teaching practices and ethical beliefs than were their psychologists counterparts. Actually, the participants in this study were more conservative overall in practices and beliefs.

In the Tabachnick study of psychologists as teachers, men were more likely than women to report sexual attraction to students; have sexual fantasies about students; and become sexually involved with students after the course ended and a grade has been issued. In this study, female respondents were found to report more often engagement in sexual comments and behavior than male respondents. It is important to be careful about placing too much emphasis on this finding, since the mean responses were very low. It is, nonetheless, an interesting issue for more examination.

Conclusions

Although only 19% of the sample population responded, some tentative generalizations can be drawn from the data in this study about the ethical beliefs and behaviors of all teaching

faculty (including the other 81%) at North Texas community and junior colleges. These data expand the limited body of knowledge, and, in doing so, provided greater awareness about the status of ethics in higher education.

North Texas community and junior college faculty hold the belief that it is ethical to teach values to students, to hug them, and accept inexpensive gift items from their students. This group does not view low race/ethnic diversity or encouraging competitiveness as unethical. Similarly, using school resources to publish research or to work a second job is also not seen as unethical.

Other results of this study can possibly be generalized to faculty in this situation and region. Faculty are less likely to believe that behaviors of a sexual nature, inappropriate or ill prepared course content nor that unfair treatment or taking advantage of student financially or otherwise should be tolerated as ethical. Additionally, engaging in the use of alcohol, drugs or other illegal substances should not be tolerated as ethical according to faculty in these specific institutions.

Behaviors of the majority of faculty at institutions represented in this study are likely to be consistent with their beliefs about ethical and unethical behavior. In other words, if they believe the behavior to be unethical, most of the

faculty in this situation will not practice the behavior. If they, on the other hand, believe a behavior is ethical, they will more often than not, have engaged in the behavior. Of the behaviors that they view as ethical, teachers in this situation will most often practice the teaching of ethics or values and accepting inexpensive gifts of all the behaviors they were queried about.

The only areas of agreement among the majority of women and the majority of men at these campuses were that all behaviors of a sexual nature, including having a sexual relationship with a same ranked colleague are unethical. Women on these campuses, however, will more often engage in behaviors of a sexual nature than will men in these North Texas institutions of higher education. This extends from colleagues equally and unequally ranked to the clearly less powerful students in or out of their classes. It is concluded, however, that this behavior, will seldom occur at all.

Most important in considering the conclusions of this study, is the opportunity to apply the knowledge gained from this in: (1) preparing community college faculty for the multiculturalism of this new millennium; (2) the determination of whether ethical standards need to be set for campuses in order for desired [ethical] behavior to be modeled for students matriculating on these campuses and to have a positive

correlation between the institutions' missions, goals, and objectives and demonstrated faculty values or ethics; (3) determining whether teaching practices and beliefs reported should be shared with stakeholders to increase public trust and the institutions' reputations; (4) determining what strategies and programs to develop and implement to enhance the overall quality of the personal and professional development of faculty; and (5) reinforcing the need for further research.

The literature review showed earlier that as people of color have increased in their presence in higher education institutions, and significantly in community colleges, there have been challenges to the status quo. Added to these challenges are those surrounding the increasing presence of women in the workforce, and legislation demanding full access to higher education by persons with disabilities. On the one hand, reporting behavior about teaching that a certain race is inferior, or whether study participants teach in settings lacking accommodations for physically challenged students, or even to what degree comments and other behavior of a sexual nature is directed toward students and other employees reveals values perceived and demonstrated by the faculty. On the other, such data is important in examining the readiness of the climate to move beyond stereotypes, and make the teaching and learning environment safe and welcoming for all people.

Managing diversity, Cox states (1993), is paramount to accomplishing organizational goals, including those that address the moral, ethical, and social responsibility of the institution. Katherine Lane indicates in her recent article (2001) that the nation is expecting two-year institutions to lead the way in educating both native and foreign born Latinos. Knowing what is being taught and acted out in the classroom and other faculty-student interactions is a good starting point for the community colleges in the study to take note of the realities of their organizational climates in this regard. Knowing that your faculty understand that teaching that a certain race is inferior is inappropriate and that few engage in the behavior, while at the same time a significant percentage (43%) work in settings that lack ethnic diversity and 51% don't view such settings of concern ethically, should give rise a questions about whether these are needs given the shift in student demographics. Black Issues in Higher Education (September 2001) recently published a report on, *Anxiety over Demographics*. Are the campuses anxious or comfortable with where they sit on the diversity continuum?

Another area for application of the findings of this study is in determining whether ethical standards are needed for faculty or others on these campuses. In other words, are these institutions pleased with the outcome of the study and its

report of ethical beliefs and behaviors? If not, should standards or workplace conduct rules be established to address any concerns related to these data? If so, what punishment should be levied for departure from standards? The in-basket study of Trevino and Ball (1992) showed that perceptions about justice for unethical behavior are most positive when there is severe punishment rendered. Also, participants' feelings about justice were lowest when no punishment was assigned. Although the results cannot be generalized to the entire target population of this investigation, there is at least evidence that punitive measures are desirable where professionals have failed to honor written or unwritten ethical standards.

Maybe, rather than punishment, new imperatives are warranted to reinforce behavior desired by the institution. The study, again, provides data that are helpful in making these decisions about taking on new or improved standards or conduct.

Since these community college faculty reported relative conservatism in their rare practice of many of the behaviors queried, and only showed that universally accepting an inexpensive gift from a student might be the worst thing that they would do sometimes do, institutional leaders may want to share these data with their boards and advisory councils, or otherwise use it to increase public trust in the ethical practices of the campus. On the other hand, some controversy

among faculty about sexual relationships with each other and with students could cause concern even if the relationships are consensual. The data are there for the perusal of institutional leaders from districts represented in the study.

