ABSTRACT

Daniel Sawyer Mayo. COMPARISONS OF PERCEPTIONS OF NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS AND FACULTY ON CODES OF CONDUCT. (Under the direction of Dr. Cheryl McFadden) Department of Educational Leadership, April, 2010.

The development of ethical standards by institutions of higher education has been in part a response to real and perceived unethical behaviors on the part of faculty members. Though institutional codes of ethics are not required by North Carolina Community College System colleges, eleven of the 58 colleges have adopted and published codes. This qualitative study examines how those codes are perceived by the Chief Academic Officers (CAO) and fulltime faculty members.

The study collected responses through face-to-face interviews with three CAOs and 17 faculty members. The interview questions focused on awareness, understanding, and internalization of the published code of ethics. The structured questions were designed by the author and were based on literature and relevant studies. The creation or adoption of the code of ethics at their respective colleges was in response to internal issues or external pressures. The CAOs in this study had a key role in developing and implementing the code at their respective colleges, but they had not fully maximized employment and integration of the code into the college culture. The findings indicated that faculty and CAOs vary in perceptions of purpose and utility of the code. The findings also reveal that among the faculty participants in this study, there may be a superficial awareness of the code. Health Science faculty member were found to have a strong association with the codes of their professional organizations.

COMPARISONS OF PERCEPTIONS OF NORTH CAROLINA

COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS AND

FACULTY ON CODES OF CONDUCT

A Dissertation Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Daniel Sawyer Mayo

April, 2010

COMPARISONS OF PERCEPTIONS OF NORTH CAROLINA

COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS AND

FACULTY ON CODES OF CONDUCT

by

Daniel Sawyer Mayo

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF DISSERTATION: _____
Cheryl McFadden

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____
Maria Clay

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____
Dave Siegel

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____
Kermit Buckner

INTERIM CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP:

_____
William Rouse, Jr.

ACTING DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL:

_____
Paul Gemperline

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Unethical behavior and questionable conduct of professionals have come to the forefront of many national stories with very negative implications and accusations. Enron, Arthur Andersen, Tyco, and WorldCom are a few household names no longer associated with successful businesses, but are now synonymous with the terms *ethically-challenged*, morally bankrupt, and untrustworthy. These organizations enjoyed tremendous success and seemed, at one time, to be trustworthy entities. At some point in the lives of these organizations, the misdeeds of a few have caused public trust and confidence to be lost. The victims were employees, investors, and customers. Unfortunately, not all incidents of malfeasance, poor judgment, and other improprieties are limited to private business corporations; institutions of higher education have experienced their fair share of incidents. Many probably are not considered newsworthy, but are indeed unethical (Baron, 2003; DeRussy, 2003; Hamilton, 2007; Rocheleau & Speck, 2007; Sherman, 2005). On a daily basis, businesses, corporations, professions, and even institutions of higher education are subjected to increased public scrutiny; ethical failures, questionable actions, and misdeeds can cause irreparable and lasting damage to organizations and to those they serve. Community colleges are no exception; Hellmich (2007) states that "every community college is cursed with faculty and administrators whose influence is far-reaching but directed toward the dark side" (p. 26). Colleges such as LaGuardia Community College, Pasco Hernando Community College, and Diablo Valley College are examples of colleges that have suffered from unfavorable publicity due to the actions and misconduct of faculty or staff (Ashburn, 2007; Goldman, 2006; Moorhead, 2009). Grade-changing, cash-for-grades, and improper student-faculty relationships can provide fodder for the local news, and the Internet has provided a venue to keep scandals alive and to be forever associated with the institutions in question.

The frequency of unethical behavior in the professions and in higher education itself demonstrates the issue (Davis, 2003; Lucas, 1996; Sherman, 2005). In 1993, Rifkin identified ethics in institutional management as a top ten issue for community colleges. In 2007, George Boggs, as President of the American Association of Community Colleges, recognized the responsibility and ethical dilemmas faced by community college leaders. In his address, he specifically includes faculty, as leaders, noting their closeness in working with students. He recommends that colleges adopt professional ethic statements to guide behavior (Boggs). Hardy (2002) adds that "a kaleidoscope array of real and perceived unethical behaviors and practices involving teachers in higher education is making the news and troubling the faculty and administration throughout the country" (p. 383). The empirical research confirms the perception of misconduct; Knight and Auster's (1999) research revealed that nearly 31% of faculty reported what they considered to be very serious infractions by other faculty members. Additional research of faculty conduct confirms the existence of faculty improprieties such as improper student relationships, use of profanity, favoritism, and ignoring student cheating (Birch, Elliott, & Trankel, 1999; Braxton & Mann, 2004; Friedman, Fogel, & Friedman, 2005; Morgan & Korschgen, 2001).

An extensive literature review indicated that there is some research directed towards the study of codes of ethics and conduct for many diverse organizations. Researchers have studied faculty misconduct and codes (Braxton & Bayer, 1999; Knight & Auster, 1999; Morgan & Korschgen, 2001; Tabachnick, Keith-Spiegel, & Allen, 1993) but there are none that investigate the perceptions of faculty regarding codes in higher education, more specifically within community colleges.

Plagiarism, harassment, improper relationships, lying, and intentional misrepresentations have been associated with faculty on many campuses (Cahn, 1986; Rocheleau & Speck, 2007). These aspects of faculty conduct, along with the evidence and anecdotes, can have a negative impact on the profession and the institution. It is important to know that this internal threat occurs and it is probably more important to know what institutions do about it. Unethical behavior and misconduct on the part of faculty members can impart damage to the credibility, reputation, and the work of the academy.

It is important for the academy to make every effort to maintain the public trust (Bruhn, Zajac, Al-Kazemi, & Prescott, 2002). As a partner in higher education, community colleges provide a tremendous service to the local communities by providing a variety of flexible, responsive educational and training programs as well as certificates, diploma, and degrees. Community colleges offer opportunity for intellectual growth, career preparation, and development. An investment of time and tuition will often yield increased career opportunities for success. With its training and instruction in a variety of programs it can help fuel the economy of the nation. The public has high expectations of the community college; it is trusted as a source of knowledge and opportunity. Society, as taxpayers and investors in this institution, has expectations that increase along with the increases in tuition. Instructors are held to high standards by stakeholders; they are accountable to maintain the trust of the college. They receive great autonomy in carrying out that mission. What, how, and when they teach is generally self-directed; "they (faculty) have remarkable control over when and how they teach" (Bennett, 1998, p. 44). But community colleges and all the value they provide, too, have suffered similar ethical transgressions and failures found throughout other organizations and society. Vaughan (1992)

states that "bad behavior diminishes the beauty of what the community college is all about" (p. 205).

To regulate or guide the faculty, as professionals of the institution, many colleges have adopted codes of ethics to clearly state expectations of acceptable conduct. Codes define ethical conduct and can provide methods to resolve a breach of ethical conduct. Codes of ethics provide faculty a common frame of reference for expectations of conduct (Rekow, 2006). Codes provide a written statement of beliefs as a public display of commitment to doing what is right.

What do community colleges do to protect their reputation and maintain public trust relevant to the ethical behavior of faculty members? Some have created or adopted codes of ethics. Codes of ethics can serve as a deterrent to unprofessional conduct and can promote professional organizational behavior (Kerns, 2003). What is the faculty perception of the purpose and function of the code? Are faculty members aware of the codes? How do institutions integrate codes into the culture of the faculty environment? Have the codes of ethics made any perceptible impact on faculty? And how do faculty integrate or adjust under a professional or discipline code versus an institutional code? These are the obvious questions concerning codes. To begin any assessment to formulate or discover and answer the question, it would be first imperative to establish a foundation of data.

The purpose of this study is to examine how community college chief academic officers (CAO) and faculty perceptions compare regarding the implementation of published codes of ethics or conduct within three colleges the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS). The specific perception to be analyzed is that of CAO's relative to faculty conduct. The first step in the study is to determine whether or not codes exist at the institutions.

The motivation for this study is based on the understanding that faculty misconduct, though rare, does occur and can have a negative impact upon students, the institution, and the profession. With increased public scrutiny, the college itself may suffer lasting damage to its reputation and possibly lose public trust (Langlais, 2006). Rezaee, Elmore, and Szendi (2001) determined that the CAO was usually involved in the preparation of institutional codes. The CAO's perspective is significant because he or she has a major role in deterring and sanctioning faculty misconduct (Noseworthy, 2002). The CAO is the leader responsible for faculty, and makes decisions everyday related to faculty issues and policy. As a leader, the CAO has the responsibilities of communicating to campus the values and standards expected of faculty and to create an environment where faculty act ethically (Vaughan, 1992).

Community Colleges and Instructors

Higher education institutions enjoy a great deal of public trust (Hamilton, 2002). It is within these institutions that students and stakeholders have great faith and trust in the instructors to facilitate learning and scholarship as well as model behavior. For many, interactions with instructors are the first of adult professional relationships for students. Teaching involves genuine concern for students, and that is the highest form of moral behavior (Bennett, 2003). Interaction with community college faculty is an important aspect of students' experiences. Instructional faculty provide the point of most frequent contact for the students (Matus-Grossman & Gooden, 2002). Nearly 37% of all freshman and sophomore undergraduates are taught by community college faculty (Twombly & Townsend, 2008).

As with non-academic organizations, unethical behavior by professionals can damage the reputation and harm the perception of community colleges. Community colleges face many of the same challenges and pressures as other institutions of higher education: retention, completion

5

rates, recruiting, and course offerings are all in response to student and career preferences. One of the factors that further complicates the work of the community college is that its purpose is to provide for the local workforce demands and serve the educational needs of the adult population. Because community colleges often have more locations, a commuter population, and larger adult populations, they are extremely vulnerable to many risks (Rekow, 2006). Faculty members have a special responsibility to uphold before students: the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline (Roworth, 2002). The community college can be the first-stop, last chance, or the only opportunity for higher education for many students. It is important that the community colleges "provide ethical role models in their administrators, faculty, and staff" (Little, 1989, p. 3). Community Colleges are the middle ground for higher education. As long as one possesses a high school diploma or equivalent, the open-door policy assures acceptance of all who wish to matriculate. In a perfect world, these students would be ready to begin training immediately, but often they require substantial remediation courses before commencing with core programs. Students may come to the community colleges immediately after high school, or after completing an adult high school degree or GED, or they may be victims of a local plant closure and layoff and seek retraining to once again gain their place as a productive member in the local economy. Community colleges have a long history of providing the greatest access to postsecondary education to disadvantaged groups in the United States (Dougherty, 1994). Community college faculty members are the core of this unique organization. They have the specialty training and experience to effectively teach and train students. The role of the community college faculty member is different when compared to university counterparts. There is no pressure for the community college faculty member to publish journal articles or to conduct research; their primary purpose is to teach and to advise (Palmer, 1992). Community college

6

instructors face ethical dilemmas daily. Their conduct and misconduct is a direct reflection on themselves, the faculty, and the college. Braxton and Bayer (1999) even suggest that faculty misconduct in teaching provokes the growing problem of student misbehavior in the classroom.

It has been questioned whether or not community college faculty are even considered to be true professionals (Outcalt, 2002a). Without the requirements of research and publishing, and without the option for tenure within the NCCCS, community college faculty are, by title, considered instructors rather than professors. Amongst the characteristics of a professional body is that the group has a published standard or code of ethics. The code guides behavior and provides direction for professional behavior and conduct. The hallmark of professionalism, a code of ethics, could certainly be incorporated for community college instructors; in fact, many community colleges have made this transition (Diamond, 2003; Hardy, 2002). Accredited community colleges in the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) are required to have an established code of ethics. Other colleges and community college systems, on their own initiative, have established codes (e.g., Suffolk County Community College, Northwest Arkansas Community College, The Community College of Vermont, and the Virginia Community College System) (VCCS, 2008). One theory supporting the effectiveness of codes is *situational ethics theory* that recognizes the relevance of the use of written codes when an institutional member is faced with an ethical dilemma. Rezaee et al. (2001) and McCarthy (1997) base this upon the assumption that pluralistic beliefs held by individuals vary so greatly that it may be impossible to reach consensus about ethical conduct, but the written code can clarify and does provide guidance to members of a specific organization, therefore his or her actions can be affected by the written code. The code itself provides definitively what is acceptable or unacceptable conduct for members of the organization without regard to personal beliefs. The code can provide

7

consensus. The move to implement and even require such codes is an indication that there is a need to prevent unethical behavior. Another theory supporting codes of ethics is that they clarify professional responsibility and so deter unethical behavior (Fimbel & Burstein, 1990; Harrington, 1996; Manley, 1991). Codes have value in the orientation process for new faculty orientation to the institution and to the duties and expectations of instructors: "codes can be used as teaching tools, as a method of socialization of new professionals to the values and standards of the specific profession, and as a guide for practical situations" (Winston & Dagley, 1985). Peterson and Mets (1987) emphasize the importance of codes and organizational culture—communicating a direction that empowers individuals to work towards shared goals. The moral and ethical vision of an institution must be protected by all of its members (Wilcox & Ebbs, 1992). The code can be symbolic in creating an environment; codes can contribute to a more ethical environment or are at the very least considered to enhance the ethical environment (Rochler, 2004).

This dissertation explores the faculty and CAO perceptions of formal codes at community colleges where codes are established.

<div align="center">Definitions</div>

Code of Ethics - A formal document that states an organization's primary values and the ethical rules it expects its members to follow (Cleek & Leonard, 1998). Within this study it specifically refers to formalized codes to include conduct of community college faculty. Codes have been used to state the ideals of a profession or field, to legitimate the profession in the face of skepticism or uncertainty, to regulate the practices of its practitioners toward each other, and to delineate the relationship that should obtain between practitioner and client (Callahan, 1982).

Ethics – The set of principles, beliefs, and rules of moral conduct that guides the actions of the members of the college community (Vaughan, 1992).

Ethical Behavior - A behavior in which a person is not motivated by self interest, but rather by a concern for others or some ideal (Farago, 1991). Behaving ethically requires knowledge of the rules and standards of behavior.

Unethical Conduct - Unethical behavior is defined succinctly by Jones (1991, p. 367) as "Behavior that has a harmful effect upon others and is either illegal or morally unacceptable to the larger community." Faculty misconduct could include: sexual misconduct, irresponsible or careless teaching, lack of civility, use of classroom for indoctrination, or failure to have any sense of obligation to a larger society. Regardless of the type of offense or perceived misconduct, what actually constitutes an *ethical failure* on the part of faculty is defined by whether or not the action is "done willingly or intentionally" (Bruhn et al., 2002, p. 467). The misconduct could evolve out of a subtle and routine pattern such as not updating lecture material or it could be motivated by greed or personal gain. Misconduct may not always be apparent to colleagues; in such situations, the professional faculty member is self regulated by personal integrity.

Faculty - Refers to college faculty member whose primary role is in an instructional capacity. For the purposes of this study, faculty includes those in fulltime and adjunct capacities.

Chief Academic Officer - Is the senior academic official at the community college. Equivalent titles include: provost and vice president for/of academic affairs.

Codes in Higher Education

The topic of ethical conduct by of faculty has, historically, been an important one. It was aired most prominently in 1982: an edition of the Journal of Higher Education focused entirely on faculty conduct and served as a forum of expression regarding the effectiveness and

establishment of formal codes. Since then, ethical conduct and codes have been revisited on several occasions, usually in opinion pieces by academics. There are two schools of thought; the codes do not make a difference and that codes are important. Many researchers Adams, Tashchian, and Stone (2001), Bolman and Walton (1979), Bruhn et al. (2002), Farago (1981), Kerns (2003), Rekow (2006), Schurr (1982) profess the virtues of codes, while Callahan (1982), Lee (2003), and Scriven (1982) see little value in implementing codes to affect conduct. Most agree on what codes are, but there are many contradictions as to the effectiveness of such codes (Robin, Giallourakis, David, & Moritz, 1989).

In 1987, the California Community College System recommended accepting the AAUP's (AAUP, 2006; Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2002. statement on faculty ethics. In 1994, it expanded the AAUP statement to more closely fit the mission of the community college. By 1994, 15 California community colleges had formally adopted faculty codes of ethics. Today, it is a requirement of WASC member institutions, community colleges included, to have a formal code of ethics. This study is justified in its attempt to determine whether or not the codes have created a more ethical environment, that is, at least as perceived by CAO's.

The study may be of significant value to community college administrators and leaders who are considering or have been required to establish codes of ethics in hopes of creating a more ethical campus climate. It may provide insight as to what is effective. Building a strong ethical culture is a standard by which leadership is defined and organizations are valued. A code can mitigate risk and can provide a strong message to employees and the community. A code of ethics is a significant policy and should articulate the ethical culture of the institution (Rekow, 2006). Community college leaders can utilize data garnered to shape and possibly create a more

ethical campus environment. Davis (2003) contends that "organizations can be structured in a way that encourages ethical behavior" (p. 8). This study is also significant in that it responds to the call for further research in the area of codes and related faculty conduct (Cleek & Leonard, 1998; Hamilton, 2002; Hardy, 2002).