One way to define or shift organizational culture is through training and development activities. Social psychological approaches to the perception of moral or ethical dilemmas will be essential in the discussion of more effective monitoring of faculty conduct and appropriate strategies for personal and professional development (Payne & Giacalone, 1990). The results of this study may offer value for organizational interventions such as, for example, sensitivity training or organizational reflective activities used to analyze situations where questionable ethical conduct exists. Interventions to assist in developing communication and decision-making skills may also be made more effective with the knowledge from this research. Such training can be more effectively designed with knowledge of what ethical beliefs and practices actually exist among the teachers at the participating institutions.

Implications for Future Research

Finally, this study supports the need for more scholarship on ethics in teaching. It would be interesting to examine the beliefs and behaviors of faculty in four-year institutions across disciplines. Are there disciplines that engage more

frequently in the teaching practices surveyed in the questionnaire and is there a positive relationship between belief and behaviors? Are there common universal, controversial and rare behaviors across disciplines? Do four-year institutions in this same region of the country compare similarly to the community college faculty in this study on behaviors and beliefs, in gender, and most interestingly, those of a sexual nature? What would a national sample of community and junior colleges constitute and what would such participants report? Is there support for reporting a trend in the increase in women engaging in sexual harassment or other behavior of a sexual nature? There are numerous exciting questions that can be answered with further research in this area.

In closing, many institutions of higher education have struggled with the decision about whether ethics should be taught (Churchill, 1982). The community college faculty in this study has stated the reality of what is happening on the campuses represented. They are teaching values and ethics and they believe that doing so is ethical. This is valuable information for the colleges participating in this study, and a good place to conduct more research. What are faculty teaching that they perceive as ethics or values?

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

<u>Characteristic/Category</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Gender		
Female	70	52.6
Male	61	45.9
Race		
African- American	5	3.8
Asian	1	0.8
Caucasian	116	87.2
Hispanic	1	4.5
Native American	2	0.8
Other		1.5
Age Group		
20-30	7	5.3
31-40	17	12.8
41-50	42	31.6
Over 50	60	45.1
Highest Degree Held by Faculty		
High School Diploma	1	0.8
Associates Degree	1	0.8
Bachelors Degree	7	5.3
Masters Degree	88	66.2
Doctorate Degree	30	22.6
Years of Teaching of Faculty		
5 or less	22	16.5
5-10	28	21.1
11-15	30	22.6
16-20	16	12
Over 20	35	26.3
Ranking of Faculty		
Professor	45	33.8
Associate Professor	49	39.8
Instructor/ Lecturer	29	23.6
Tenure Status of Faculty		
Tenured	55	41.4
Non- Tenured	37	27.8
NA	34	25.6

Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Survey Responses (N= 133)

N=never, NVO= not very often, S= sometimes, O= often, A= always, NIMC= not in most cases
 IMC= in most cases, C= completely

	Your Teaching?						Ethical?					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
	<u>N</u>	<u>NVO</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>%</u> Total	<u>N</u>	<u>NIMC</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>IMC</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>%</u> Total
1. Using school resources to publish an external document (publication)	55.6	15.0	15.0	7.5	3.8	96.9	34.6	13.5	32.3	9.0	6.0	95.4
2. Ignoring strong evidence of cheating	66.2	27.1	4.5	0.8	1.5	100.1	74.4	12.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	97.8
3. Giving easy courses or test to ensure popularity with students	71.4	21.1	4.5	3.0	0.0	100.0	75.2	12.8	6.0	0.0	4.5	98.5
4. Giving academic credit instead of salary for student assistance	78.2	6.8	6.8	1.5	0.0	93.3	60.2	15.8	10.5	4.5	1.5	92.5
5. Selling unwanted complementary textbooks to used book vendors	39.1	22.6	19.5	11.3	7.5	100.0	38.3	14.3	24.1	12.8	9.0	98.5
6. Teaching full-time while working another job at least 20 hours a week	63.9	15.8	15.0	3.8	1.5	100.0	27.8	22.6	27.1	7.5	13.5	98.5
7. Dating a student	92.5	6.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	72.9	12.8	10.5	0.8	0.8	97.8
8. Asking small favors (e.g. ride home) from students	63.2	26.3	10.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	41.4	29.3	20.3	6.8	0.8	98.6
9. Hugging a student	30.8	30.8	31.6	5.3	0.8	99.3	20.3	24.8	39.8	9.8	3.8	98.5
10. Telling a student: "I'm sexually attracted to you"	94.7	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	91.7	3.0	2.3	1.5	0.0	98.5
11. Accepting an expensive gift from a student	76.7	16.5	0.8	1.5	0.0	95.5	75.2	13.5	4.5	0.8	0.8	94.8
12. Teaching when too distressed to be effective	24.8	39.8	28.6	1.5	0.0	94.7	25.6	38.3	22.6	7.5	0.0	94.0
13. Becoming sexually involved with a student	89.5	3.8	0.8	1.5	0.0	95.6	79.7	5.3	6.0	1.5	2.3	94.8
14. Lending money to a student	52.6	30.8	10.5	0.0	0.0	93.9	33.8	24.8	32.3	2.3	0.0	93.2
15. Accepting a student's invitation to a party	58.6	25.6	9.8	1.5	0.0	95.5	30.1	27.8	29.3	6.8	0.0	94.0
16. Selling goods (e.g. your car or books) to a student	60.9	18.0	9.0	5.3	2.3	95.5	33.8	29.3	27.1	3.0	1.5	94.7
17. Being sexually attracted to a student	57.9	23.3	13.5	0.8	0.0	95.5	57.9	10.5	19.5	3.0	2.3	93.2

	Your Teaching?						Ethical ?					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
	N	NVO	S	Q	A	% Total	N	NIMC	S	IMC	C	% Total
18. Teaching material you have not mastered.	30.1	49.6	14.3	0.8	0.8	95.6	39.1	32.3	17.3	4.5	0.8	94.0
19. Teaching that homosexuality is pathological	76.7	6.0	5.3	1.5	2.3	91.8	69.2	5.3	13.5	1.5	3.0	92.5
20. Accepting an inexpensive gift from a student (worth less than \$5)	13.5	27.8	29.3	12.8	11.3	94.7	13.5	16.5	38.3	17.3	9.0	94.6
21. Teaching class without adequate preparation that day	23.3	53.4	18.0	0.0	0.0	94.7	34.6	32.3	22.6	2.3	1.5	93.3
22. Making deliberate or repeated sexual comments, gestures, or physical contact that is unwanted by student	89.5	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	94.8	89.5	2.3	0.8	0.0	2.3	94.9
23. Teaching while under the influence of alcohol	85.0	9.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	95.5	85.7	3.0	2.3	0.8	2.3	94.1
24. Engaging in sexual fantasies about students	66.9	20.3	6.8	0.8	0.8	95.6	65.4	10.5	12.0	2.3	4.5	94.7
25. Helping a student file ethics complaint against another teacher	66.2	18.8	11.3	1.5	1.5	99.3	38.3	16.5	27.1	8.3	6.0	96.2
26. Teaching that certain races are intellectually inferior	94.7	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.0	99.3	89.5	3.8	1.5	0.8	1.5	97.1
27. Encouraging students to participate in your research projects	54.9	18.8	15.8	4.5	0.8	94.8	36.1	17.3	28.6	6.8	6.8	95.6
28. Having students be research subjects as part of a course requirement	69.9	15.0	6.0	3.0	0.0	93.9	49.6	19.5	16.5	6.0	1.5	93.1
29. Accepting undeserved authorship of a student's paper	88.0	6.8	2.3	0.0	0.0	97.1	91.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	2.3	96.3
30. Teaching in classes so crowded that you cannot teach effectively	45.9	35.3	15.0	1.5	0.8	97.0	48.1	24.8	21.1	2.3	0.0	96.3
31. Using a grading procedure which does not adequately measure what students have learned	63.2	30.8	5.3	0.0	0.0	99.3	63.9	22.6	6.8	2.3	0.8	96.4
32. Teaching content in a nonobjective or incomplete manner	61.7	31.6	5.3	0.0	0.0	98.6	66.2	17.3	11.3	0.8	0.8	96.4

	Your Teaching?						Ethical ?					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
	<u>N</u>	<u>NVO</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>% Total</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>NIMC</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>IMC</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>% Total</u>
33. Teaching while under the influence of cocaine or other illegal drugs	92.5	5.3	0.8	0.0	0.0	98.6	86.5	5.3	1.5	0.8	1.5	95.6
34. Accepting for yourself a Publisher's monetary rebate for adopting their text	87.2	6.0	4.5	1.5	0.0	99.2	81.2	10.5	2.3	0.0	2.3	96.3
35. Accepting for your department a publisher's monetary rebate for adopting their text	89.5	4.5	3.0	1.5	0.0	98.5	78.9	12.0	3.0	1.5	1.5	96.9
36. Allowing a student's "likeability" to influence your grading	58.6	28.6	9.0	2.3	0.0	98.5	71.4	19.5	3.0	0.8	1.5	96.2
37. Using profanity in lectures	63.9	28.6	6.0	0.8	0.0	99.3	57.1	27.6	10.5	0.0	1.5	96.7
38. Allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved	59.4	15.0	7.5	8.3	5.3	95.5	51.9	12.8	18.0	6.8	3.0	92.5
39. Engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member within your department who is the same rank	82.7	6.0	4.5	0.8	0.0	94.0	51.9	9.0	17.3	5.3	9.0	92.5
40. Engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member who is of higher or lower rank than you	84.2	6.0	2.3	0.0	1.5	94.0	62.4	9.0	10.5	3.8	7.5	93.2
41. Inadequately supervising student assistants	62.4	19.5	8.3	1.5	0.0	91.7	60.2	22.6	5.3	1.5	0.8	90.4
42. Using school resources to prepare a scholarly textbook	63.2	11.3	11.3	5.3	2.3	93.4	39.1	19.5	21.8	6.8	3.8	91.0
43. Requiring students to use aversive procedures with research subjects	82.0	5.3	0.8	0.8	0.0	88.9	77.4	6.8	1.5	0.0	1.5	87.2
44. Omitting significant information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student	54.1	30.1	7.5	2.3	0.8	94.8	57.9	19.5	13.5	0.8	1.5	93.2
45. Including false or misleading information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student	75.9	15.8	1.5	1.5	0.0	94.7	79.7	6.8	4.5	0.0	1.5	92.5