Does having codes make an impression on faculty? Perceptions of ethical conduct do not guarantee actual good conduct, but it could prove to be a fine indicator of faculty behavior or professional conduct. It would be beneficial to campus leaders and to faculty members themselves to understand the possible benefits of incorporating codes of ethics or pursuing other methods to improve student and faculty perceptions of ethical faculty conduct.

Ethical codes represent professional ideals, serving as guides for behavior and establishing principles for performance (Dobel, 1993; Rifkin, 1993). Based on the premises of professionalism, Holohan (1996) suggests the more effective approach would be to provide resources to enhance the expertise and skills of the faculty, to empower their participation in determining who is admitted to their ranks and in controlling the essential processes of their work, and to promote an institutional culture that fosters collegiality, group identity, and the professional code. Dobel (1993) adds that codes can be beneficial in restoring public trust.

Declining public trust has been fueled by repeated scandals publicized in the news media (Wagner, 1996). Even college and university presidents and faculty have had their own share of unethical conduct (Langlais, 2006). Sherman (2005) suggests that there is widespread misconduct amongst faculty and students.

Significance of the Study

Do codes of ethics make a difference? Are codes generally accepted and internalized by faculty and CAO's? This study will contribute to the understanding of the existence, the

implementation, and the perceptions of conduct and codes of ethics within community colleges. Community college faculty will continue to serve more students as enrollment increases. With this increase, the likelihood of misconduct will only increase. The establishment and inclusion of codes for faculty could be an important element in creating an ethical campus environment as well as providing standards of professional instructor conduct. Many community college leaders are grappling with this issue. Insight provided by this research may enable campus leaders to make rational decisions related to faculty behavior and conduct and to the creation and implementation of professional codes of ethics for faculty and ultimately a more ethical environment for students and faculty.

The findings of this research code could be used to develop and implement effective codes of ethics. The findings would also contribute to the body of knowledge regarding codes in higher education. As will be demonstrated in the literature review, many academicians recognize the need for additional research of codes.

Overview of Methodology

Ethical conduct continues to be an issue for most organizations. Because organizations consist of the human element, it is inevitable that misconduct will occur. It is no different for community college faculty. The establishment of codes has been the response in some community colleges to clearly state professional and organizational expectations. Though some North Carolina community colleges have taken steps to create and adopt codes, there is very little research to determine the effectiveness or even the intended purpose of the codes.

The methodology of this study is qualitative in nature and design. The qualitative approach is the appropriate type for this exploratory research; it seeks to discover how the codes are perceived by community college CAOs and faculty. A purposeful sample of North Carolina

Community Colleges with codes of ethics for faculty will serve as the representative grouping; specifically, the perspective of the Chief Academic Officer will be the focus of the sample. The interviews with the CAOs, faculty, and document reviews will be the primary method of data gathering.

<div align="center">Organization of the Dissertation</div>

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 provides and introduction and background for the study. Chapter 2 is the literature review; it is specifically focused on faculty misconduct and the perceived effectiveness of codes of ethics. It provides conflicting opinions and philosophies regarding codes of ethics. Chapter 3 provides the methodology and research design as well as sample descriptions. Chapter 4 is the analysis of the data. Chapter 5 is the research summary and recommendations for future research.

The purpose of this research is to determine perceptions of faculty and CAO's at community colleges where formal codes are established. If the codes are intended to enhance the ethical environment and to guide faculty in ethical decision making and conduct, do they have that or any perceived effect related to behavior and conduct? This research will integrate methods similar to those used in previous empirical studies, but not nearly as comprehensive in detail or sample volume. But it will lead to more specific areas of research for community colleges.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter demonstrates the breadth of research and writing relevant to codes of ethics and faculty conduct in higher education. A variety of sites and sources were utilized to identify previous studies related to codes, faculty, perceptions, and effectiveness. The search was primarily completed through tools such as ERIC, ProQuest, Google, and other Internet search engines. It revealed that there are a substantial number of publications addressing the issue of faculty behavior and codes of conduct. Overall, studies of ethics in education are relatively small when compared to studies of other organizations and professions (Cahn, 1986; Rezaee et al., 2001; Rocheleau & Speck, 2007). Many of the studies are relevant to this dissertation, but none directly address the study of codes within the community college setting as it relates to faculty misconduct. The literature reviewed clearly defines what is considered to be faculty misconduct from both a faculty and a student perspective. It demonstrates the recognition of ethical conduct as an essential trait of the profession. There is a paucity of literature based upon empirical evidence (Birch et al., 1999; Bruhn et al., 2002; Cleek & Leonard, 1998; Hamilton, 2002; Tabachnick, Keith-Spiegel, & Pope, 1991). The lack of data and research in this field is considered a "serious institutional deficit" (Counelis, 1993, p. 86) for practitioners and researchers in higher education (Hardy, 2002; Rezaee et al.). Rocheleau and Speck attribute this deficit to the public perception that "ethical dilemmas and tensions are less readily apparent" in institutions of higher education (p. 2). Specific to this dissertation, the review also revealed a substantial fundamental gap in research: Do community colleges have formal codes of ethics? How are they perceived by administration to function and for what purpose? It is an obvious starting point to begin researching and comparing for effectiveness or perceptions. It is a step

toward understanding what the codes are and how they are perceived. The literature review

provides an evolution of codes in education up through and to the community college. The

review uncovered no studies of codes or faculty misconduct within the North Carolina

Community College System (NCCCS). The NCCCS is the collective of 58 community colleges

intended to serve the educational and vocational training needs of local populations and

industries.

The framework for this section reviews current literature addressing (a) the historical

evolution of formal codes in education; (b) the background on the implementation of formal

codes in community colleges; (c) incorporation of codes of ethics for academic professionals and

the profession itself; (d) the intra-academy argument on the value and effectiveness of codes; (e)

empirical studies of the types of misconduct and perceptions of conduct as perceived by faculty

and students; (f)empirical studies to determine the effectiveness of codes of ethics; and (g) calls

for additional research in the area of codes and ethical conduct.

Historical Background

The Georgia Education Association first adopted a code for professional conduct in 1896

(National Educators Association, 1945). By 1945, 34 state associations had established formal

codes. The codes stressed wholesome personality and high moral character, personal

responsibility, and professional integrity.

As early as 1939, Bixler contended that the behavior of the individual faculty member is

the behavior of the college. Bixler's work noted that there was an abundance of student issue

research, but that the faculty itself as an issue had been overlooked.

Professionalism and self-regulation through a standard is best illustrated by the AAUP's

efforts   in establishing Statements of Principles on academic freedom and professionalism

(AAUP,2006). The AAUP (1915) Principles empower and challenge the professional faculty to

"purge its ranks of its incompetent and unworthy" (p. 10). In 1940 the AAUP clarified the duties

of the professional body to "determine when individual professors inadequately meet their

responsibilities" (Hamilton, 2002, p. 47). By 1987, the ever-evolving ethical code was used as a

tool to set a tone for executive leadership to establish a more ethical climate on campus

(Anderson & Davies, 2000).

The Principles eventually evolved into the powerful 1998 statement that encourages

professors who believe that others have violated the "standards of professional behavior"

(Hamilton, 2002, p. 49) to take action. The reason for doing so is: (1) for the "common good"

and (2) as professionals they must protect their own standards (AAUP, 1998, p. 58). The AAUP

has always maintained that the privileges associated with faculty status demand a corresponding

obligation to abide by professional and ethical standards (Roworth, 2002).

<div align="center">Community Colleges and Codes of Ethics</div>

In 1988, the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges (ASCCC) adopted a

faculty ethics statement developed by the AAUP detailing responsibilities to their respective

disciplines, as instructors, as colleagues, and as members of academic institutions. The

adaptation of the AAUP version was modified in 1994 to be more relevant to unique functions

and characteristics of community college faculty. ASCCC recognized that the code contributes to

"nurture an institutional culture that provides an atmosphere of comfort and safety where

learners can flourish" (Viewpoints, 1994, p. 10). By 2000, 15 of the California Community

College System colleges had implemented formal faculty codes. In 2002, the ASCCC formally

made a recommendation that local faculty senates should adopt a statement of professional ethics

(California Tomorrow, 2002).

Little (1989) stated at the 69th American Association of Community and Junior Colleges convention that adopting a professional code does not in itself guarantee ethical behavior, but it does demonstrate that the college is committed to ensuring an ethical academic community. Little further emphasized that faculty members have a responsibility to uphold professional standards and that ethical behavior is essential if community colleges want to maintain public confidence and if faculty wish to be role models for students. Little's work was primarily motivated by claims and concerns related to sexual harassment. Hardy (2002) provides ethical guidelines specific to community colleges; he states that community colleges should set their own unique standards of professional ethical behavior in order to assure integrity and competence of members. Wagner (1996) adds that the education profession is vested by the public with the trust and responsibility requiring the highest ideals of professional service.

Referencing codes in community colleges, Vaughan (1992) suggests that because of the relative youth of community colleges there are "few traditions or past experiences to guide behavior" (p. 74). A code may serve as a guide to community college faculty for ethical conduct, but it cannot assure it. Vaughan believes that the creation of a code can be a very valuable process, but he cautions with what he refers to as *Myth Four*: "If you have a code of ethics, things will be dramatically improved" (p. 200). Vaughan also provides clarification on the *ethicalness* of community college personnel: "faculty members will never have to select a candidate for organ transplant or issue an order that sends a murderer to the electric chair." "They will, however, need to be able to function in real-life situations" (p. 102).

The Community College Studies Program at UCLA and the Irvine Group identified existing codes at community colleges. For community colleges, the codes tended to specify professional standards for conflict of interest, integrity, nepotism, and accountability. Of the 33

community colleges responding, only four had policies related to sexual harassment. None had research related codes or standards (Rifkin, 1993). Twenty-seven of the community colleges surveyed had codes that addressed faculty conduct in the role of the teacher rather than simply as an employee. The conclusion of the research was that comprehensive and well developed codes of ethics set the standard for community college administrators and faculty.

Codes of Ethics

Callahan (1982) contends that the need for codes will usually arise when something unethical happens, an incident occurs, or when there is in an internal state of disarray. According to Schurr (1982) "the irony of the situation is that even if a code is antithetical to the ethical foundation of the academic profession, there may be no other choice than to speak out in the name of preserving the academic profession" (p. 333). Formal and informal codes are especially effective for those not motivated by conscience; it provides guidance and directives (Chambers, 1983). Bellingham (2003) provides three purposes for codes of ethics: they (a) serve as an ethical guide, (b) a public statement of institutional values and beliefs, and (c) and an element toward creating an ethical environment.

Kerns (2003) states that "codes of ethical conduct can help steer ethical behavior by offering a cue to remind personnel of the right thing to do" (p. 4). Kerns categorizes codes of ethics into three types. Type 1: *Inspirational-Idealistic* codes specify global themes not anchored to specific behaviorType 2: *Regulatory* codes proscribe clearly delineated conduct. This type of code is designed to help as a jurisprudential tool when disputes occur. Type 3: *Educational/Learning Oriented* codes offer principles to guide decision making and behavioral reactions into likely situations. This approach is compatible with building a learning organizational culture.

Codes of Ethics and Academic Professionalism

Greenwood (1957) defines the attributes of a profession: imbued with a sense of calling, possessing a code of ethics, and an ideal of service that involves a sense of identity or community or culture. Bolman and Walton (1979), Bruhn et al. (2002), Kerns (2003), and Schurr (1982) all recommend the establishment and creation of codes to benefit the academic institutions as it provides a common frame of reference for all and can promote ethical organizational behavior.

Hamilton (2002) discusses the "unwritten social compact" enjoyed by academic professionals (p. 3). The position of professor is held in high regard by those inside and outside the academy. In exchange for their high standards and expectations, society grants and trusts the professional academics to self-regulate. Hamilton (2002) states what he believes it will take to maintain that trust. The first two relate directly to the questions of this review: (1) establish a clear and accessible code of ethics and (2) establish an effective means of inculcating the cultures and values of high ethical standards within the academy with faculty members.

Callahan (1982) presumes that due to the nature of the academic setting, with so many actors playing many roles, and a variety of different goals being pursued simultaneously, moral dilemmas and difficult choices will be endemic; it is likely that unethical conduct will occur. Callahan emphasizes, theoretically, yet grounded in personal awareness of misconduct, that some faculty members have failed to serve as exemplars of decent moral behavior. He lists seven types of problems and allegations ranging from sexual exploitation of students to toleration of cheating. There is much reported about faculty misconduct, but there is very little empirical research to indicate or support that faculty engage in such unethical behaviors (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1999; Tabachnick et al., 1991). Books and articles indicate that faculty misconduct does

occur; the discussions of faculty conduct and codes demonstrate the issue and interest within the academic community. It is an issue that has long existed, acknowledged by deans, chairs, colleagues, and students, but it has never been accurately or empirically summarized.

Hauptman (2002) harshly describes the attributes and qualities of some unethical academic professionals: "they are sometimes charlatans and frauds: they masquerade as something they are not; they dissimulate; they distort their credentials; they accept bribes; they steal; they plagiarize; they fabricate; and they fudge, cook, trim, republish, and destroy their data" (p. 39). The variety of irregularities and improprieties committed by faculty members are researched. Among the most commonly recognized offenses are: plagiarism, sexual harassment, misuse of funds, negligent advisement, credential fabrication, grade inflation, and lateness for class (Baca & Stein, 1983; Braxton & Bayer, 1999; Bruhn et al., 2002; Hamilton, 2002). Some are minor indiscretions while others are crimes; episodes of misconduct do vary significantly in range and degree of seriousness.

Much of what has been written regarding the conduct of faculty has related to the assumed professionalism and self-governance of the faculty (Baron, 2003; Bennett, 1998; Braxton & Bayer, 1999; DeRussy, 2003; Farago, 1991; Graubard, 2001; Outcalt, 2002b; Roworth, 2002). According to Cohen and Brawer (1996), "academic professionalism is determined not by discipline, but by the 'discipline of instruction'" (p. 86). The focus sharpens on academicians as ethical and professional; that a true profession by nature is "enshrined in a code of ethics" (Bruhn et al., 2002, p. 462). The written or unwritten code of ethics is a true trait of professionals (Bruhn et al.). Sockett (1990) adds that it is almost definitional that a profession is guided by a code of ethics. Arguably the most prolific researchers in the area of ethical

20

conduct by faculty, Braxton and Bayer (1999), state "professionalism includes a code of conduct" (p. 188).

Bolman and Walton (1979) provide 30 recommendations for improving ethical conduct. The second recommendation, the most relevant to this study, calls for each academic institution "to be explicit about the standards of ethical behavior" (p. 6). According to Bruhn et al. (2002), "It is reasonable to hold academics to a high moral standard, as they are in a prime position to influence young minds through their modeling and control of information" (p. 271). Bruhn et al. argue that the ultimate victims of ethical failure are the students, but it affects all stakeholders. Bruhn et al. and Bennett (1998) offer recommendations for reducing incidents of tolerance of ethical failure. To influence behavior of faculty Bruhn et al. suggests that behavior as a good citizen be made an "explicit and integral factor" (p. 487) in determining tenure and promotion. O'Neil (1983) profiles the academy's role as a good citizen, and that its professors should have a higher standard of professionalism; "…a university that teaches and preaches ethical responsibility must itself be a model and adhere to a more strict code of ethics" (p. 465). Wilcox and Ebbs (1992) argue that professionals profess their "affiliation with the community of like persons and publicly declare their willingness to fulfill their mission and that standard is the ethical code" (p. 390).

Friedman, Fogel, and Friedman (2005) believe that faculty benefit from a code just as attorneys and physicians; it is a reminder that they have an ethical and professional responsibility. Each community should have a board of ethics. They must have the authority to police their own ranks; a board of ethics is the public benchmark of professionalism (Wagner, 1996).

Are academic professionals properly and formally prepared for the ethical decision-making that comes along with the profession? The lack of ethical training is highlighted by Hamilton (2002). In many disciplines the graduate programs offer primarily specialized training, education, and research specifically related to the respective field. In some disciplines, such as medicine, law, and theology, the students may receive ethical training as it relates to their chosen profession and how it may impact their future capacity to be professional. Many disciplines do not offer any ethical preparation for the graduate: "…in the academic profession few graduate programs require a course on the ethics of the profession" (Hamilton, 2002, p. 7). Golde and Dore (2001) recognize that lack of preparation for education professionals. Graduates are credentialed and knowledgeable of their respective disciplines, but for those who elect the career path of instruction, they are not formally or adequately prepared for their role of teacher: the "ethical dimension of faculty and professional life: how to act responsibly and in the best interest of the profession is not part of graduate training" (Golde & Dore, p. 13).