	<u>Your Teaching?</u>						<u>Ethical ?</u>					
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>NVO</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>% Total</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>NIMC</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>IMC</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>% Total</u>
47. Grading on a strict curve regardless of class performance level	65.4	20.3	6.0	1.5	0.8	94.0	54.9	22.9	9.8	3.8	1.5	92.9
48. Teaching in a building which does not accommodate physically challenged students	54.9	24.8	12.0	2.3	0.0	94.0	51.9	21.8	15.8	1.5	1.5	92.5
49. Using films to reduce class time or your teaching work without regard for educational value	74.4	16.5	3.8	0.0	0.0	94.7	72.9	13.5	5.3	0.8	0.8	93.3
50. Telling colleagues confidential disclosures told to you by a student	53.4	31.6	9.5	0.0	0.0	94.5	62.4	21.8	7.5	1.5	0.0	93.2
51. Teaching in a setting lacking adequate ethnic diversity among the faculty	30.1	24.1	18.8	18.0	6.8	97.8	24.8	20.3	29.3	16.5	5.3	96.2
52. Teaching ethics or values to students	17.3	16.5	33.8	15.8	16.5	99.9	14.3	10.5	27.1	19.5	26.3	97.7
53. Failing to upgrade lecture notes when teaching a course	39.8	43.6	12.8	3.0	0.0	99.2	38.3	22.6	21.1	3.0	12.8	97.8
54. Assigning students to carry out work for you which has little educational value for the student	82.7	9.8	4.5	0.8	0.8	98.6	72.9	7.5	6.8	6.8	3.0	97.0
55. Privately tutoring students in the department for a fee	91.7	4.5	1.5	0.8	0.0	98.5	70.7	14.3	5.3	4.5	1.5	96.3
56. Taking advantage of a student's offer (e.g. wholesale prices at parent's store)	79.7	12.8	6.8	0.8	0.0	100.1	56.4	18.8	15.8	4.5	1.5	97.0
57. Criticizing all theoretical except those you prefer	74.4	17.3	6.8	0.8	0.0	99.3	69.2	12.0	10.5	4.5	0.8	97.0
58. Using cocaine or other illegal drugs in your personal life	92.5	4.5	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.1	88.0	2.3	2.3	3.8	1.5	97.9
59. Insulting ridiculing, etc. a student in the student's presence	82.7	11.3	4.5	0.8	0.8	100.1	83.5	8.3	3.8	0.8	1.5	97.9
60. Encouraging competition among students	26.3	27.1	34.6	6.8	5.3	100.1	20.3	22.6	33.8	11.3	8.3	96.3
61. Ignoring unethical behavior by colleagues	27.1	34.6	20.3	15.0	3.0	100.0	37.6	24.1	22.6	12.0	1.5	97.8
62. Becoming sexually involved with a student after he or she has completed your course and the grade has been filed	84.2	9.0	3.8	0.0	0.8	97.8	57.1	13.5	12.0	6.8	6.8	96.2

Table 3: T-test of Gender Differences

<u>Variables</u>		<u>t-test for Equality of Means</u>			Mean Differences
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed) p=. 05, p=. 01	
Dating a Student	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.877	129	.005	-.17
Hugging a Student	Equal Variances Assumed	.649	128	.518	.11
Admitting Attraction to Student	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.156	129	.033	-.08
Sexually Involved with Student	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.873	123	.005	-.23
Sexually Attracted to student	Equal Variances Assumed	-4.400	123	.000	-.57
Making Unwanted Sexual Advances	Equal Variances Assumed	-3.092	122	.002	-.13
Engaging Sex Fantasies about Student	Equal Variances Assumed	-3.121	123	.002	-.40
Sex with Same Dept Faculty	Equal Variances Assumed	-1.503	121	.136	-.15
Sex with Low/High Dept Faculty	Equal Variances Assumed	-2.345	121	.021	-.26
Sex with Student After Course Completed	Equal Variances Assumed	-3.169	126	.002	-.31

Table 4: Group Statistics on Gender Differences

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>
Dating a Student			
Male	1.01	.120	.014
Female	1.18	.466	.060
Hugging a Student			
Male	2.17	.954	.115
Female	2.07	.946	.121
Admitting Attraction to Student			
Male	1.01	.120	.014
Female	1.10	.300	.038
Sexually Involved with Student			
Male	1.00	.000	.000
Female	1.23	.655	.087
Sexually Attracted to Student			
Male	1.29	.575	.070
Female	1.86	.854	.113
Making Unwanted Sexual Advances			
Male	1.00	.000	.000
Female	1.13	.334	.045
Engaging Sex Fantasies about Student			
Male	1.24	.649	.079
Female	1.63	.771	.102
Sex with Same Dept Faculty			
Male	1.12	.409	.050
Female	1.27	.674	.090
Sex with Low/High Dept Faculty			
Male	1.06	.239	.029
Female	1.32	.876	.117
Sex with Student After Course Completed			
Male	1.06	.291	.035
Female	1.37	.763	.099

Table 5: Correlations of the Variables: Teaching Practice and Ethical Behavior

Teaching Practice (TP)	Ethical Behavior (EB)	Correlation Coefficient
School Resources	School Resources	.487 ^{**} , N= 126
Ignoring Cheating	Ignoring Cheating	.336 ^{**} , N= 130
Easy courses for popularity	Easy courses for popularity	.404 ^{**} , N= 131
Credit vs. Student Sal	Credit vs. Student Sal	.265 ^{**} , N= 120
Selling Comp Books	Selling Comp Books	.648 ^{**} , N= 131
Full time with Another Job	Full time with Another Job	.388 ^{**} , N= 131
Dating a Student	Dating a Student	.183 [*] , N= 130
Favors for Students	Favors for Students	.494 ^{**} , N= 131
Hugging a Student	Hugging a Student	.511 ^{**} , N= 130
Admitting Attraction to Student	Admitting Attraction to Student	.060, N= 131 (No Correlation)
Accepting Expensive Gift	Accepting Expensive Gift	.466 ^{**} , N= 126
Ineffective teaching due to Stress	Ineffective teaching due to Stress	.334 ^{**} , N= 124
Sexually Involved with Student	Sexually Involved with Student	.098, N= 126 (No Correlation)
Lending Money to Student	Lending Money to Student	.546 ^{**} , N= 124
Accept Invitation to Party	Accept Invitation to Party	.534 ^{**} , N= 125
Selling Goods to Student	Selling Goods to Student	.488 ^{**} , N= 126
Sexually Attracted to Student	Sexually Attracted to Student	.492 ^{**} , N= 124

^{**}.05 significance level, .001 significance level

^{*}.01 significance level only

Not Correlated = do without believing its ethical

*Teaching Practice (TP)	Ethical Behavior (EB)	Correlation Coefficient
Teaching without Mastery	Teaching without Mastery	.570 **, N= 125
Teaching Homosexuality as Path	Teaching Homosexuality as Path	.584 **, N= 121
Accepting Inexpensive Gift	Accepting Inexpensive Gift	.627 **, N= 125
Teacher changing with out Adequate Preparation	Teacher changing with out Adequate Preparation	.439 **, N= 124
Making Unwanted Sexual Advances	Making Unwanted Sexual Advances	.003, N= 125 (Not Correlated)
Teaching Under Influence of Alcohol	Teaching Under Influence of Alcohol	.080, N= 125 (Not Correlated)
Engaging in Sexual Fantasies about Student	Engaging in Sexual Fantasies about Student	.402 **, N= 126
Help File Ethics Complaint	Help File Ethics Complaint	.451 **, N=128
Teaching Race Inferiority	Teaching Race Inferiority	.170 **, N=129
Encouraging Participation in Research	Encouraging Participation in Research	.260 **, N=123
Require Student to Participate as Subjects in Research	Require Student to Participate as Subjects in Research	.414 **, N=120
Accepting Authorship of student Paper	Accepting Authorship of student Paper	.088, N=126

** .05 significance level, .001 significance level.

* .01 significance level only

Not Correlated = do without believing its ethncial

*Teaching Practice (TP)	Ethical Behavior (EB)	Correlation Coefficient
Teaching in a Crowded Classroom	Teaching in a Crowded Classroom	.334 ^{**} , N=128
Using Ineffective Grading System	Using Ineffective Grading System	.362 ^{**} , N=126
Nonobjective Teaching	Nonobjective Teaching	.444 ^{**} , N=128
Teaching Under the Influence Of Drugs	Teaching Under the Influence Of Drugs	.105 ^{**} , N=127
Accepting Publisher Rebate for Adopting Text	Accepting Publisher Rebate for Adopting Text	.193 ^{**} , N=128
Accepting for Department Publisher Rebate	Accepting for Department Publisher Rebate	.181 ^{**} , N=128
Likeability Affects Grades	Likeability Affects Grades	.259 ^{**} , N=127
Using Profanity in lectures	Using Profanity in lectures	.640 ^{**} , N= 129
Unofficial Approval of Dropping Course	Unofficial Approval of Dropping Course	.704 ^{**} , N= 123
Sex with Same ranked Department Faculty	Sex with Same ranked Department Faculty	.034, N= 122 (Not correlated)
Sex with Low/ High Faculty	Sex with Low/ High Faculty	.131, N= 123 (Not correlated)
Inadequate Supervision	Inadequate Supervision	.193 [*] , N= 120
Using School Resources for Test	Using School Resources for Test	.297 ^{**} , N= 121
Requiring Aversive Procedures	Requiring Aversive Procedures	.165, N= 115 (Not correlated)
Omitting Information in a Student Recommendation	Omitting Information in a Student Recommendation	.548 ^{**} , N=124
Misleading Information in student recommendation	Misleading Information in student recommendation	.386 ^{**} , N=123
No Adequate Grievance Procedure	No Adequate Grievance Procedure	.184 [*] , N=120
Strict Grade Curve	Strict Grade Curve	.344 ^{**} , N=123
Building without Physical Accommodations	Building without Physical Accommodations	.163, N= 123 (Not correlated)
Film to Reduce Work	Film to Reduce Work	.425 ^{**} , N= 124

^{**}.05 significance level, .001 significance level.

^{*}.01 significance level only

Not Correlated = do without believing its ethical

*Teaching Practice (TP)	Ethical Behavior (EB)	Correlation Coefficient
Confident Disclosure to Colleague	Confident Disclosure to Colleague	.431 ^{**} , N=124
No Faculty Ethnic Diversity	No Faculty Ethnic Diversity	.188 [*] , N=127
Teaching Ethics	Teaching Ethics	.564 ^{**} , N=130
Fail to Upgrade Lecture	Fail to Upgrade Lecture	.258 ^{**} , N=129
Assigning Unpaid Work	Assigning Unpaid Work	.525 ^{**} , N=128
Private Tutoring of Students for Free	Private Tutoring of Students for Free	.272 ^{**} , N=128
Taking Advantage of Student Offers	Taking Advantage of Student Offers	.447 ^{**} , N=129
Criticizing Opposing Theory	Criticizing Opposing Theory	.561 ^{**} , N=129
Personal use of drugs	Personal use of drugs	.241 ^{**} , N=130
Direct Insult To Student	Direct Insult To Student	.505 ^{**} , N= 130
Encouraging Competition	Encouraging Competition	.611 ^{**} , N=128
Ignoring Unethical Beliefs	Ignoring Unethical Beliefs	.523 ^{**} , N=130
Sexually involved with student after Completion of Course	Sexually involved with student after Completion of Course	.265 ^{**} , N= 127

^{**}.05 significance level, .001 significance level.