There are several definitions for professionalism, but most (Bruhn et al., 2002; Hamilton, 2002; Wagner, 1996) assert that professionalism entails self-regulation and occupational autonomy. El Khawas (1981) expands on the ideology of self-regulation and professionalism and its impact on ethical behavior. El Khawas chiefly addresses academic leadership and the responsive actions taken by administration. El Khawas does not share any information or data about faculty misconduct per se; it does demonstrate the relevance and significance of campus response. Faculty members may observe or encounter misconduct by a colleague; how that faculty member responds can have significant impact. The response is a "critical element" amongst faculty rather than ignoring or waiting for someone else to take action (El Khawas, p.

61). Professionalism incorporates a formalized response process in addressing incidents, primarily because of public accountability.

<center>Faculty Misconduct and Incidents</center>

Research revealed no statistics reporting all instances of faculty misconduct; that itself would be extremely difficult to completely capture and accurately categorize. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has processed nearly 1200 cases concerning the actions of faculty members (Knight & Auster, 1999). Though that is a small percentage of the nearly 550,000 faculty members nationwide, the inappropriate actions or misdeeds of a few could cause irreparable damage to the career of the individual, the profession, and the reputation of the institution. Even eliminating or preventing a single action of misconduct could prove to be of great value to the institution in a variety of ways. There is an assumption that many incidents of misconduct go unreported or are quietly handled in-house. Rocheleau and Speck (2007) suggest that unless it involves sex, misconduct in higher education may not have the sensational characteristics or media appeal as other organizations. What professors do in the classroom is important in terms of ethical significance; "misconduct by professors can harm students and hinder their ability to contribute to society"(Rochelau & Speck, 2007, p.1).

The reality of the existence of such misconduct has led to action on the part of leaders in higher education. It has been formally addressed and researched, the problem exists, yet the argument continues as to how behavior, specifically faculty misconduct, can be tempered. Though not all agree, codes have been recognized as a standard to directly address and guide professional conduct (Adams et al., 2001; Rezaee et al., 2001; Rifkin, 1993). The effectiveness of codes in organizations has been sparsely researched through qualitative and quantitative studies within the academy of higher education and other organizations.

<center>23</center>

Codes Specific to Academic Faculty

Schurr (1982) recommends the establishment of a code "in the name of preserving the academic profession" (p.333).Schurr (1982) suggests that there should be a code for academicians based upon accountability, service, accountability, and professional competence . There are theories and opinions expressed to attempt to identify what constitutes unethical conduct on the part of faculty members. Callahan (1982) included sexual misconduct, careless teaching, and tolerating cheating (p. 337). In a subsequent empirical study using faculty responses, Birch et al. (1999) identified the same types of misconduct.

Callahan (1982) also describes what he feels are the faculty interactions of conduct: (a) faculty to student, (b) faculty to faculty, (c) faculty to those within particular discipline, (d) faculty to administration, and (e) faculty to community. Though he concludes that he feels that a code of ethics would be "totally insufficient", those five relationships must be recognized as significant and very distinct when considering rights, responsibilities and obligations of faculty (p. 338).

Faculty Perceptions of Faculty Misconduct

Regarding the professionals of instruction, the expectations of ethical conduct by colleagues is similarly shared. As part of a larger key collective in education, faculty members are aware of misconduct by colleagues, but there are some differences in what is perceived as unethical. Birch et al. (1999) surveyed 147 faculty members at the University of Wyoming to determine perceptions of ethical and unethical conduct on campus. Their research was motivated by the awareness of increased public interest in professional conduct. Survey participants, full-time tenured faculty, rated the ethical appropriateness of 64 behaviors. The research revealed nine faculty behaviors deemed to be unethical, as rated by 90% of the respondents, and 8 other

behaviors rated by 80%. The ethical faculty member does not: (a) punish students with lower grades for opposing views, (b) ignore cheating, (c) give easy grades to avoid negative student reviews, (d) become sexually involved with a student, (e) relax rules to gain favor, (f) lower demands for athletes or minority students, and (g) teach under the influence of drugs or alcohol, or (h) ignore unethical conduct on campus. This faculty on faculty study demonstrates the regard for professional community amongst academicians and provides consensus within this population as to what is considered unethical conduct.

Regarding codes of ethics, Birch et al. (1999) argue that there is no true ethical code or universal standard for faculty conduct. The AAUP code is acknowledged, but it is not deemed to be binding by the profession. Birch et al. (1999) state that there is little information as to what is perceived by the profession to be ethical and the professional expectations thereof. The AAUP code would apply only to members or the organization rather than all faculty of an institution.

Braxton and Bayer (1994) offer extensive data in researching faculty misconduct and behavior. Their method of research is based upon their instrument, the College Teaching Behavioral Inventory (CBTI); the inventory is a 126 question survey that asks questions that are answered on a five point scale. The questions are categorized into eight groups ranging from *preplanning the course* to *out-of-class practices* (Braxton & Bayer, 1994). The authors use anecdotal case studies to demonstrate misconduct scenarios to help define and explain descriptively behavioral models. Their research questions are: do other faculty members observe and consider certain actions of others as misconduct? Do faculty members at different types of institutions consider with some consistency what constitutes misconduct? The survey does pry deeply into the thoughts and beliefs of faculty members in assessing their feelings ranging from intoxication to inappropriate attire and plagiarism to personal hygiene. The research revealed

what was determined to be the seven intolerable categories of faculty misconduct determined to be the most egregious: (a) condescending negativism, (b) inattentive planning, (c) moral turpitude, (d) particularistic grading, (e) personal disregard, (f) uncommunicated course details, (g) uncooperative cynicism. Though Braxton and Bayer (1999) do consider their research significant, Bauer (2001) is critical of this study and questions the statistical significance of their findings. Bauer states the CBTI "deals with minutiae" (p. 98); the monograph is misleading and not instructive. In fact he raises the direct question of misconduct in academic publishing by Braxton and Bayer.

Braxton and Bayer (1994) do find supporting empirical evidence that professional solidarity shapes attitudes towards misconduct in general and toward taking action against wrong doing and that professional solidarity and collective accountability can protect academic professionals. The research and publications of Braxton and Bayer demonstrate the interest and necessity for professional discussions of faculty conduct.

<center>Purpose and Function of Codes for Colleges</center>

In his presentation at the 2006 Association of American Community Colleges, the Director of Research for the Education Policy Center at The University of Alabama, David Hardy, remarked that codes may not necessarily guide ethical behavior, but do assist community college professionals in avoiding legal action. That intent of the applied code may not be purely motivated for ethical reasons, but primarily for avoiding legal issues. It does provide potential value for community college administrators as purely a practitioner's instrument in litigation or personnel matters.

Codes of conduct, theoretically speaking, should positively guide the conduct of faculty. Shapiro and Stefkovich (2005) conclude that to affect behavior and conduct that "simply having

<center>26</center>

a code is not sufficient; they model the ideals of the profession only" (p. 21). Callahan (1982)

does not believe that the code can be effective; it would either be too vague or too specific, but

certainly totally insufficient. Codes do have value, but they do not make faculty more ethical.

Callahan recommends a campus wide discussion every two years on such topics to maintain

faculty ethical fitness. Professional conduct as established by codes is covered by several journal

articles and monographs. Bruhn et al. (2002) and Bennett (1998) touch on the employment

contract as a *code* or guide to affect behavior. The contract usually does not stipulate ethical

conduct, but it does delineate expectations as employees rather than standards of professional

conduct (Bruhn et al.). The code issued by the AAUP addresses obligations of the professionals

to their students, institution, and discipline, but it does not directly address misconduct; it

assumes adherence to professional conduct. The codes for other professions (law, medicine) do

address misconduct and shared responsibility (Knight & Auster, 1999). To further complicate the

issue of faculty conduct, instructors are provided some leeway, given the nature of their

profession, through the concept of academic freedom. O'Neil (1983) leaves the concept of

academic freedom to the judgment of the instructor. The interpretation of academic freedom can

blur the lines of acceptable professional conduct by faculty. Lederman (2008) suggests that

"faculty have a tendency to hide all sorts of questionable behavior behind the shield of academic

freedom" (p. 2).

<div align="center">Students' Perceptions of Faculty Misconduct</div>

It is significant and noteworthy that faculty misconduct has many undesired effects.

Probably the most damaging is the impact upon the student. Students do notice and are aware of

many of these incidents. Tabachnick et al. (1993) surveyed 482 students on 107 different acts by

faculty to determine and rate in terms of ethical acceptability. The study determined that there is

little difference between students, faculty, and genders in opinions of what is or is not acceptable, ethically speaking, in terms of conduct by faculty. The results were compared with faculty perceptions as well. There was no significant difference between gender, upperclassmen versus new students, or western students compared to Midwest students. It is significant in this review because it demonstrates what is perceived as unethical and, more importantly, that students are aware of faculty conduct and misconduct from an ethical perspective. Students in this study have similar opinions when compared to faculty. The study only seeks difference between per students based upon region (Midwest and West). The research does not consider whether or not the colleges had established codes of ethics or not nor does it describe the perceptions of faculty.

Kuther (2003) researched college students' perceptions of the ethical responsibilities of professors. This study was also built on the work of Tabachnick et al. (1993). Kuther surveyed 248 undergraduate students using 25 questions on the appropriateness of faculty behaviors. The participants responded on a five-point scale. The behaviors were topically categorized in the areas of academic dishonesty, student-professor relationships, teaching, drug and alcohol use, and respect for students. The participant students were consistent in agreement about unethical behavior related to academic dishonesty and respect for student, but were more ambiguous in the categories of student-professor relationship, drug and alcohol use, and teaching. The first survey was evaluated using quantitative methods to rate behaviors as: not ethical, ethical under rare circumstances, ethical under some circumstances, ethical under most circumstances, or ethical under all circumstances. Kuther's conclusion based upon data collected is that students do view their professors as role models. Kuther emphasizes the AAUP guidelines and its implied direction to faculty to practice professional and ethical conduct. This research validates the perceptions and confirms the relationship between student and faculty. This research also

recommends the implementation of established codes in its conclusion. Kuther feels the code provides a foundation and a standard of professional conduct.

Friedman et al. (2005) focused on student perceptions of the ethics of professors. The study surveyed 350 students and what affects students' perceptions of the ethics of the professor. The researchers sought to determine whether a prior course in ethics, taken by the student, would affect the student's perception. The study was directly related to Morgan and Korschgen's (2001) research. There was no significant difference between students who had and had not taken ethics courses. In making a determination as to the ethicalness of instructor, the most important factor was "fairness in grading" (Morgan & Korschgen, p. 10). Students notice the actions of faculty, and this research reinforces that premise, whether or not the student has any formal exposure to ethics studies. Again, this research design could have included a question regarding the existence of a faculty code of ethics. If, as argued, a code does affect conduct, it may have been demonstrated here.

Comparison of Perceptions: Students and Faculty

Students are a most important consideration when discussing faculty misconduct. It is the interaction between instructor and student that is the essence of the profession. Braxton and Bayer (1999) believe that classroom incivility is a tricky terrain, but it is an important issue because of the potential impact on students. Morgan and Korschgen (2001) researched the differences between 157 students and 115 faculty members as to what is considered unethical. The study compared faculty and student perceptions of faculty behavior using items from the Tabachnick et al. (1991) research. Sixteen questions were culled from the Tabachnick et al. (1991) study. The questions focused on issues of faculty-student and professional ethics for college instructors. The results did reveal a significant difference between students and faculty

perceptions on four of the issues. The faculty tended to believe that using profanity, accepting text book rebates, and ensuring popularity with easy tests to be more unethical; the students felt that the use of old lecture notes was more unethical when compared with faculty results. The study again demonstrates the importance of professional conduct of faculty in and outside of the classroom; it is recognized by students.

Swazey, Louis, and Anderson(1994), the head of the Acadia Institute, and her fellow researchers surveyed 4,000 doctoral students and professors at 99 universities. The researchers found that 44% of students and 50% of faculty were aware of at least two types of unethical activity. This study provides an empirical foundation that supports the belief and perception that unethical behavior occurs and does not go unnoticed by faculty or students.

<center>Self-Regulation and Faculty Misconduct</center>

Knight and Auster (1999) provide an empirical study on an aspect of faculty misconduct; their research focused on what happens when an action of misconduct occurs. Are administrators or other faculty members notified? Is the perpetrator confronted? Are other colleagues consulted? Their research is based on the assumed tenet that faculty members are self-regulated and that misconduct occurs, but the effectiveness of this self-regulation may completely depend on the responsiveness of colleagues. Knight and Auster hone in on the action or inaction on the part of other faculty members; what happens at this critical time is termed *ethical activism.* Their study revealed that most faculty members would not let incidents of misconduct pass without action. Most of the faculty members studied would speak with the colleague involved or would communicate concerns to administrators. Most are unlikely to tolerate unethical behavior of their professional contemporaries (Knight & Auster). Their study also suggests that action by administrators can account for the degree of ethical activism. To discourage misbehavior,

<center>30</center>

administrators must follow through in the admonishment of culprits. The issue of faculty

misconduct is confirmed and provides that administrative or colleague response is key in

maintaining an ethical environment.

Their study emphasized what faculty said they did when they, by whatever means, were

made aware of misconduct. Knight and Auster (1999) based their research on the responses of

890 faculty members at various postsecondary, institutions. The populations were stratified by

the different types of institutions (research, doctoral-granting, comprehensive, liberal arts, and

two-year) (Knight & Auster, 1999). The survey instrument was a 150 question survey focusing

on ethical activism. It addressed a variety of types of faculty misconduct ranging from plagiarism

to sexual harassment. The authors research is not intended to illuminate the types or degree of

misconduct, but rather it considers the responses and reactions of faculty members and

perceptions of others. Though the question of ethical activism does not directly address the

questions of this literature review, it does provide insight into how the policies or actions may

affect the behavior of the organization; administrative response to this activism can shape the

culture of the organization relative to faculty misconduct. This connection will be demonstrated

in the discussion section of the review.

Codes of Ethics: Perceptions of Conduct

 Adams et al. (2001) researched employees of various business organizations, with codes

of ethics to determine perceptions of behavior. In this study, the research focused on the effects

of codes of ethics on perceptions of ethical behavior. The methodology included a series of

interviews with employees of companies with and without a code of ethics. The results suggest

that employees at a company with a code of ethics judge themselves and coworkers to be more

ethical when compared to employees at companies without codes. The difference between the

two groups was determined to be significant. The research suggests that organizational codes of ethics do affect employee perception and conduct. The existence of a formal code can have a positive effect on the ethical climate. Though not purely academic in nature, the model and methodology does demonstrate the quest to determine whether or not codes can have the desired intent. Within the parameters of this study, Adams et al. determined that they do. This was a complex and comprehensive study took place over two years and it utilized 132 interviewers and 766 subject participants.To arrive at their conclusions, Adams et al. had to first determine which organizations had formal codes of ethics to guide member conduct and behavior.

<center>Baseline Study of Codes in Colleges and Universities</center>

Rezaee et al. (2001) explored the existence and implementation of codes at higher education organizations. It was based on the premise that many public companies and organizations had established codes at the urging of the Treadway Commission. The Commission emphasizes internal control in organizations to prevent fraudulent activities. At the time of the research, there was much attention relating to businesses and codes, but none sufficient related to colleges. It does, however, demonstrate the need to first determine the existence of a code at an institution. The theoretical framework for the study is based on situation ethics theory that supports the use and implementation of codes. Situation ethics recognizes that there is a great variety in beliefs, values, and ethics of individuals. It is within that pluralistic society that it would be impossible to reach consensus, but an accord could be achieved for an organization through identifying appropriate ethical conduct and practices. Those ethical practices would provide the elements and structure for a code of ethics that will foster appropriate ethical behavior (McCarthy, 1997; Rezaee et al.).

<center>32</center>

The research of Rezaee et al. (2001) was motivated by the call for written codes of conduct and about how they function and how they are implemented. The researchers surveyed 1,000 administrators at a variety of colleges and universities. The questionnaires focused on the existence, adoption, and implementation, of codes. Nearly 70% of the institutions indicated that they had codes. Respondents also concurred in the belief that higher education institutions should have written codes of conduct. Discussion points identified that faculty had little involvement with implementation or follow-up on the codes. In its conclusion, Rezaee et al. state that codes of ethics can be effective in eliminating unethical practices and promoting the organization's commitment to ethical conduct. Rezaee et al. recommend future studies to investigate codes of conduct and internalization of the codes for faculty at different colleges.

In a more recent study, Shapiro and Stefkovich (2005) researched doctoral students in an EdD program and compared professional codes with personal beliefs and character. The conclusion stated that "educational leaders should look for consistencies and inconsistencies between and within their own codes" (Shapiro &Stefkovich, p. 56). The study is relevant to this dissertation by demonstrating that individuals may behave, in a professional capacity, based upon personal beliefs. Their personal convictions for good or bad may carry over into their duties as faculty. Codes do provide professional and institutional guidelines, and if codes are absent, individuals may act, sometimes unwisely, upon their own accord.