^{*}.01 significance level only

Not Correlated = do without believing its ethncal

Part Two - A Ethics Survey

Following are sixty-two behaviors which may be practiced in community college teaching. It should take you about four minutes to complete this section. Please circle the number on the scale which best describes frequency of occurrence in your classroom teaching:

1= never 2= not very often 3= sometimes 4= often 5= always

1. Using school resources to create an external publication. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
2. Ignoring strong evidence of cheating. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
3. Giving easy courses or test to ensure popularity with students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
4. Giving academic credit instead of salary for student assistance. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
5. Selling unwanted complimentary textbooks to used book vendors. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
6. Teaching full-time while working another job at least 20 hours a week. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
7. Dating a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
8. Asking small favors (e.g., a ride home) from students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
9. Hugging a student.
10. Telling a student: "I'm sexually attracted to you." (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
11. Accepting an expensive gift from a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
12. Teaching when too distressed to be effective. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
13. Becoming sexually involved with a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
14. Lending money to a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
15. Accepting a student's invitation to a party. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
16. Selling goods (e.g., your car or books) to a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
17. Being sexually attracted to a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
18. Teaching material you have not mastered. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
19. Teaching that homosexuality is pathological. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

20. Accepting an inexpensive gift from a student (worth less than \$5). (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
21. Teaching a class without adequate preparation that day. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
22. Making deliberate or repeated sexual comments, gestures, or physical contact that is unwanted by the student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
23. Teaching while under the influence of alcohol. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
24. Engaging in sexual fantasies about students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
25. Helping a student file an ethics complaint against another teacher. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
26. Teaching that certain races are intellectually inferior. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
27. Encouraging students to participate in your research projects. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
28. Having students to be research subjects as part of course requirement. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
29. Accepting undeserved authorship of a student's paper. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
30. Teaching in classes so crowded that you cannot teach effectively. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
31. Using a grading procedure which does not adequately measure what students have learned. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
32. Teaching content in a nonobjective or incomplete manner. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
33. Teaching while under the influence of cocaine or other illegal drugs. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
34. Accepting for yourself a publisher's monetary rebate for adopting their text. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
35. Accepting for your department a publisher's monetary rebate for adopting their text. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
36. Allowing a student's "likeability" to influence your grading. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
37. Using profanity in lectures. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
38. Allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
39. Engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member within your department who is the same academic rank as you. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

40. Engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member within your department who is of higher or lower rank than you. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
41. Inadequately supervising student assistants. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
42. Using school resources to prepare a scholarly textbook. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
43. Requiring students to use aversive procedures with research subjects. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
44. Omitting significant information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
45. Including false or misleading information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
46. Teaching where there is no adequate grievance procedure for students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
47. Grading on a strict curve regardless of class performance level. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
48. Teaching in buildings which do not accommodate physically challenged students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
49. Using films to reduce class time or your teaching work without regard for educational value. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
50. Telling colleagues confidential disclosures told to you by a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
51. Teaching in a setting lacking adequate ethnic diversity among the faculty. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
52. Teaching ethics or values to students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
53. Failing to update lecture notes when teaching a course. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
54. Assigning unpaid students to carry-out work for you which has little educational value for the student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
55. Privately tutoring students in the department for a fee. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
56. Taking advantage of a student's offer (e.g. wholesale prices at parent's store). (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
57. Criticizing all theoretical orientations except those you prefer. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
58. Using cocaine or other illegal drugs in your personal life. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

59. Insulting, ridiculing, etc., a student in the student's presence. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
60. Encouraging competition among students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
61. Ignoring unethical behavior by colleagues. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
62. Becoming sexually involved with a student only after he or she has completed your course and the grade has been filed. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Pope, Spiegel, and Tabachnick, May 1991. Adapted by R. Scales, January, 1998.

Part Two - B
Ethics Survey

Following are sixty-two behaviors which may be practiced in community college teaching. It should take you about six minutes to complete this section. Please circle the number on the scale which best describes your opinion of the behavior as ethical in teaching.

1= never 2= not in most cases 3= sometimes 4= in most cases 5= completely

1. Using school create to publish an external publication. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
2. Ignoring strong evidence of cheating. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
3. Giving easy courses or test to ensure popularity with students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
4. Giving academic credit instead of salary for student assistance. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
5. Selling unwanted complimentary textbooks to used book vendors. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
6. Teaching full-time while working another job at least 20 hours a week. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
7. Dating a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
8. Asking small favors (e.g., a ride home) from students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
9. Hugging a student.
10. Telling a student: "I'm sexually attracted to you." (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
11. Accepting an expensive gift from a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
12. Teaching when too distressed to be effective. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
13. Becoming sexually involved with a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
14. Lending money to a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
15. Accepting a student's invitation to a party. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
16. Selling goods (e.g., your car or books) to a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
17. Being sexually attracted to a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
18. Teaching material you haven't really mastered. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
19. Teaching that homosexuality per se is pathological. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

20. Accepting an inexpensive gift from a student (worth less than \$5). (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
21. Teaching a class without adequate preparation that day. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
22. Making deliberate or repeated sexual comments, gestures, or physical contact that is unwanted by the student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
23. Teaching while under the influence of alcohol. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
24. Engaging in sexual fantasies about students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
25. Helping a student file an ethics complaint against another teacher. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
26. Teaching that certain races are intellectually inferior. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
27. Encouraging students to participate in your research projects. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
28. Having students to be research subjects as part of course requirement. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
29. Accepting undeserved authorship of a student's published paper. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
30. Teaching in classes so crowded that you can't teach effectively. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
31. Using a grading procedure which does not adequately measure what students have learned. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
32. Teaching content in a nonobjective or incomplete manner. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
33. Teaching while under the influence of cocaine or other illegal drugs. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
34. Accepting for yourself a publisher's monetary rebate for adopting their text. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
35. Accepting for your department a publisher's monetary rebate for adopting their text. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
36. Allowing a student's "likeability" to influence your grading. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
37. Using profanity in lectures. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
38. Allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
39. Engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member within your department who is the same academic rank as you. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

40. Engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member within your department who is of higher or lower rank than you. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
41. Inadequately supervising student assistants. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
42. Using school resources to prepare a scholarly textbook. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
43. Requiring students to use aversive procedures with research subjects. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
44. Omitting significant information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
45. Including false or misleading information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
46. Teaching where there's no adequate grievance procedure for students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
47. Grading on a strict curve regardless of class performance level. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
48. Teaching in buildings which do not accommodate physically challenged students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
49. Using films to reduce class time or your teaching work without regard for educational value. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
50. Telling colleagues confidential disclosures told to you by a student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
51. Teaching in a setting lacking adequate ethnic diversity among the faculty. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
52. Teaching ethics or values to students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
53. Failing to update lecture notes when re-teaching a course. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
54. Assigning unpaid students to carry-out work for you which has little educational value for the student. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
55. Privately tutoring students in the department for a fee. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
56. Taking advantage of a student's offer (e.g. wholesale prices at parent's store). (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
57. Criticizing all theoretical orientations except those you prefer. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
58. Using cocaine or other illegal drugs in your personal life. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

59. Insulting, ridiculing, etc., a student in the student's presence. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
60. Encouraging competition among students. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
61. Ignoring unethical behavior by colleagues. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
62. Becoming sexually involved with a student only after he or she has completed your course and the grade has been filed. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Pope, Spiegel, and Tabachnick, May 1991. Adapted by R. Scales, January, 1998.

References

- Alexitch, L. R. (1997). Students educational orientation and preferences for advising from university professors. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 38(4), 333-341.
- Altbach, P. G. (1991, Spring). Patterns in higher education development: Toward the year 2000. *The Review of Higher Education*, 14(3), 293-294.
- American Council on Education (1997, May). Gender equity Survey reveals some gains in women's sports. *Higher Education & National Affairs*, 46(9).
- Andrews, K. (1989 September/October). Ethics in practice. *Harvard Business Review*, 67(5), 104.
- Azen, I and M. Fishbein. (1980) Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Bacchetti, R. F. (1990). When responsibilities conflict: Stock ownership in South Africa. In W. W. May (Ed.), *Ethics in Higher Education*, (pp. 320-340). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Bauman, Z. (1994). *Postmodern Ethics*, (pp 16-17). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Baumgarten, E. (1982). Ethics in the academic profession: A Socratic view. *Journal of Higher Education*, 53(3), 282.
- Black Issue in Higher Education (July, 1998). Special report: top 100 degree producers, V(No) 22-54.
- Black Issues in Higher Education (March, 2001). Disparities and gaps in America, 18(1), 29..

- Blake, J. H., Melodia, A., Porter, O. F. & Saufley, R. W. (1990). The challenge of diversity. In W. W. May (Ed.), *Ethics in Higher Education*, (pp. 233-236). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Branstetter, S. A. & Handelsman, M.M. (2000). Graduate teaching assistants: Ethical training, beliefs, and practices. *Ethics & Behavior*, 10(1), 24-27.
- Callahan, D. (1982). Should there be an academic code of ethics? *Journal of Higher Education*, 53(3), 335-344.
- Churchill, L. R. (1982). The teaching of ethics and moral values in teaching: Some contemporary confusions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 53(3), 303-306.
- Cooper, C. G., Lindemann, B.T., & Kadue, D. D., (1997). *Sexual Harassment in Employment Law 1997 Supplement*, (pp. vi). Washington D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.
- Counelis, J. S. (1993, Jan/Feb). Toward empirical studies on university ethics: A new role for institutional research. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(1), 74-84.
- Cox, Taylor, Jr. (1993). *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Practice*, (pp.11). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishing Company, Inc.
- David, F. R., Anderson, L. & Lawrimore, K. W. (1990, Autumn). *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 26-32.
- Davies, T.G. & Anderson, S.K. (2000). *An ethical decision-making model: A necessary tool for community college Presidents and boards of trustees.*

- Davis, N. A. (1993). Contemporary deontology. In Singer, P., (Ed.), *A Comparison to Ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell, (pp.205-218).
- Deal, T. E. & A. A. Kennedy (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Dey, E. L., Korn, J. S. & Sax, L. J. (1996, March/April). Betrayed by the academy: The sexual harassment of women college faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 157.
- Dill, D. D. (1982). The structure of the academic profession: Toward a definition of ethical issues. *Journal of Higher Education*, 53(3), 255-267.
- Dzeich, B. W., & Weiner, L. (1984). *The lecherous professor: Sexual harassment on campus*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Fass, R. A. (1990). Cheating and plagiarism. In W. W. May (Ed.), *Ethics in higher education*, (pp. 170-184). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Fjortoft, N. & Smart, J. C. (1993). Enhancing organizational effectiveness: The importance of culture type and mission agreement. *Higher Education*, 26(3), 431.
- Fishbein, M. & Raven, B. H. (1961). *Human Relations*, 15, 35-44.
- Galston, W. A. (1996, Spring). Value pluralism and political liberalism. *The Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy*, 16(2).