The issue, problem, and environment related to unethical faculty behavior by community college instructors is clearly illustrated by Hardy (2002): It is amplified by five ethical considerations more specific for community colleges: (a) faculty-student relationships, (b) teaching of adults, (c) institutional risk management, (d) technology and distance education and (e) philosophies and ethics of higher education. He considers and reviews a variety of codes

ranging from professional philosophical to institutional suggestive to prescriptive. Hardy reviews three codes of ethics for his study: the AAUP's Statement of Professional Ethics, The Texas Community College Teachers Association (TCCTA) and The Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE). Hardy identifies modern areas of concern: teacher-student relationships, sexual harassment, discrimination, diversity, conflict of interest, impaired performance, electronic delivery and computer-Internet related issues. Heasks: What formal guidelines exist regarding professional ethics for faculty in community colleges and what differences are evident in existing guidelines? This question demonstrates the imperative need to first determine which academic institutions have codes. Hardy's research and ultimate generalization offers little significance, but strongly demonstrates the need to determine how existing codes are generally accepted and internalized. He addresses another gap in research related to ethics and teaching in the community college. He also recommends further research to learn about perceptions about addressing conflicts that could possibly emerge when faculty member are guided by a professional or academic discipline code of ethics and an institutional policy or code. Hardy acknowledges that much literature is available, but it is mostly philosophical in nature. More often than not it is shaped by opinion or intended to relate to a particular audience. According to Hardy, empirical research is absent. Philosophical foundations and personal opinions are of value, but as academicians, we must be ethically-obligated to provide "…a better empirical base for the opining that we appear to do so readily when the subject of ethics and teaching arises" (Hardy, p. 397).

<center>Recommendations for Further Research for Ethics and Teaching</center>

There are several aspects and perspectives considered in the literature reviewed. Most are anecdotal, opinion, or philosophical. The questions of this dissertation were touched upon and

supported by many of the writings and research. Though none directly address the questions through empirical methodologies, they do contribute to a better understanding of the research completed and recommended.

Several echo the sentiment of further research needed. Cleek and Leonard (1998) states that there is a lack of research to support whether or not codes can influence behavior. Bruhn et al. (2002) states that there are several publications addressing guidelines for academic conduct in specific disciplines such as: science, public policy, engineering, but it has failed to address ethical issues of higher education in general terms such as instruction. According to Tabachnick et al. (1991), there is relatively little research on ethical issues in academia. Though it has been initiated, there is sparse research on students' perceptions of ethical behavior by faculty (Morgan & Korschgen, 2001).

Knight and Auster's (1999) study details the response to ethical behavior that, in and of itself, is interesting and valuable, but it does not provide answers to whether or not the faculty member has an obligation to respond when he or she encounters misconduct by colleagues. It does not address whether or not the institutions studied had any sort of written code or formalized process for investigating such claims. It does not actually investigate the act of misconduct; it only investigates the response of others when they learn of the alleged misdeed.

Bruhn et al. (2002) also suggest that empirical research on testing types and tolerance of ethical failure would be valuable. Birch et al. (1999) recommend further research regarding ethical responsibility of faculty. Birch et al. points out that understanding perceptions of professional ethics would contribute to the potential content of a code of ethics. All are relatively worthwhile and interesting topics for further studies, but it is essential to first gather foundation

data to identify colleges with and without codes and to explore perceptions and processes at colleges working with established codes of ethics.

Clark Kerr (1992) states in discussing ethical responsibilities at community colleges "At least as many or more of the ethical lapses are the responsibility of faculty members and students as of presidents and trustees" (p. xii). He continues, "Is it enough to heighten sensitivity to ethical issues or whether it is better to have some general guidelines or whether it is necessary also to have specific codes to control actions" (Kerr, p. xii). "Few know if the codes are working; substantial research is still needed in this area" (Hamilton, 2002, p. 6). The studies and future research in codes will have value for all including community colleges to better understand what can be incorporated to provide an ethical working and learning environment.

There are four compelling considerations in answering the questions of this review. First, there seems to be a strong belief that an established code of ethical behavior is worthwhile (Bennett, 1998). Second, the code is an integral part of any professional organization; professors and instructors should be no different. Third, the establishment of a formal code, both nationally and locally, may assist in effectively establishing the ethical culture of the institution. Fourth, externally, it is symbolic as a sign of assurance for those outside the academy. Internally, it gives clarity to expectations of behavior for all faculty members.

<center>Summary</center>

The literature is extensive, yet it is does not have the depth in studies related to implementation of codes of ethics, especially at academic institutions, and it allows much room for further research in the field of codes of ethics. Each publication or article points the way to another related piece. The work of Rifkin (1993), Rezaee et al. (2001), and the private sector

study by Adams et al. (2001) all include the essential step in identifying and researching organizations where codes exist.

It appears that ethical conduct and behavior of faculty has been a topic of interest and an issue for higher education and it has been observed and can be assumed that episodes of misconduct are inevitable. The literature does demonstrate that not all are convinced that a code of ethics or conduct can make a difference, but establishing codes will do no harm. It will be important for administration to do all possible to provide an ethical environment for learning and work. Beyond simply writing, adopting, and incorporating a code, it must be explored and examined to learn more about the impact and impression that codes actually have on faculty and CAOs.

Though there is ample interest in expressing theory, opinion, and speculation about codes and conduct, there is a dearth of qualitative studies to determine perceptions of codes. A fundamental piece of literature that is essential in determining effectiveness or acceptance of formal codes is to first determine which colleges have codes and to learn from those sites. Learning and exploring those perceptions would provide a solid foundation and starting point for research in effectiveness of codes. It would fill in gaps in research upon which to build a framework of research on various aspects of codes and perceived effectiveness.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the conceptual framework, design, site selection, data collection procedures, data analysis methods, validity, and reliability utilized in the study. The purpose of the research was to gain an understanding of how chief academic officers (CAOs) and faculty perceived the codes of ethics and how those perceptions compare. Community colleges have adopted codes of ethics to affirm expectations of professional conduct, to affect change in the organization, or to make a public statement about its commitment to ethical principles. It is unknown what effect or impact these published codes of ethics have had upon faculty.

Conceptual Framework

Using Merriam's (1998) model, the outer frame of this study is found in the literature that pointed to the existence and the unfavorable impact of faculty misconduct upon institutions and the profession (Birch et al., 1999; Braxton & Bayer, 1999; Hardy, 2002; Hellmich 2007; Rekow, 2006; Rocheleau & Speck, 2007; Wilcox & Ebbs, 1992). The second interlocking frame within the outer is based upon the literature that provided a range of opinions and philosophies regarding the creation of and the practical application of codes to affect organizational culture and behavior on college campuses (Little, 1989; Merriam & Brockett, 2007; Rezaee et al., 2001; Rifkin, 1993). There is nonetheless a scarcity of research relating the perceptions of codes of conduct by faculty at colleges where codes exist. Academic leadership may be unaware of how codes have been received and internalized to best contribute to an ethical working and learning environment (Campbell, 2001; Hardy, 2002). The purpose or innermost frame of the study was conducted to specifically explore and compare the perceptions and impressions of

CAO's and fulltime faculty at North Carolina Community Colleges with established and published codes of ethics.

Codes of ethics have been established for various reasons, but primarily codes have been incorporated to serve as a guide for conduct or as a deterrent against misconduct (Cleek & Leonard, 1998; Hardy, 2002; Rifkin, 1993). Community colleges have experienced their share of incidents of faculty misconduct; it occurs in a variety of ways, but it always has had negative implications for the college, the faculty, and the student (Hardy). By incorporating codes of conduct at community colleges, campus leadership has attempted to clearly state the expectations and standards of professional conduct. It is not known how these codes have been integrated, internalized, or what impression they have had upon faculty. This study explored and compared the perceptions and impressions of CAO's and fulltime faculty regarding established codes of conduct at North Carolina community colleges.

The five secondary questions were:

1. Are CAO's and faculty aware of institutional codes of faculty conduct?

2. Do CAO's and faculty differ in awareness of incidents of misconduct of faculty?

3. Do CAO's and faculty differ in awareness and perception of how codes are used by the college?

4. Do CAO's and faculty differ in how the codes are learned by faculty?

5. Is faculty conduct primarily guided by institutional code or by disciplinary codes?

Research Design

Qualitative methodology was an appropriate approach to this research problem. What the researcher intended to discover is *how* the CAOs and faculty members compared in perceptions about institutional codes of conduct. Qualitative study was suitable because the study demands a

39

complex, detailed understanding of the perceptions (Creswell, 2007). Qualitative studies deal

directly with the individuals, in their natural setting, to collect data. This type of detailcan be

best learned by speaking directly with those individuals involved. Yin (2009) states that "the

case study has a distinct advantage when: a how or why question is being asked about (a) a

contemporary set of events and (b) over which the investigator has very little control" (p. 13).

Qualitative methodology also allows for acknowledgement and inclusion of the researcher's

perspective and biases. This research utilized the characteristics of generic or basic qualitative

studies; the intent was to discover the perspectives of the people involved (Merriam, 1998). The

primary method of data collection was through participant interviews.

The literature on codes of conduct and faculty misconduct indicated that there had been

some sustained interest and cyclical recognition of the issue. Interest usually piques amid

incidents of unethical conduct within organizations. The literature also indicated that further

research is desired. One area of interest was the practical application of codes; the argument over

the effectiveness of codes remains and seems to be ongoing, but colleges have taken steps to

incorporate codes to provide a common frame of reference and to promote ethical organizational

behavior (Bolman & Walton, 1979; Bruhn et al., 2002; Kerns, 2003; Schurr, 1982). Some

community colleges have made the transition to develop, adopt, and make codes part of the

culture and character of the college. Community colleges have achieved this with the

incorporation of various types of codes. This research specifically focused on North Carolina

Community Colleges that have established Type III codes, as defined by Kerns (2003), "this

codeoffers principles to guide decision making and behavioral reactions into likely situations;

this approach is compatible with building a learning organizational culture" (p. 4). The study

explored and compared how the codes are perceived in purpose, intent, and function by Chief

Academic Officers (CAO's) and faculty at three different campuses. In this research, the perceptions were generally defined by statements, opinions, and the understanding of the participants. The intent of the research was to explain and compare the perceptions of faculty and CAO's regarding established codes of conduct.

Case-Site Selection

Marshall and Rossman (2006) provide guidance/recommendations for what would provide a realistic site and sample. The following criteria were used to determine site and sample: (1) entry was possible; (2) there wasa high probability existed that the researcher could learn about the people, processes and structure relevant to the research question, (3) the researcher was able to establish a trusting relationship with the participants and (4) data quality and credibility were reasonably assured.

The sites selected for this study will be referred to as College A, College B, and College C in an effort to assure anonymity of the participants. All were member institutions of the NCCCS and all had published codes of conduct. The colleges were ideal locations for sample and study. Entry to campus and interviews with selected faculty was authorized with appropriate notification and subsequent permission was granted. As both a graduate student and an employee of the community college system, I did not have any difficulty in establishing a mutually professional and respectful relationship to conduct interviews. Data quality and credibility sources were assured as they were faculty members and CAOs at NCCCS colleges with an established code of conduct. Data were derived through direct inquiry with primary sources.

The sites selected for the study, College A, College B, and College C were all very similar colleges with some slight variations. All were classified by Carnegie as public, 2-year, associate degree granting institutions. College B and College C were classified as S2 or small

41

two-year colleges with enrollments of approximately 2,500 and 1, 500 full time equivalents (FTE) respectively. College B was classified as M2 or medium two-year with an enrollment of 5,000. As member institutions of the NCCCS, they all possessed similar missions and functions: to provide open-door post-secondary education opportunities and vocational skills training to support and enhance the local and state workforce. The colleges offered a variety of degree programs and numerous continuing education programs.

The colleges were selected through a deduction process. The initial pool considered was the 58 colleges of the NCCCS. Imethodically searched the websites of each college to determine whether or not a formal code of ethics existed at the college. Each college Website was searched via the site's internal search engine. Key search terms such as *ethics, codes, faculty, handbook, personnel,* and *conduct* were used. If no results were yielded, the site was perused for additional handbooks, faculty guides, and human resource directives. If all efforts provided negative results, for the purposes of this study, it was determined that the college did not have a published code of ethics. Of the 58 colleges, eleven indicated that some sort of code or policy did exist. Of the eleven, eight were determined to be Type 1 or *Idealistic-Inspirational* and three were categorized by as Type 3 or *Educational-Learning.* The colleges selected all possess Type 3 codes. At College C and College B, the codes were formally titled *Codes of Ethics,* at College A, it was titled *Professional and Ethical Practices.*

<div align="center">Participants</div>

The interview participants included the three CAO's and 17 fulltime faculty members selected by non probability purposeful sampling. Creswell (2007) provides that in qualitative research, the researcher identifies the participants that can best help the researcher understand the central phenomena. Patton (1999) notes "the standard on choosing participants and sites is

whether or not they are information rich" (p. 169). Qualitative methodology allows research to present an array of perspectives; this research sample criteria utilized *maximum variation sampling* to allow a variety of traits related to gender, race, education level, academic or vocational discipline, and years of community college experience. Iconducted a total of 21 interviews: three with CAOs, and 18 with fulltime faculty. One of the digital recordings of a faculty member was accidently deleted and thus the interview was not used in the final data. Selection of the faculty members was based on the following sequence: (1) The college site and date was selected based upon availability of the respective CAO faculty interview; (2) faculty interviews were then selected by using posted faculty office hours to determine participants available from each academic division. Regarding the interview sequence, at every site the CAO was interviewed prior to other faculty participants.

The three colleges selected were accessible without excessive travel or expense. By Marshall and Rossman's (2006) definition, the sites were considered ideal and realistic for purposes of this research. By letter and telephone call, I requested permission from the college vice presidents to conduct the research. All research protocol and access issues were disclosed and were subject to the approval of the respective vice president.

<div align="center">Data Collection</div>

The primary method of data collection was through semi-structured in-depth interviews with selected participants at selected sites. Marshall and Rossman (2006, p. 101) identify interviews as strong method to yield large amounts of data quickly. All interviews were recorded, with participant permission, on a digital audio recorder. Transcribed copies of interviews were offered to participants for review to assure accuracy. Transcriptions and audio recordings were audited and compared for accuracy by a peer evaluator; the evaluator confirmed

and matched samples of what was said by participants against what was transcribed. The peer evaluator also assisted in review of emergent themes and coding of data. I also maintained field notes and a research journal to chronicle the procedures and impressions during the research.

Institutional documents such as faculty handbooks, codes of conduct, and organizational charts were reviewed. The documents were reviewed to determine basic information regarding the code of ethics and its conception, design, content, intent, location, and orientation.

All data collected were maintained on a password protected hard drive and on an external hard drive which was secure at all times. Creswell (2007 recommends keeping data for a reasonable time after analysis and completion of research. I will maintain the transcriptions and the electronic data in accordance with UMCIRB policy.

Data Analysis

This section describes the process used for data analysis. According to Marshall and Rossman (2006) "the process of bringing order, structure, and interpretation of to a mass of collected data is messy, ambiguous, time consuming, creative, and fascinating" (p. 154). Procedurally, the analysis followed the phases provided by Marshall and Rossman. The phases were: (a) organizing the data ; (b) immersion in the data; (c) generating categories and themes; (d) coding the data; (e) offering interpretation through analytic memos; (f) search for alternative understandings; and (g) writing for presentation (Marshall & Rossman, p. 156). Analysis and collection occurred simultaneously in this research. Constant comparative methods guided category construction and sorting for analysis; participant responses, observations, and impressions were considered and compared for inclusion as units of analysis (Merriam, 1998). I used the research questions and literature as guidelines for data analysis (Marshall & Rossman).

The interviews were transcribed by me utilizing voice-to-text software. This process allowed me to hear, speak, write, and read the words of the participants. The process dramatically increased the my familiarity with each participant interview. The transcription was tedious and time consuming, but it allowed for deep immersion into the data to occur while simultaneously creating transcripts.

I created data summary tables for all interview questions and sub-questions. Participant responses, including quotations, were recorded in the tables. Responses were analyzed and coded to determine pervasive themes. Outliers were noted as well and analyzed for significance to the study. The coded responses were matched with quotes to best illustrate participant perceptions.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability was assured through utilization of the interview and procedural protocol. Yin (2009) states that "having a case study protocol is a major way of increasing the reliability of the case study by guiding the researcher (p. 79). Documentation and organization was explicit to assure that data were accurately reflecting what occurred in the interviews and in the documents review. Any variation from the protocol was recorded in the my field notes.

Internal validity is the measure of how well the data matches reality. This study attempted to discover perceptions through face-to-face interviews with the selected participants. To enhance the internal validity this research utilized two techniques suggested by Merriam and Brockett (1997): (a) *peer examination* in which professional colleagues were asked to comment on emerging data; and (b) complete disclosure of *researcher's biases* to clarify the researcher's assumptions and perspective.

External validity is the extent of transferability of generalizations beyond the case study itself (Yin, 2009). Though the three campus study was narrow in focus, it could have applicability to other community colleges or educational institutions. The information gleaned from this research could be of value to colleges considering the adoption or creation of codes as well as those colleges with codes of conduct.

Delimitations the of Study

The study allowed for an in-depth examination of perceptions of CAO's and faculty at only three North Carolina Community Colleges with codes of conduct The findings and implications could have limited transferability to be of practical benefit to community colleges considering or incorporating codes.

Researcher bias was also a factor in this study. One trait of qualitative research is that the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis and personal biases do interfere with interpretation and analysis (Merriam, 1998, p. 20). As the primary research instrument, I recognized how my perspective affected his understanding and interpretation of the data as it was being collected and analyzed. Iconducted the research as a graduate student eager to do worthwhile research as well as to fulfill dissertation requirements, but I also recognized that he held a fulltime position as a community college administrator who works in academic affairs dealing directly with faculty on a daily basis. I considered the fact the I could possibly work with any of the participants in future collaborative projects. As a student and as a practitioner, this problem statement was the offshoot of a natural curiosity as a well as a practical concern. I was aware of personal dealings and incidents amongst faculty. I had no preconceived notion of what this research would reveal. I entered into the process open to all findings and

shared, confidentially, with a professional colleague for discussions for alternate explanations. These colleagues will substantiate the objectivity of the interpretation of the data.

At the time of the research, Ipossessed 13 years working experience with the NCCCS. All of my work has been at Pitt Community College (PCC). He has held a variety of positions in student services, continuing education, and academic affairs. At the time of the research, and the preceding five years, he has served as the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. In these roles, he has worked directly with faculty leadership on a variety of issues.

<div align="center">UMCIRB and Approval</div>

The interview protocol and research design and plan for this research was submitted in accordance with the guidelines for approval by the East Carolina University Medical Center and Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB). A copy of the UMCIRB approval is included in Appendix A.

Once the proposal and UMCIRB approvals were granted, the Icontacted the appropriate colleges and informed them of the research. One week prior to the actual site visits and interviews, the participants were contacted to confirm interview times and dates. The contact was done by telephone. This assisted in putting the participants more at ease about the research and allowed meto assure confidentiality of the interviews. All formal correspondence was followed up with a telephone call to make introduction and to make specific requests regarding the faculty members who were to be interviewed to achieve maximal variation sampling. Due to circumstances beyond the my control , some primary participants were not available at College B; alternate fulltime faculty members were interviewed. The participant interviewing at all sites was accomplished in a one week period.

The interviews were transcribed and the data was assigned an associated designation code to protect the anonymity of the participant. Each participant was provided the my contact information in case they encountered any concerns or questions.

The interviews took place during normal working hours and were scheduled at the convenience of the participants. The findings and selected interview transcript excerpts are provided in chapter Four.

Summary

A multiple-case study qualitative methodology was selected to describe faculty and CAO perceptions about codes of conduct as it relates to implementation, intent, and purpose. The case sites and participants were selected after the respective North Carolina community colleges were determined to have established codes of conduct. The participants were CAO's and fulltime faculty members with a wide range of instructional experience and a variety of disciplinary backgrounds. All participants were interviewed on site at their respective colleges. College documents and publications related to codes of ethics, professional expectations, and faculty policies were reviewed. The data collected from these sources were used to build the cases.

The cases were analyzed and a coding method was developed to identify themes and patterns. Imaintained field notes and journal to keep bias in check and to monitor adherence to procedural process for replication and reliability. Validity was attended to through participant review of transcriptions and peer/colleague review.

Researcher Reflection

During the methodology phase of this project, it was stated that there were no expectations by the researcher. After the interviews had concluded and the transcription was underway, it did appear that there were some unmet expectations. It was never voiced or even realized, but it was assumed that the participants would be more active in the discussions. That

they would have strong feelings, opinions, or would just have "something to say" about the codes: that either the codes were a great idea or a perfunctory policy. It seemed that the codes simply were of no interest or that they truly weren't understood. It may have been the nature of the questions and the connection with the CAOs that caused this reticence by faculty; especially when there was such a strong connection between the codes and termination. It was these faculty opinions and perceptions that were to contribute to the "rich and thick" descriptions the researcher had hoped to collect, analyze, and share. The qualitative methodology was certainly the correct choice for this study. The face-to-face interviews revealed much more about the current perspectives at these colleges. A survey may have been adequate for incidents of misconduct, but it wouldn't have captured the expressions and the stories that were shared after the results were tallied. It would not have adequately sensed the tension and unease on the part of some of the participants.

The impact of a recorded interview was far more significant than anticipated. Most all of the participants seemed to immediately decompress with the recorder was switched to the off position. It was also at this point where the conversation flowed more freely. An in-depth case study, with extended time with faculty, could yield rich results.

Codes of ethics and misconduct can be sensitive subjects amongst faculty and academic leadership. Interviews that include topics such as racism, sexual harassment, and instructor misconduct are never taken lightly. The questions, regardless of assured confidentiality, can be cause for participants to be tentative or inhibited to provide complete thoughts.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

The study was conducted to gain an understanding of faculty and Chief Academic Officer's (CAO) perspectives regarding published codes of ethics in the North Carolina Community College System. Interviews with three CAOs and 17 other fulltime faculty at three different community colleges were analyzed to learn and extract insights and perceptions of the published codes at their respective institutions.

This chapter presents a discussion of the results obtained from the process described in chapter 3. An overview of interviews and participant information is provided as well as detailed descriptions and analyses of each question. This section presents the study results in the following sequence: description of the colleges, the codes, background and demographic information on participants, the findings related to the interview questions, and additional researcher findings. The interview results are presented separately to provide CAO and faculty perspectives on each question.

Overview

The selection of the three colleges as sites for the study was based on the following criteria: (1) the colleges were accessible and entry was possible, (2) a high probability existed to learn about people, processes, and perspectives relevant to the research questions, (3) the researcher could establish a trusting relationship with the participants and (4) data quality and credibility are reasonably assured (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Each college had a published code of ethics and the CAOs and faculty had agreed to participate in the research. The three colleges are all accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). All of the colleges are member institutions of the North Carolina Community College System created that was created in 1963.

College A

College A was established in a rural county in 1965. It is located in small town with a local population of just over 9,000 people; the county's economy is based primarily in agriculture and livestock. The college has a current enrollment of approximately 1,600 students. Its curriculum programs and offerings are standard for NCCCS institutions; its academic divisions include: college transfer, health sciences, business, and agricultural and industrial management. Some of the academic departments are very small and have only one fulltime faculty member. The CAO has over 25 years experience as an instructor and administrator in the NCCCS; he has 10 years experience in his current position. He describes his responsibilities to be "just about anything in the way of instruction." It includes supervision of all instructional personnel and programs. He was unsure as to when the Code of Ethics was actually created at his college, but the code was revived during his transition to CAO, shortly after the arrival of a new college president.

According to the preamble of the code each employee is expected to observe the code of professional and ethical practices. The code is available on the college website and is printed in the 2005 Staff Handbook. The handbook is separate from the college's policies and procedures manual. The staff handbook includes categorized information that would be similar to most any college. It includes sections on college mission, college organization, policies, and processes. The Code of Ethics is mixed in amongst sexual harassment and employee benefits. A Google search revealed that the exact same code is utilized by another NCCCS college. The preamble of the code emphasizes the expectations of all employees to work toward to mission of the college. All employees are to consider their personal behavior while working on campus as well as in the community. Its code provides twelve statements to guide employees. All of the statements begin

with commands such as: *avoid, inform, refuse,* and *support*. The first three statements address the expectation that all employees will recognize and abide by the formal organizational chain of command. This includes immediate notification and appropriate channels for grievances. The code also addresses the confidential nature of student information; it emphasizes that protected information should only be discussed with permission or within context of official college business. The code also cautions against being a rumormonger and outlines the subsequent damage such behavior can do to the college. Another statement warns against associating with groups that could bring discredit to the college. It directs employees to be clear in separating themselves from the college when expressing political or other opinions that could be perceived as controversial. The code provides straightforward guidance on issues of diversity and the acceptance of all cultures. Those same issues are also covered in another section of the policy handbook. The code states the expectations of fairness and objectivity when working with colleagues and students. It directs faculty to refuse gifts, refuse to give favors or any activity that would give the appearance of favoritism or other impropriety. The document appears to be a matter-of-fact listing of do's and don'ts for employees. The consequences for violations or the failure to comply with the code are addressed in the dismissal and disciplinary action section of the handbook.

The statements are more akin to rules and regulations rather than ethical principles. It offers no connection to the institution's role in education. There is no mention of professionalism and how it relates to the work of instruction or administration.

The CAO, Participant One, (P1) explained his perspective of the meaning and purpose of the code of ethics.

CAO (P1): Well for the faculty they understand that as long as we have something in writing we can enforce it. And from my standpoint, the president's standpoint it gives us the authority to make decisions to terminate people if we have to for violations of the code of conduct. And other than a few instances here and there they pretty much stay in line. We realize that the code of conduct has to do with what we know as far as their conduct and how it affects their personal image, excuse me their professional image and their work here at the college. What they do in their private life is their business. We try to not let one come into the other unless it does and we have had a situation where something that was going on in their private life did affect what was going on in the college and particular students. And, because we had a code of conduct we were able to terminate that faculty person with no repercussions on our part.

From his perspective, "violations of the code of ethics allow administration the authority to make decisions to terminate people." His philosophy about the college code is that it guides "their (faculty) conduct and how it affects their professional image." He summarized the basis of the code is to "ensure professionalism."

Interviews at College A were conducted in the main administration conference room between the CAO's and president's offices. The CAO greeted and introduced all faculty members prior to the research interviews. The introductions were very formal and complete. The researcher sensed the authority and perceived power of the CAO. It seemed as though the interviews were more about affirming the college's good behavior or its compliance with policies, much like an accreditation visit.

College B

College B was established in 1965 in a small town, population 3,500, on the outskirts of a large metropolitan area. The college has a current enrollment of approximately 2,500 students. Its curriculum programs, too, are standard for NCCCS institutions; its academic divisions include: college transfer, business, health sciences, and engineering technology programs. The CAO has a total of 30 years experience as an instructor and as an administrator in the University of North Carolina System and the NCCCS; he has been in his current position as CAO for 8 years. He describes his responsibilities as "anything that has to do with academics," and at his college that includes all academic programs, a radio station, a childcare center, and the college libraries. Upon appointment of his position as CAO, he began the process of developing the current code of ethics. The code was formally adopted and published in 2005. He describes himself as "a proponent of codes of ethics, and very much a proponent of a community itself developing the code of ethics." After assuming his leadership role, which, as he described, was preceded by "many years of turmoil," the first action was "to challenge the faculty senate to come up with a code of ethics." During this process, a faculty member informed him that the college did have a code of ethics, but no one knew where it could be found or what it was; no document existed to be referenced. The CAO stated: "that's how buried it was." The CAO further explains the impetus and his philosophy about the code of ethics:

CAO (P9): When I came to this college I knew that there had been many years of turmoil. I had known -- I know that very well. That there was -- there had been from previous presidents as I understand a lot of stuff came up because there wasn't a real system. We needed a hiring practice; we needed a salary system, all these things. Not a good ole boy type thing. I knew that when I came there was

54

still some difficulties in certain ways. Before I came here I knew that the first

thing that I would do was to challenge our faculty seven to come up with a code

of ethics. And the reason that I did that was that if a code of ethics works and

people pay attention to it creates a self-governing faculty and it wouldn't mean

you would-you would have a lot more self-governing and a lot less dealing with

the administration. You know, the administration saying yes, no, acting like

parents. I want folks to look at what are the principals that they want to guide

themselves by. I wanted them to think in terms of a higher moral decision making

level which ethics are higher than rules and regulations; but I also did not want to

tell them what those are. So I didn't want to bring in a code of ethics. So I

challenged the first faculty senate meeting I was in I said I would like this faculty

senate to come up with a code of ethics and for the reasons that I said. It took a

couple of years before that caught traction and when it caught traction part of the

reason why it was hard catching traction came out I think, and the faculty said

well we don't want to have a code of ethics that we have to live by and no one

else in the college will have to live by.

After months of research and discussions, the faculty decided upon a code used by an

international community college. The code can be found in the staff handbook and on the college

website. It is non-prescriptive in nature; it is a thorough five page document. Its preamble states

that it is intended to be educational and inspirational. Its purpose is to demonstrate the intended

ethical climate and to state the ethical principles and guidelines for the conduct for all

employees. It was also clear in its intent to inform the public of the standards of ethical conduct.

The code includes appendices to provide definitions and situational guidance.

The college arrived at its current code of ethics by adopting the code of conduct of another community college. It may at first seem to be a mere cut-and-paste adaption to fulfill an administrative charge by the CAO, but that is not the case. The CAO had challenged the faculty to develop a code of ethics. The faculty assembled and started the process of determining content and application of the desired code. It was during this process that staff asked to be included in the process. This committee gathered input from all points on campus through campus emails and surveys. The committee solicited ideas from faculty and staff at the college. The progress and process of the committee was communicated to the campus on a regular basis. The committee ultimately adopted the code of another college and felt that it fulfilled the requirements that they were seeking in a code of ethics. The code was adopted verbatim. The only changes made were the college name and in the context of the preamble "aspirational" was changed to "inspirational." The preamble establishes the purpose of the code; that it is to demonstrate to the college community and to the public the college's commitment to establish an ethical climate. The code instructs employees to be familiar with the code and to apply its principles to their professional conduct. It clearly separates the code as a college philosophy rather than merely an extension of rules and policies.

The principles of the code include integrity, competence, equality, and trust. The principles are provided to assist faculty and staff in interpreting the code. The principles demonstrate how the code is applied by providing examples of applied ethical principles as well as definitions and terms used within the code. The code itself is annotated to acknowledge that other professional codes may exist within various professions and disciplines on campus and that the institutional code does not supersede those codes.

College B's CAO (P9) states that he has "leaned upon the code of ethics as part of that definition of professionalism. If it is unethical, it is unprofessional." He does feel that the code had a vibrant start, but recently it has become more dormant.

Interviews with the CAO and faculty members at College B occurred in each faculty member's office. There was no formal introduction to faculty by the CAO or other faculty supervisors. The researcher worked directly with the faculty participants.

College C

College C was established in a rural area in 1968. It exists in a town with a local population of about 11,000; the college has a current enrollment of approximately 3,500 students. Its curriculum programs are standard for NCCCS institutions; its academic divisions include: college transfer, health sciences, business, and industrial technology. It has unique curriculum specialty programs in biotechnology and dental hygiene. The college employs approximately 75 fulltime instructors and 75 adjunct members. The CAO has 15 years experience as an instructor and administrator in the NCCCS; he has 4 years experience in his current leadership role. In his position, Vice President of Instruction, he oversees all areas of curriculum and continuing education; this includes distance learning, library services, and the Early College. When he first assumed the CAO position, he stated: "I looked at the handbook and all of the policies, because of being the newbie on the block, one of the first things you wanted to do was to know what the policies are. What I realized is that we did not have a code of ethics."

He added that there was also "quite a push from the State (System Office) that administrative personnel at the college needed to follow codes of ethics." He states that he

personally "spearheaded the effort" to create the college code of ethics. When he was asked to describe what he thought was the purpose and function of the code, he stated:

> CAO (P14): When I first came onboard, one of the first things I did was… We were four years out from having SACS accreditation and so, one of the first things I did was look at the handbook and all of the policies, because being a newbie on the block, one of the first things you wanted to do was to know what the policies are. When you had to implement and follow them, I wanted to make sure I knew that they were. What I realized is that we did not have a code of ethics. So, one of the things that I began to do, in collaboration with our president, we talked about that, and at the same time there was quite a push from the state that especially administrative personnel at the college needed to follow codes of ethics. I think… it is just a set of standards that we should reflect on… when we are making leadership decisions. It is one of the frames that you look through, as you are making educational leadership decisions. I think I had issues mainly with how we were doing business. I did not think it was fair, and when fairness plays comes into play, I think that that is where you begin to look for something to guide you. And so when certain people were getting special treatment, just because of their standing in the community or their position at the college that troubled me, and I did not think I could make good decisions, based on that because I did not know the people. No one knew anything, so I needed a way to make a good decision and still follow the policy.