- Gates, D. (1993, March). White male paranoia. *Newsweek*, 29, 48.
- Goodin, R. E. (1993). Utility and the good. In Singer, P., (Ed.), *A Comparison to Ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell, (pp. 241-248).
- Gottlieb, T. T. (1988). Teaching ethics in the community college data processing curriculum. *Community College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, 12(1), 47-54.
- Grathoff, R. H. (1970). *The Structure of Social Inconsistencies*, (pp. 7-8). Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Holloway, K. (1995). *Code Of Conduct: Race, Ethics, and the Color of Our Character*, (pp. 1-225). New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Johnson, S. & J. Myerson (1994). *Measuring Institutional Performance in Higher Education*, (pp. 4-9). California: Stanford University Press.
- Kadue, D.D. & B. Lindemann (1997). *Sexual Harassment in Employment Law*, (pp.1). Washington D.C.: BNA Books.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Toward an agenda for business ethics research. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(2), 314-317.
- Krager, L. A. & R. D. Brown (1985). Ethical issues in graduate education: Faculty and student responsibilities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 56(4), 403-417.
- Laney, J. T. (1990). Through thick and thin: Two ways of talking about the academy and moral responsibility. In W. W. May (Ed.), *Ethics in Higher Education*, (pp. 49-66).

- New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Leatherman, C. (1993). A top female administrator at St. John's University (N. Y.) has filed a sex discrimination Complaint against the Roman Catholic institution and its president. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 39(22), A18.
- Leatherman, C. (1993). Colleague sues ex-director of Women's Studies at Emory U. for sexual harassment and bias. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 39(26), A15, A18.
- Lynton, E. A. (1989, Winter). Openness and opportunity. *New Direction for Higher Education*, 68, 25-42.
- Magner, D. K. (1993). Accounting professor is unlikely heroine in battle against sex bias at Wisconsin. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 39(23), A15-A16.
- Mainero, L. A. (1986). A review and analysis of power dynamics in organizational romances. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 750-762.
- Mangan, K. (1993). Thorny legal issues face colleges hit by sexual harassment cases. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 39(48), A13-A14.
- May, W. W. (1990). *Ethics in Higher Education*, (pp. 1-2). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Microsoft Encarta 96 (1995). Cognitive dissonance. *Microsoft Home*.
- Miller, E.W. (2000). Ethics in higher education. In Miller et. al (Ed.), *Ethics in Academia*, (pp.1-2). Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania Academy of Science.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Burton, S. & Johnston, M. (1991).

- A comparison of two models for the prediction of volitional and goal-directed behaviors: A confirmatory analysis approach. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54(2), 87-99.
- Nkomo, S. M. & T. H. Cox (1990). Invisible men and women: A status report on race as a variable in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 419-431.
- O'Brien, W. A. (1991, Fall). In quest of virtue: Liberal education and the ethics crisis. *Scholar and Educator*, 15(1), 22-30.
- O'Hara, L. F. (1992). Institutional ethical practices and faculty professed self-esteem survey report. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, 16(4), 319-328.
- Paludi, M. A. (1996). *Ivory Power*, (pp. 335). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Pastin, M. (1986). The fallacy of long-range thinking. *Training*, 23(5), 47-52.
- Payne, S. L. & R. A. Giacalone (1990). Social psychological approaches to the perception of ethical dilemmas. *Human Relations*, 43(7), 649-663.
- Pierce, C. A. & Byrne, D. (1995). Attraction in organizations: A model of workplace romance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16.
- Rodriguez, R. (1996). Life after Hopwood. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 13(12), 8-10.
- Schaef, A. W. (1985). *Women's Reality: An Emerging Female*

- System in a White Male Society*, (pp. 7-10). New York: Harper & Row.
- Shields, S.A. (2000). Ethical issues for women's leadership in the university. In Miller et al (Ed.), *Ethics in Academia*, (pp.86-97).
- Singer, P. (1993). *A Companion to Ethics*, (pp. 588). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, D. C. & C. H. Reynolds (1990). Institutional culture and ethics. In W. W. May (Ed.), *Ethics and Higher Education*, (pp. 21). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Steneck, N. H. (1990). Regulating proprietary and classified research: Some observations on current university policies. In W. W. May (Ed.), *Ethics in Higher Education*, (pp. 283-298). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Tabachnick, B. G., P. Keith-Siegel & K. S. Pope (1991, May). Ethics of teaching: Beliefs and behaviors of psychologists as educators. *American Psychologist*, 46(5), 506.
- Terenzini, P. T., Edison, M., Hagedorn, L. S., Nora, A. & Pascarella, E. (1996, March/April). Openness to diversity. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 189.
- Terry, D. J., Gallors, C. & McCamish, M. (1993). *The theory of reasoned action: Its application to aids-preventative Behavior*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Trevino, L. K. & G. A. Ball (1992). The social implications of punishing unethical behavior: observers' cognitive and affective reactions. *Journal of Management*, 18(4), 751-766.

- Wall, L., Hattwick, R., Kathawala, Y., Monippallil, M. & Shin, B. P. (1990). Business ethics in America: A view from the classroom. *The Journal of Behavioral Economics*, 19(1), 125-140.
- Wallace, A. (1996, Spring). Occidental College's noble experiment in diversity. *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 11, 114- 117.
- Weber, L. E. (1999). Survey of the main challenges facing higher education at the millennium. In Hirsch, W. Z. & L. E. Weber(Ed.), *Challenges Facing Higher Education at the New Millennium*, (pp. 3-17). Arizona: The Oryx Press.
- West, C. (1993). *Race Matters*, (pp. 1-105). Massachusetts: Beacon Press.
- Wiley III, E. (1993). Sexual harassment claims surge since Hill-Thomas clash. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 10(17), 40.
- Wilson, E. K. (1982). Power, pretense, and piggybacking: Some ethical issues in teaching. *Journal of Higher Education*, 53(3), 268-269.
- Wilson, K. R. & Kraus, L. A. (1983). Sexual harassment in the university. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 24, 114-219.
- Wittig, M. (1980). Fear of success: A personality trait or a Response to occupational deviance and role overload? *Sex Roles*, 6(1) pp.27-46