The code was developed primarily by the CAO with the assistance from the other vice-presidents. It was adopted in 2006. Its preamble sets forth a statement to reflect the college's intention to conduct its business fairly and ethically. The code is available online at the college website and it is also published in the employee handbook. The code is part of many policies and

statements in the information section of the handbook. It is listed along with topics such as: sexual harassment, drug-free workplace, and the communicable disease policy. It is arranged into five concise sections, those sections being behavior, respect, judgment, use of college property, and diversity. The Code of Ethics itself is very brief; of the five statements, four are directed toward employee behavior. There are three statements that are broad proclamations about (1) working with integrity, (2) respect for others, and (3) using good judgment. Another statement directly addresses personal use of college equipment by employees. That statement was a response to a specific ongoing issue that was considered unethical. According to the CAO, it seemed that certain people were having their cars repaired by automotive students. That in and of itself is not illegal, but the manner in which whose vehicles were selected was perceived as unfair. The final statement addresses the college's general commitment diversity in selection and promotion. From the CAO's perspective, the code is a reference source for decision making and a statement of how the college "was doing business."

Interviews at College C were conducted in the main administration conference room next to the CAO's office. Most all participants interacted with the CAO prior to their interviews. It was apparent that the participants had spoken with the CAO about the interviews prior to meeting with the researcher. These conversations could be partially overheard by the researcher. Some of the participants had chatted with the CAO and they shared interview related information about the CAO and her responses.

<div align="center">Findings: CAO Responses</div>

This section presents findings of each interview question as answered by CAOs and faculty members. The summaries are intended to give a better understanding of the findings as

related to the groups and institutional sub-groups. The participants are grouped collectively into two groups: the CAOs and the Faculty.

Question 1: Interview Question One gathered information about the participants' roles and positions at the colleges. Those data are provided in the Overview for the CAOs and the faculty.

Question 2: Does your college have code of ethics? All CAOs affirmed that their institution did have a code of ethics.

Question 2.B: What is the purpose or intent of the code? Two of the CAOs believed that the codes were established to set standards of conduct and to guide and assist administrative decision-making. CAO (P1) claimed that it was a written standard to reinforce or provide a basis for employee termination, but also that it was to "ensure professionalism." CAO (P9) provided that the code would contribute to faculty self-governance; it was beyond rules and regulations and would allow faculty to view administration as not so paternalistic, but that it could empower faculty in their professional capacities. CAO (P14) describes the code as a set of standards to reflect on when making leadership decisions.

Question 2.C: How did you learn about the code? All three CAOs had different responses. They were all involved in the establishment, formulation, or revival of their respective codes. It was during those processes that they became personally aware of the codes. At College A, the CAO revived the code as part of his new role as CAO; this was primarily in response to faculty/personnel issues at the college. At College B, the CAO learned of the Code of Ethics along with the faculty committee as it was being developed and adopted. At College C, the CAO was the primary creator of the code.

Participant P9: There may have been one a couple of years before this that nobody

knew about. There did not appear to be a code of ethics. We started from scratch,

even if there was one before, people did not realize (it) was there.

Participant P14: We did not have a code of ethics. So one of the things that I

began to do, in collaboration with or president…I sort of spearheaded the effort in

the fact that we did not have one (a code of ethics), and felt that we needed

something written, in place, that would help frame our decision making.

Question 2.D. Where would I find the code of ethics? All CAOs responded that the code

could be found on the college website or in the staff/faculty handbook. CAO, P14, stated that he

was unsure whether or not the code was part of the faculty handbook. CAO, P9, stated that it was

also part of the part-time faculty handbook.

Question 3. Awareness of Incidents of Faculty Misconduct: During your experience with

the college, are you aware of faculty incidents of: sexual harassment, faculty cheating, improper

grading or grade changes, improper relationships, false credentials or deceptions in experience,

or teaching misconduct to include: improper planning, early dismissals, favoritism, racism, or

gender biases? The Table 1 indicates awareness of incidents of faculty misconduct. The most

common response observed was violations of classroom and lecture time or not complying with

scheduled hours of class duration. These violations would include early dismissals or class

cancellations at the convenience of the instructor; eleven, 65%, of the faculty members were

aware of occurrences. All of the CAOs were aware of instances of abuse of classroom

instructional time. This is a regularly audited item and violations are considered serious

infractions that can ultimately affect community college budgets. Nearly half, 48%, of the faculty

were aware of improper planning and inadequate preparation for instruction or coursework. All

Table 1

CAO and Faculty Awareness of Faculty Misconduct by Type of Infraction

Participants	Sexual Harassment	Ignoring Cheating	Grade Changes	Improper Relationships	False Credentials	Improper Planning	Time Violations	Favoritism	Racism	Gender Bias
CAO	67%	0	0	100%	67%	100%	100%	100%	33%	33%
Faculty	41%	6%	6%	35%	29%	48%	65%	18%	18%	35%

of the CAOs were aware of such transgressions by faculty. Amongst faculty, 35% were aware of incidents of improper relationships by other instructors. All of the CAOs were aware of occurrences of improper relationships by faculty at the college. Two of the three CAOs were aware of incidents of sexual harassment and the use of false or deceptive credentials by faculty. Only seven faculty members (41%) were aware of actual sexual harassment on campus. Five (30%) of the faculty were aware that other faculty had attempted to use deceptive or false credentials. The responses to questions of misconduct were generally straightforward as a yes or no answer.

Table 1 provides a complete summary of participant responses to questions about misconduct by faculty.

Question 4. How are the codes used by the college? The responses varied greatly to this question. CAO (P1) emphasized that it is a document for dismissal and used primarily to "keep the college out of court." According to CAO (P1), "Well for the faculty, as long as they understand that we have something in writing, we can enforce it." The code has been effectively used as a procedural policy tool in personnel actions, particularly employee dismissals. The code provides clear cut standards and expectations of conduct.

CAO (P1): Since we've (president and CAO) been here, we've cleaned, because we did this to set an example. We did it because they were guilty, because they said okay, I did this, I understand. It's because we had that code of conduct that helped us to enforce and gave us the documentation authority we need to dismiss them without any repercussions. We had some ugly things, but it did not take long to clean it.

CAO (P9)'s perception of its use was as a source to build relationships between faculty and administration. He believed the code could actually enhance self-governance and assist in gray-area decision making for faculty rather than the traditionally strict oversight and outright approval of administration.

> Participant (P9): I wanted them to think at a higher moral decision making level in which ethics are higher than just rules and regulations. We don't have to mess with Draconian rules that have to be put out all the time by administrators and then you get into the us versus them mentality.

CAO (P14) stated: "it (the code) is probably non-existent. I will be surprised if faculty even know that it exists. So, I do not think that it is used regularly."

Question 5. How is the code learned and reviewed by the college? The CAO responses offered a variety of perspectives. CAO (P1) stated that it had not been reviewed and that there was no reason to do so, but if there were a need that they would certainly consider revising the code. He added "We've never had to reinforce it…people just know what's accepted." CAO (P9) revealed that he felt that due to its relative newness, it had not been emphasized, but he was planning to begin to emphasize it along with the college mission, vision, and values statement. The code of ethics will be included with marketing and publicity of the college statements in an upcoming awareness campaign.

> CAO (P9): We have not done a great job of acculturating folks with that code of ethics as they come into the institution. That became very apparent in the last few weeks when there were some things going on with the faculty senate and stuff that to me was apparent that they were not aware of our code of ethics. I don't think that it has been emphasized. We're getting closer to doing something like that.

Faculty sometimes get very little orientation. They get here and they don't even

have time to put their syllabus together.

CAO (P14) stated that his college code had never been reviewed or relearned in

anyway by the college or faculty, but stated enthusiastically: "It will be!" In fact, he

stated that upon reflection, during the interview, that it would be included in upcoming

staff and faculty development training.

Question 6: Does a professional code or other disciplinary code exist for your

department or specialty? Two of the three CAOs stated that there was no other code that

influenced them or came into their leadership positions. CAO (P14) did state that he was familiar

with a professional association code that "he had always followed" and provided good guidance

for him. It is described as "guidelines for responsible behavior and a common basis for resolving

ethical dilemmas" (www.nayec.org). He also stated that he "looks at" the Code of Ethics for the

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC); the AACC code is designated for

college presidents and CEOs.

<center>Faculty Responses</center>

Seventeen faculty members participated in the interviews. The fulltime faculty members

represented a variety of academic backgrounds and subject specialties. The ages of the

instructors ranged from 32 to 72; nine of the faculty were 50 years or older. There were 9 female

and 8 male faculty. Amongst the group, there was one African American, and one Asian

American. Two faculty members had doctoral degrees, 13 have master's degrees, and two had

bachelor's degrees. Their experience in teaching ranged from 4 to 30 years. The average

experience level was 14.7 years.

Question 2: Does your college have code of ethics? Most (88%) of the faculty members indicated that their college did indeed have a code of ethics. Two faculty members had negative responses (P17, P19). However, before audio recording started, during the pre-interview process to discuss the interview protocol and participant consent, five other faculty (P2, P4, P10, P12, P15) disclosed that they were unsure whether or not their college had a code. Those responses were recorded in the researcher's field notes.

Question 2.B: What is the purpose or intent of the code? Most (88%) faculty members stated that the purpose of the codes was to provide guidelines and standards of conduct. There was a wide range of interpretation of the perceived application of the codes. The responses ranged from the enforcement of employee dress codes or to avoid public embarrassment to the delineation of activities and philosophies to guide instructors. Five faculty members did emphasize or imply that there was a punitive or deterrent element of the code:

Participant P2: I think the code serves two major purposes. One is a reminder whenever it's brought to our attention that there is such a thing as professional ethics and it's something we should be mindful of. And the second purpose it serves is that when we need it as a base text, and almost a legal text, if you will, for definitions of behavior when someone needs to be corrected.

Participant P10: I think that our code of ethics is just a statement that says things I should not be doing anyway, you know, and I think the sad part of the code of ethics is that some people don't know that they should not be doing that, and it kind of gives them a contract.

Participant P12: Interesting, in the light of thinking that we all assumed that we would be professionals, I could see it being used as a standard by which if

someone has behaved unethically, it could be used to catch and punish them. I am

not exactly sure exactly except, I guess to define a standard of professional

behavior.

Participant C-6: To keep us in line with our students and the image we portray to

the community.

Participant C-7: It is also a reason to give the college leverage that if you ever do

anything bad, they can "can your butt" And let's face it that is a big part of it. It

gives them grounds to punish you accordingly.

Question 2.C: How did you learn about the code? Most (82%) of the faculty members

stated that they learned of the codes through employee orientation or through a personal review

of the staff or faculty handbook. Two faculty members (P2, P19) were unsure or had not seen

the code. Another (P8) discovered the code while doing an assignment for a doctoral class in

higher education administration.

Participant P19: I really have not seen the code of ethics here. I just feel like for

sure they have one. I mean we are a business institution.

Participant P4: We were given this along with many other forms and information

upon hiring.

Participant P15: It is in the faculty handbook and I remember reading it when I

first got here, but I haven't read it since.

Participant P8: How did I learn? Because of the education classes I'm taking. One

of the courses dealt with ethics and I had to research it and so therefore I started

with the school here.

Question 2.D. Where would I find the code of ethics? Nearly all of the faculty members believed that the code of ethics could be found on the college website on in the faculty/staff handbook. One faculty member (A-5) stated early in interview that "it is probably on file in the president's office, but I am almost 100% certain it is on file somewhere in the library." Later in the interview he added "it may be in the library, but the chances of anybody knowing where to look to find it are slim."

Question 3. Awareness of Incidents of Faculty Misconduct. The most common response observed was violations of classroom and lecture time or not complying with scheduled hours of instruction. These violations would include non-adherence to published class times at the convenience of the instructor; eleven, 65%, of the faculty members were aware of occurrences. Again, this is a standard audit item and failure to comply can negatively affect the college budget. Nearly half, 48%, of the faculty were aware of improper planning and inadequate preparation for instruction or coursework. Amongst faculty, 35% were aware of incidents of improper relationships by other instructors. Two of the three CAOs were aware of incidents of sexual harassment and the use of false or deceptive credentials by faculty. Only seven faculty members (41%) were aware of actual sexual harassment on campus. Five of the faculty (30%) were aware that other faculty had attempted to use deceptive or false credentials. The responses to questions of misconduct were straightforward as a yes or no answer.

Participant P20 did provide commentary and perspective as a male instructor in response to gender and harassment issues: "I mean... you would not believe how often a male teacher is flirted with. I mean, I'm not saying that they throw it at you, but they flirt thinking it is going to help. Girls like to flirt."

Question 4. How are the codes used by the college? The most popular response from faculty was that the code is used as a response tool after an incident or issue occurs. It is perceived by seven faculty (P3, P5, P7, P8, P10, P12, P13) to be used as an administrative procedural guide. Faculty members used phrases to describe this perspective: "when there's a problem, out comes the handbook" (P3) or "if someone is accused, there is a specific procedure" (P8). Participant P3 noted, "It has been very cyclical, whenever something that falls within that code of ethics seems pressing, we hear about it and then it kind of goes away."

> Participant (P5): Well as part of the policy they actually come from, if you decide to deviate from the policy for any means, there are a set of rules and policies that you must follow, and if you deviate from those policies for any means, there is a set of actions.

> Participant (P15): I mean you would need something in documentation so that you on an administrative side of a point, you could talk to a faculty member that might be breaking some rules, but they might not think they are breaking them, but you could say well in our ethics, this is what we have written, and you cannot do that. So, it would give it a little bit more of a legalese to it. They would have a reason to say, you can't do it because it is written down, instead of just saying it is an opinion that you should not do it. It is not an opinion anymore, if you write it down. You have some grounding work written down that you can just point to all of your employees. This is how we are all going to behave. No one is going to be treated differently. And if it is not in the code of ethics, then you really cannot say too much to the faculty member, other than giving them suggestions.

Three faculty members (P2, P4, P6) felt that it was implemented primarily for orientation to the institution and that it is "a description of what we try to be" or "to inform candidates (prospective employees) of what is expected."

Four faculty members (P15, P16, P19, P20) expressed their perspectives about the negative connotations of the codes and usage by the college.

Participant (P16): I actually lost a faculty member this year because of the code of conduct. I actually fought to keep that faculty member. He was a very good faculty and I thoroughly enjoyed having him on staff. It has kind of left me, this year, thinking that the code of conduct can be used more in the negative way than it can in a positive way. It can be used to find a way to get rid of somebody. That is how I experienced it.

Participant (P15): We had one teacher. He would put very political stuff on his door about abortion, the election, and Barack Obama; the administration would constantly tell him that is against state rules. Eventually, he got let go because he wouldn't stop. The codes are used as a leverage to get people to stop.

Other single faculty perspectives (P17, P18) included responses that it "is not ever used", or that it was just "posted on the web", or that it was simply a faculty senate document (P11).

Though the faculty did not consistently align in the perceived uses of the codes, most of the faculty, 94%, felt the code was integral to the duties of the instructor.

Participant (P5): I think it's absolutely vital…it's part of our job to make sure policy is just absolutely crucial. Without proper policy and procedure, you have basically anarchy.

70

Participant (P20): Absolutely, you know, I mean you think about it, this is a job

where there has to be an air of respect. These students have to respect you at least

to some amount, and if you are not conducting yourself in such a manner, they are

just not going to.

Question 5. How is the code learned and reviewed by the college? Most faculty (80%)

responded that it was not reviewed or relearned at any time by faculty. The responses were

concisely stated: "No, I do not recall" (P16) or "I don't remember a time" (P2). A few within the

category did add some commentary to the negative response: "…Step out of bounds, and you

will learn it" (P6) ; "if somebody stepped out of bounds, they would be guided to it" (P8) and

"no, we did have (a policy review) after the incident with sexual harassment" (P10). Two of the

faculty members (P4, P5) stated that it was done only during the hiring process or orientation,

"when hired…as long as you're holding up your end of the professionalism bargain, you'll never

hear anything about it" (P5). Two other faculty (P7, P12) provided that codes were reviewed in

meetings, one was more jaded than the other, "Probably one of those oh-my-gosh here we go

again another meeting for an hour and a half" (P12).

Question 6: Does a professional code or other disciplinary code exist for your

department or specialty? Those faculty members involved in health related curriculum all

responded positively to this query. Four of the faculty (P4, P13, P18, P19) had strong affiliations

with other groups: American Nurses Association (ANA), American Health Information

Management Association (AHIMA) and that it "was directly related to the profession" (P18);

participant P18 even provided, at the interview, a copy of the AHIMA Code of Ethics.

None of the other faculty members associated with professional codes. Two faculty (P8,

P17) did disclose that they had learned professional ethical conduct, that they now incorporate in

71

their role as an instructor, from previous employers. One had worked with an international

production conglomerate and the other had worked as a local building contractor. The participant

who worked with the conglomerate added that the company had a published code of ethics and

that it was reviewed by employees every year.

<center>Comparisons and Analysis of Secondary Research Questions</center>

The secondary research questions support the response to the primary research question

to determine how CAOs' and faculty perceptions compare.

Secondary Research Question 1

Are CAOs and faculty aware of institutional codes of faculty conduct? The overall

finding of the research is that all faculty and CAOs indicated that they were aware of the

published code of ethics at their institution. The CAOs all possessed an acute awareness of their

codes of ethics. Each had been closely involved with the code early in their leadership roles at

their respective colleges. Each had distinctly different experiences with the codes, but all were

well aware of the purposes and uses by the college.

It is significant that seven of the 17 faculty members did share that they were unsure of

the existence of a code at their institution either before or after the formal interview. The lack of

awareness existed at all college sites; participants who were unsure were veteran instructors who

had an average college work experience of 14 years.

The faculty members continued answering the interview questions assuming that the

college did have a code, but the faculty members spoke in general terms rather than with a

convincingly familiar approach and understanding of the codes. The responses deviated and

addressed issues understood, assumed, or perceived to be within the code, such as student

misconduct, classroom management, or dress codes.

<center>72</center>

Secondary Research Question 2

　　Do CAOs and faculty differ in awareness of incidents of misconduct of faculty?
Both the CAOs and the faculty members did seem to be aware of misconduct by faculty. The
CAOs possess a greater awareness of incidents and types of misconduct. The CAOs had
collectively a 63% positive response rate to the questions of specific misconduct in comparison
to the collective response of faculty at 28%.

Secondary Research Question 3

　　Do CAOs and faculty differ in awareness and perception of how codes are used by the
college? As a group, the faculty participants were consistent in the belief that the codes' purpose
is to serve as guidelines or standards for expected professional conduct, though the degree to
which the standards were emphasized and implied varied. Some faculty felt the codes were used
as guidelines for "working with everybody" (P8) to serves as a "reference in dilemmas…of an
ethical nature" (P13) to "how to conduct yourself to avoid public embarrassment" (P20). When
referring to how the codes were used by the college some felt that it was reactive and used as an
administrative policy response tool. It is seen as an enforcement procedure or as a deterrence
policy to assure standards of conduct.

　　The CAOs all had different perspectives and philosophies regarding their codes of ethics.
CAO P1's responses were consistent and aligned with the faculty's perspective. It was a tool to
ensure professionalism and to terminate employees who did not comply. CAO P9 envisioned
greater applicability of the codes in enhancing the professionalism of the faculty. The code that
was developed is intended to help guide faculty in decision-making without being too
proscriptive with policy, regulations, or enforcement. His belief was that there was more that a
faculty member could do with professional codes rather than restrictions and boundaries that

limit the professional capacity of the instructor. The code is not about defining right and wrong conduct and behavior; it is about guidance in the areas that are often encountered, but not clearly defined. CAO P14 stated that the code is intended for administrative decision–making for campus leadership. Although the code had been in existence for over three years, it did not yet have applicability to the entire campus community.

Secondary Research Question 4

 Do CAOs and faculty differ in how the codes are learned by faculty? All of the CAOs were consistent in their responses to how the faculty were oriented and updated on the code of ethics; the code was learned at orientation or through reading the faculty handbook, but that it was never revisited as a working document or policy. Two of the CAOs (P9, P14) recognized this shortcoming in this code review and inculcation for the faculty.

 The faculty members, too, agreed that an introduction to the code was covered at some point in the orientation process. None of the faculty revealed any sort of detail of this orientation to the code. From their responses, it seems that there was a very cursory introduction or that it was not a priority item for orientation. Most were told to read it in the faculty handbook or that they were responsible for the contents of the handbook. Most of the faculty concurred with the CAOs on the question of the code being relearned. There seems to be no review, update, or discussions about the published code of ethics.

Secondary Research Question 5

 Is faculty conduct primarily guided by institutional code or by professional/disciplinary codes? The CAO had no other disciplinary or professional code by which they primarily abide. Only one of the CAOs was influenced by another code, but it did not supersede the college code of ethics.

Amongst the faculty, the perspective was similar for most, but faculty in health science professions were quick to identify with their respective codes. Their health professional codes were considered, at a minimum, to be equal or more important than the college code. Their affiliation with health science professional organizations and adherence to the code was important. According to Participant P13, "that is what we are and what we do." According to the interviews, professional codes are frequently featured in publications and are often topics of discussion between colleagues.

Researcher Observation

There were great inconsistencies within the faculty at the different colleges. It seemed that very few had any real familiarity with their respective codes of ethics. Their statements about the codes did not align with the published codes. Only those participants (P9, P11, P13) involved in the process of creating or developing the code seemed to truly know the code. Participant P11 precisely demonstrated his knowledge with this statement: "it pretty much delineates those activities and philosophies that help to guide us as instructors in making decisions regarding our contacts with students and administration and the outside world."

Some of the participants' statements when asked about the code were straightforward in demonstrating this lack of faculty familiarity: "So many of us just assume that we know what ethical behavior is as instructors in a college, I've never read it. I don't know of any others that have studied or read it" (P12); "I would have to look it up" (P3); or "I have not seen the code of ethics here" (P19); or "I probably skimmed through it nine or ten years ago". Note that the code has only existed for six years. Other faculty members provided responses about the perceived code that did not reflect the published code: "I think the function is to make sure that you can conduct classes in an orderly fashion" (P7); "If I had to write up an employee, I would use this as

a reference" (P13); and "Our code of ethics guides us spiritually, professionally, and personally"
(P18).

Within each college the faculty perceptions of the code aligned with the philosophy and
beliefs of the CAOs. In the case of College A, the CAO placed great emphasis on the code as a
tool to keep faculty inline. It is the proverbial line not to be crossed. That message about the code
was crystal clear for faculty. Faculty members were well aware of the consequences of the
CAO's interpretation, and subsequent implementation, of the code of ethics. In the case of
College B, he had made a genuine attempt to be inclusive of all faculty in the creation and
adaptation of the code. Those faculty who actively participated in or followed its creation, had a
similar interpretations and understandings of the code that matched the CAO's philosophy. The
CAO of College C was well aware of the limited effort that had been placed in orientating
faculty about the code. College C's faculty perceptions of the code were inconsistent and
validated the CAO's realization about how the code was promulgated.

Summary

This chapter presented the findings learned during participant interviews. The chapter
provides an overview of the three colleges to provide the reader with a better feeling for the
environments and situations of the interviews and institutions. The findings are organized
sequentially with the interview questions followed by the comparisons between the CAOs and
faculty according to the secondary research questions. The findings are supported by direct
quotations from the participants to provide the best representation of the actual responses and
perceptions.

The first finding of this study is that all CAOs were aware and most faculty indicated that
they were aware that their institution had a code of ethics. This finding is based on a 100%

positive response rate to the question. It also revealed that there may be a significant number of faculty who are not aware of the codes. Seven of the faculty that answered that the college did have a code confided that they were unsure and did not know whether or not one actually existed.

The second finding of this study is that most agreed that the codes were established to provide guidelines and standards for faculty conduct. These guidelines were interpreted or perceived differently as directives for faculty dress code or a standard for prohibited behavior and grounds for dismissal. There was a wide range of interpretation in the intent, purpose, and institutional usage of the code.

The third finding of this study is that there is a consensus amongst all of the participants that the code of ethics is not reviewed or relearned during professional development or faculty training days. This finding is significant in that it was recognized as a weakness by two of the three CAOs and that the code would be addressed in future training sessions and would be promulgated through campus marketing along with mission and vision statements.

The fourth finding of this study is that the CAOs had all learned about the code through its creation or revitalization. It was a significant part of the CAOs' initial work upon assuming the leadership role at the college. The majority of the faculty learned of the code through employee orientation. There was little emphasis placed upon the learning, explaining, or discussing code during the orientation process. All agreed that it could be found in the handbook or on the college web site.

The fifth finding of this study is that all participants were aware of some sort of faculty misconduct. Improper lecture planning and early dismissals or canceled classes were cited as the most frequently observed for all participants. The most significant difference in observed

misconduct was improper relationships, all of the CAOs were aware of improper relationships between faculty and students. Only 35% of the faculty members were aware of such relationships. Faculty members were more aware of faculty biases based upon gender; seven faculty members were aware of biases versus only one of the CAOs.

The sixth finding of this study is that the faculty in health science professions readily identify themselves with their respective professional or organizational codes such as ANA or AHIMA. These codes are part of the daily operations of the professions and are highly regarded by the faculty members. Instructors within the industrial technology disciplines all had previous work experience in industry and provided in the interview that they transitioned to teaching with a strong ethical culture that was developed in previous work experiences.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of North Carolina Community College System CAOs' and faculty perspectives regarding published codes of ethics. To accomplish this, qualitative methodology was used to obtain an in-depth understanding of those perspectives. The study sought to discover, learn, and compare CAO and faculty perspectives. The study sought to hear and capture the voices of those community college leaders and faculty working in environments where published codes of ethics exist. The results of this study may be beneficial to academic leaders who are considering adopting a college code of ethics.

This chapter provides background information, discussion, and conclusions relevant to all of the secondary research questions and findings and presents recommendations for practitioners. In the NCCCS, codes of ethics are not required, but of the 59 colleges, 11 have adopted and published codes. This research provides faculty and CAO perceptions about these published codes.

The study itself was guided by five secondary research questions:

1. Are faculty and CAOs aware of institutional codes of faculty conduct?

2. Do CAOs and faculty differ in awareness of incidents of misconduct?

3. Do CAOs and faculty differ in awareness and perception of how codes are used by the college?

4. Do CAOs and faculty differ in how the codes of ethics are learned by faculty?

5. Is faculty conduct primarily guided by institutional code or by professional/discipline code?

Due to the boundaries of the study, it may have limited transferability to other contexts, but it may have relevant transferability to community colleges. Merriam (1997) suggests that the transferability and applicability is primarily on the part of the reader rather than the researcher. This study attempted to provide the reader with enough detail and description to allow the reader to determine to that fit.

Superficial Awareness of the Code

The first finding of this study is that all CAOs were aware and most faculty indicated that they were aware that their institution had a code of ethics. This finding is based on a 100% positive response rate to the question. But it also revealed that there may be a significant number of faculty who were not aware of the codes. Seven faculty members, who answered that their college did have a code, confided outside the formal interview, that they were unsure and did not know whether or not one actually existed.

Though a majority of the participants indicated that they were aware that a code existed, the inconsistencies in their responses and the disclosure by the seven faculty members demonstrates uncertainty; they were truly unsure about the codes. The seven instructors, who confided this before or after the interview, continued along with the interview and answered the questions as if they knew. It was only through their veracity that their uncertainty was revealed. Their answers did not align with the codes; the responses were generic or completely off target relative to the published code. These inconsistent and non-aligning responses were similar to other faculty who stated that they were aware. It can be interpreted that others may have been guessing or using general knowledge about codes in the interview. Beyond awareness, the participants' responses revealed that only a few of the faculty demonstrated, in a convincing manner, that they were familiar with their respective code and its purpose. This unfamiliarity and

apparent lack of internalization can be interpreted to mean that the codes simply were not a priority or are of lesser importance for most faculty. Rezaee et al. (2001) experienced similar encounters and presumed "…the sensitive aspect of codes of ethical conduct and behavior may have inhibited some respondents from answering truthfully" (p. 179). It also indicates that there may be little emphasis placed on understanding the code and its purpose.

It can be concluded that a vague and superficial awareness may exist regarding codes. It appears that this presumption of awareness by faculty could render the code to be a less effective as a standard or guide. A fundamental understanding of the codes should be clear, especially if academic leadership assumes that awareness on the part of faculty is complete. Establishing codes of ethics can be a good step towards creating an ethical environment, but that step is hollow if the code is not completely understood. Without true internalization of the code, it does not really stand a chance to evolve as part of the faculty or college culture. Faculty merely knowing or believing that there is a code of ethics is not adequate (Birch et al., 1999; Davis, 2008).

Adopting a code may be a significant step towards establishing an ethical environment, but simply publishing or adopting a code does not guarantee understanding or adherence. To be effective, it must be known. Davis (2008) emphasized this point about code adoption: "adopting the code is only the first step…the group should already be thinking about how to disseminate the code" (p. 56). Cleek and Leonard's (1998) conclusions were similar and reflect the reasons that could explain this uncertainty by faculty: "Codes are not well written, communicated, or enforced. Therefore given these negative factors codes cannot be effective" (p. 627). Cleek makes the pragmatic recommendation: "develop codes that are widely communicated" (p. 628). Two of the three CAOs recognized communication and awareness as an area for improvement

for their institutional codes of ethics. Without effective communication and awareness, the code will never reach or affect the intended audience. Only one of the CAOs seemed to completely understand his college code. This familiarity was evidenced by his extended discussion about the philosophy and intent of the code. He knew its evolution, its intended purpose, and was even aware of its shortcomings relative to faculty inculcation.

The CAOs also assumed that faculty members were receiving information about the codes of ethics during employee orientation. Two of the CAOs realized the weakness in this assumption. One CAO realized that the codes had not been formally shared with faculty and the other CAO was aware that faculty members were not perusing the handbooks. This situation is especially true for adjunct faculty members who are often hired at the last minute and receive very little, if any, formal orientation. Outcalt's (2002b) observation was on target regarding orientation sessions for faculty: "just over half of the adjunct faculty will have access to formal orientation programs; these programs tend to be episodic at best and ineffectual at worst" (p. 106). The faculty participants in this study had similar impressions about the orientation process and the introduction to the codes. This study suggests that an effective orientation process is essential to fully understanding the code of ethics.

<div align="center">Recommendation 1</div>

It is recommended that campus leaders, who have made the decision to adopt and publish a code, recognize that there is significant and essential work to do prior to and after publishing the codes. Beyond awareness, it is important that faculty know the code and its viability and applicability to their work and role as faculty. Two of the colleges in this study specifically stated the desire to foster an ethical climate or environment. To achieve this, the dissemination of the code, its philosophy and purpose, must go beyond simply publishing. This can be

accomplished through substantive faculty orientations, departmental meetings, or being referenced to in intra-campus publications and marketing similar to College B's proposed plan.

<div align="center">Codes of Ethics: Creation, Integration, and Culture</div>

The second finding of this study is that the CAOs had all engaged or reengaged with the code, early in their tenure, through its creation or revitalization. It was a significant part of the CAOs initial work upon assuming the leadership role at the college. Just as Callahan (1982) had implied, the codes were a response to external or internal pressures such as "pressure from the system office" or "years of turmoil" (P9, P14). The codes were established to change conditions. That is how the CAOs first became involved and acquainted with the codes, or least that is what sparked their rebirth. All of the CAOs felt that it was important to establish the codes, but they were admittedly incomplete in their follow-through with efforts to make it part of the culture. From the findings and perceptions of the CAOs, it indicated that the initial steps were positive, but when they are compared to faculty perceptions, the initiative was incomplete.

There was no perceived legitimacy of the codes by most faculty. To enhance or improve this perception, Braxton and Mann (2004) recommended including faculty senate in a ratification process; the "legitimacy of a code depends on appropriate approval" (p. 51). Of the three CAOs, only one included faculty, and it was only at that campus that there was some perceived legitimacy of the code by faculty. Those who were involved in the process of development were well aware of the code, others not involved seemed to have very little understanding. Many faculty participants regarded the codes as perfunctory.

Academic leaders considering establishing codes of ethics should carefully consider the spirit and intent of a code. Codes are different than rules or policies. If the desire is to prevent or prohibit certain types of conduct, it can be clearly stated in policies and rules. To foster an ethical

culture, the creation of codes of ethics is an essential step, but if the code does not become internalized or is not woven into the culture of the college, the essence is lost. A code of ethics is not restrictive, but rather it is a guide and a statement of institutional values. Codes cannot provide for every situation, but they allow room for judgment. To employ a code of ethics as a set of rules is to miss the point. Codes of ethics can be viable. Campus leadership will have a key role in bringing the code to life and integrating it into the culture of the college. Codes of ethics can be effective if they have the daily support of top-level leadership (Fimbel & Burstein, 1990). Discussing ethics in academe, Vaughan (1992) emphasizes "community college leaders have the primary responsibility for creating a climate in which faculty and staff speak and act ethically" (p. 102).

Recommendation 2

It is recommended that leadership include key stakeholders in the development of a code. The results and findings of this study indicate that there is uncertainty and that the codes are not part of the campus culture. This can be attributed to leadership not being inclusive of those affected. And during the creation process, leadership should communicate actions and ideas of the group to keep other faculty members informed. Lack of participation and consensus by faculty in the process is a major consideration in assuring effectiveness of codes (Rezaee et al., 2001). Davis (2008) suggests utilizing wide consultation and focus groups based on the reasoning that a community is much more likely to accept a code it develops.

Revisit, Review, Revise

The third finding of this study is that there is a consensus amongst all of the participants that the codes of ethics were not reviewed or relearned during professional development sessions, faculty training days, through committees, or at any time. This finding is significant in

that it did not seem important to most faculty, but it was recognized as a weakness by two of the three CAOs. Those CAOs remarked during the interview, that the institutional code would be addressed in future training sessions.

Recommendation 3

It is recommended that if college leadership has taken the step to adopt a code of ethics, then there should be a continual effort to inculcate the faculty to that code. The code should be introduced at orientation and should also be regularly revisited and assessed to determine its relevance and applicability. Callahan (1982) recognized this aspect and suggests that faculty spend a significant time reviewing the code very two years. Modifications, scenarios, and enforcement could be discussed (Campbell, 2001). Reviews of this type could keep the code alive and may prevent it from becoming just another policy in a dusty faculty binder.

Understanding Application of the Codes of Ethics

The fourth finding of this study is that most participants, CAOs and faculty, all agreed that the codes were established to provide guidelines and standards for faculty conduct. These guidelines were widely interpreted by faculty to be directives and rules such as faculty dress code, classroom management, or a standard for prohibited behavior and grounds for termination of employment. There was a vast and inconsistent range of interpretation in the intent, purpose, and institutional usage of the code. Most felt that the codes were used as a reactionary administrative policy response tools rather than professional or ethical principles. It was perceived by most faculty members as either an enforcement or a deterrent policy.

CAOs knew the codes and to a varying degree they understood how the code is perceived by faculty. The first CAO's (P1) understanding and expectation was that the faculty members know that there is a code and noncompliance with the code could result in the loss of

employment. To him, it was more restrictive, it was there as a standard to affect conduct, a deterrent, failure to comply would result in termination. Knight and Auster (1999) alluded to this application of codes: "…and administration is not entirely loath to take up cudgels against those who they believe have acted unethically" (p. 207). In this case, the true value and purpose of the code was displaced, but its effect as a managerial tool was crystal clear. For the same CAO, the code existed to keep the college out of court. It was the documentation and basis for termination without legal retribution. Adams et al. (2001) described this usage of the code as a perceived legal tool to protect the organization and to avoid court. Carr (n.d.) precisely described it as "how-to-avoid-getting-sued" program; a degeneration of the intended purpose of the code (p. 6).

Recommendation 4

It is recommended that the code of ethics be supported, endorsed, and implemented by campus leadership as it is stated in the preamble. It should be clear and consistent with the spirit, philosophy, and underlying ideals of the code. Campus leadership should clarify its purpose as either a collection of rules and policy to avoid litigation or a set of professional tenets to guide faculty.

Awareness of Faculty Misconduct

The fifth finding of this study is that all participants were personally aware of some sort of faculty misconduct. The CAOs possessed a greater awareness of incidents and types of misconduct. The CAOs had collectively a 63% positive response rate to the questions of specific misconduct in comparison to the collective response of faculty at 28%. The CAOs had encountered more incidents. This is attributed to the fact that the CAOs ultimately contend with the issues of all academic departments, and thus would experience more incidents or the at least the aftermath. The results of this study indicate that faculty had different experiences, but were

cognizant of a wide range of misconduct by their colleagues. Braxton and Mann (2004) suggest, "faculty misconduct exists, violations are neither rampant nor non-existent, but efforts must be made to protect the clients and the profession" (p. 39).

<div align="center">Recommendation 5</div>

It is recommended that not only should codes of ethics be widely communicated, but they must be enforced. As emphasized by Campbell (2001), "there must be an expectations among everyone that all uphold the principles themselves to honor the ethical norms, even if it leads to the exposure of others" (p. 408). Schurr (1982) shared similar sentiments "a code is but a pious fraud if it is unenforceable" (p. 332). The CAOs are tasked with sanctions and decisions regarding conduct, other than students, faculty are best positioned to observe or enforce compliance among colleagues. Without consistent and fair expectations of adherence, the codes are perceived by faculty to be meaningless and merely perceived as platitudinous.

<div align="center">Professional Codes of Ethics</div>

The sixth finding of this study is that the faculty in health science professions readily and proudly identified themselves with their respective professional or organizational codes. These codes are part of the daily operations of the professions and are highly regarded by the faculty members. Friedman et al. (2005) even references the nursing code of ethics and its significant role in the nursing culture, a profession that is consistently perceived to be, even ranked (Saad, 2008), as the most ethical. Ethical conduct is part of the profession and it carries over into the academic and the student environment as well as the patient/clinical environment. The nursing instructors are instilling their professional culture into the students' learning environment. The faculty members are actually selecting, training, and evaluating those with whom they will ultimately affiliate with and work together with professionally as colleagues.

Recommendation 6

It is recommended that community colleges maximize identification of such organizations and connect and integrate the professional code to the curriculum and the institutional code. Not all disciplines or professions have such strong or relevant organizations with codes, but professional codes could complement institutional codes. In this study, the health science faculty perceptions of professional codes exemplified what it is to internalize and practice a code of ethics. Their professions have seemingly achieved what other organization hope to accomplish or aspire to be.

Recommendations for Further Research

First, another area of research should focus on community colleges where codes of ethics are mandatory. Colleges within the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) are required to have codes. How have the codes been developed? It would be of value to learn how codes have been received and are they perceived by faculty?

Second, future researchers could examine issues related to perceptions of misconduct by faculty as it relates to advances in technology. Will distance learning, social networking, and other advances in instructional technology create new issues and how can colleges proactively prepare for these changes and the inherent issues?

Thirdly, a research effort focusing on the perceptions of students would be very valuable. After all, the student is the client of the profession. Would a code of ethics for faculty really matter to students? What impact can codes have upon students? What do they consider to be faculty misconduct?

Fourth, it would be a worthwhile study to determine why codes were adopted at colleges. What was the story behind the codes? What incident, event, or pressure would inspire the need for a code? What is the content of those codes?

Fifth, though different codes may exist within disciplines and professions, do codes of ethics exist that directly relate to the profession of instruction. What codes exist for those members of the teaching profession? If those codes exist, why are the less apparent than codes of other professions?

Finally, it would also be an interesting qualitative project to conduct a similar study at community colleges where no code of ethics existed. Would participants assume that a code existed? Even without a code of ethics, would responses and perceptions be similar to this study? It is believed that this dissertation, during the interview phase, may have affected changes at two of the colleges.

Professional behavior and conduct remain as regular topics in the news; more often than not it is usually with negative implications for clients. Organizations will respond in a variety of ways, but will usually look first toward a code of ethics. Community colleges will probably take similar action, freely or by direction, by adopting codes of ethics. Simply having and publishing a code of ethics will not be sufficient, to maximize the benefits of a code, it is essential that campus leadership take action and breathe life into the document to make it truly part of the campus culture.

REFERENCES

AAUP. (1915). Principles of 1915. *Policy, documents and reports*, Retrieved from

http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1915

AAUP. (1998, November/December). On the duty of faculty to speak out in misconduct.

Academe, *84*(6), 58.

AAUP. (2006). Policy, documents, and reports (10th ed.) Johns Hopkins University Press.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2002). Faculty as professionals:

Responsibilities, standards, and ethics. Academic Senate Paper. Spring, 2002.

Adams, J. S., Tashchian, A., & Stone, T. H. (2001). Code of ethics as signals for ethical

behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 29*(3), 199-211.

Anderson, S., & Davies, T. (2000). An ethical decision-making model: A necessary tool for

community college presidents and boards of trustees. *Community College Journal of

Research and Practice, 24*, 711-727.

Ashburn, E. (2007, June 6). Cash-for-grades scandal spreads to second campus in community

college district. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved August 9, 2009, from

http://chronicle.com/article/caash-for-grades-scandal/38990

Baca, C., & Stein, R. (1983). *Ethical principles, practices, and problems in higher education* (1st

ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher.

Baron, D. (2003, October 24). Professors behaving badly. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 50*(9),

C3.

Bauer, H. H. (2001, Summer). *Reviews*. Academic questions. Springer Publishing, New York,

NY.

Bellingham, R. (2003). *Ethical leadership: Rebuilding trust in corporations*. Amherst, MA:
    HRD Press.

Bennett, J. (1998). *Collegial professionalism* (1st ed.). Phoenix, AZ: Onyx Press.

Bennett, J. (2003). *Academic life: Hospitality, ethics, and spirituality* (1st ed.). Bolton, MA:
    Anker Publishing.

Birch, M., Elliott, D., & Trankel, M. A. (1999). Black and white and shades of gray: A portrait of
    the ethical professor. *Ethics and Behavior, 9*, 243-61.

Bixler, R. W. (1939). *Institution-faculty relations in the college of integrity*. Kingsport Press,
    Kingsport, TN.

Boggs, G. R. (2007). Foreward on D. Hellmich, Ethical leadership in the community college (p.
    vi-ix). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Bolman, F. W., & Walton, C. C. (1979). *The integrity of higher education* (56th American
    Assembly, March 29-April 1, 1979). Disorders in Higher Education. Prentice-Hall.
    Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A. E. (1994). Perceptions of misconduct and an analysis of their
    correlates. *The Journal of Higher Education, 65*, 351-372.

Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A. E. (1999). *Faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching*. Baltimore:
    The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Braxton, J. M., & Mann, M. R. (2004). Incidence and student response to faculty teaching norm
    violations. In J. M. Braxton, & A. E. Bayer (Eds.) *Addressing faculty and student
    classroom improprieties. New directions for teaching and learning. Issue 99* (pp. 35–40).
    San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruhn, J. G., Zajac G., Al-Kazemi A. A., & Prescott, L. D. (2002). Moral positions and academic conduct. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*(4), 461-493.

Cahn, S. M. (1986). *Saints and scamps: Ethics in academia*. Totowa, NJ: Rowan & Littlefield.

California Tomorrow. (2002). Professional personnel development and the importance of faculty diversity in the community colleges. Working paper. California Tomorrow.

Callahan, D. (1982). Should there be an academic code of ethics? *The Journal of Higher Education, 53*, 335-344.

Campbell, E. (2001). Let right be done: Trying to put ethical standards into practice. *Journal of Higher Educational Policy, 16*(5), 395-411.

Carr, D. L. (n.d.). *Responsibility in professional life*. St Cloud University.

Cleek, M. A., & Leonard, S. L. (1998). Can corporate codes of ethics influence behavior? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *17*(6), 619-630. Retrieved December 4, 2007, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 32778755)

Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (1996). *The American community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Counelis, J. S. (1993). Toward empirical studies on university ethics: A new role for institutional research. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(1), 74-92.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative research and inquiry: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Davis, G. (2003, December). Ethics: An educational imperative. *Community College Journal*, 6-9.

Davis, M. (2008). Thinking through issues in a code of ethics. *New Directions for Higher Education, 142,* 55-73.

DeRussy, C. (2003). Professional ethics begin on campus. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B20.

Diamond, R. (Ed.). (2003). *Field guide to academic leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dobel, J. B. (1993). The real politic of ethics codes: An implementation approach to public ethics. In M. E. Sharpe (Ed.), *Ethics and public A* (p. 158-171). New York, NY.

El-Khawas, E. (1981). Self-regulation: An approach to ethical standards. *New Directions for Higher Education, 9*, 55-62.

Farago, J. (1991). Academic chivalry and professional responsibility. *New Directions for Higher Education, 33*, 63-81.

Fimbel, N., & Burstein, J. S. (1990). Defining the ethical standards of the high-technology industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *9*(12), 929. Retrieved April 19, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 572451)

Friedman, H., Fogel, J., & Friedman, L. (2005). Student perception of the ethics of professors. *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organizational Studies*, *10*, 11-15.

Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2004). The survey of doctoral education and career preparation: The importance of disciplinary contexts. In D. H. Wulff, A. E. Austin, & Associates (Eds.), *Path to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goldman, A. (2006, December 8). Instructor accused of trading grades for cash, wine. *The Bryan Times*. Retrieved August 9, 2009, from http://news.google.com/newspapers?id=pTIKAAAAIBAJ&Sjid+IEKDAAAAIBAJ&pg=4250,38973333&dq+elvin+escano

Graubard, S. (2001). *The American academic profession*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction

      Publishers.

Greenwood, E. (1957). Attributes of a profession. *Social Work, 2* (summer), 45-55.

Hamilton, N. W. (2002). *Academic ethics* (1st ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Hamilton, N. W. (2007). Faculty autonomy and obligation. *Academe*, *Jan-Feb.*

Harrington, S. J. (1996). The effect of codes of ethics and personal denial of responsibility on

      computer abuse judgments and intentions. *MIS Quarterly, 20*(3), 257-278.

Hardy, D. (2002). Ethical considerations affecting teaching in community colleges: An

      abundance of feelings and limited facts. *Community College Journal of Research and*

      Practice, 26, 383-399.

Hauptman, R. (2002). Dishonesty in the academy. *Academe, 88*, 39-45.

Hellmich, D. M. (2007). *Ethical leadership in the community college: bridging theory and daily*

      practice. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing, Inc.

Holohan, R. (1996). Dissertation the power and professionalism of community college faculty.

Keith-Spiegel, P. C., Tabachnick, B. G., & Allen, M. (1999). Ethically risky situations between

      students and professors outside the classroom. *American Psychology Society*,

      Washington, DC.

Kerns, C. (2003). Creating and sustaining and ethical workplace culture. Retrieved June 8, 2007,

      from Pepperdine University Web site. Graziadio School of Business and Management:

      http://gbr.pepperdine.edu/033/ethics.html

Kerr, C. (1992). Forward in G. Vaughan, Dilemmas of Leadership (p.xii), San Francisco, CA:

      Jossey-Bass.

Knight, J., & Auster, C. J. (1999). Faculty conduct: An empirical study of ethical activism.

    Journal of Higher Education, 70(2), 187-210.

Kuther, T. (2003). A profile of the ethical professor. *College Teaching, 51*(4), 153-160.

    Retrieved December 7, 2007, from Academic Search Premier database.

Langlais, P. J. (2006, January 13). Ethics for the next generation. *Chronicle of Higher Education,*

    52(19), B.11.

Lederman, D. (2008, November 6). Condescending negativism and other transgressions. *Inside*

    HigherEd, Retrieved June 7, 2008, from

    http://insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/news/2008/11/06

Lee, M. (2003). On codes of ethics. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 16*(2), 72-89.

Little, D. (1989). Addressing the issue of appropriate professional ethics on community college

    campuses. Presentation paper 69th Annual Convention of AACC, Washington, DC,

    March 29- April 1, 1989.

Lucas, C. (1996). *Crisis in the academy* (1st ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Manley, W. J. (1991). *Executive's handbook of model business codes*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood

    Cliffs, NJ, pp. 3-10.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

    Publishing, Inc.

Matus-Grossman, L., & Gooden, S. (2002, July) *Opening doors: Students' perspectives on*

    juggling work, family, and college. Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

McCarthy, I. N. (1997). Professional ethics code conflict situations: Ethical and value orientation

    of collegiate accounting students. *Journal of Business Ethics, 16,* 1467-1474.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San

      Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S. B., & Brockett, R. G. (2007). *The profession and practice of adult education.* San

      Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Morgan, B., & Korschgen, A. (2001). The ethics of faculty behavior: Students' and professors'

      views. *College Student Journal*, *35*(3), 418.

Moorhead M. (2009, July 1). Pasco-Hernando Community College Instructor investigated for

      explicit email, threatening message. St. Petersburg Times. Retrieved on August 9, 2009,

      from http://tampabay.com/news/publicsafety/crime/article1014746.ece

Noseworthy, J. A. (2002). Students as tenuous agents of social control of professional

      misconduct. *Peabody Journal of Education, 77,101-124.*Olscamp, P. (2003). *Moral*

      leadership: Ethics and the college presidency (1st ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowan and

      Littlefield.

O'Neil, R. (1983). Ethical responsibility of the faculty. In Baca & Stein (Eds.). Ethical

      principles, practices, and problems in higher ed(37-44). Springfield, IL: Charles C.

      Thomas.

Outcalt, C. (Ed.). (2002a). *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges*

      (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Outcalt, C. (2002b). Toward a professionalized community college professoriate. *New Directions*

      for Community Colleges, 118, 109-115.

Palmer, J. (1992). Faculty professionalism reconsidered. *New Directions for Community*

      Colleges, 20, 29-38.

Peterson, M. W., & Mets, L. A. (1987). An evolutionary perspective on academic governance, management and leadership. In *Key resources on higher education governance, management, and leadership: A guide to the literature*, edited by Marvin W. Peterson and Lisa A. Mets. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rekow, S. (2006, Winter). Creating a sustainable ethical culture on your campus. *Trustee Quarterly*.

Rezaee, Z., Elmore, R. C., & Szendi, J. Z. (2001). Ethical behavior in higher educational institutions: The role of the code of conduct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *30*, 171-181.

Rich, J. (1984). *Professional ethics in education*. Charles C. Thomas Publisher, Springfield, IL, 62717.

Rifkin, T. (1993, August). Administrator and faculty ethics codes in community colleges. Descriptive report ERIC ED360037

Robin, D., Giallourakis, M., David, F. R., & Moritz, T. E. (1989). A different look at codes of ethics. *Business Horizons, 32*, 66–73.

Rocheleau, J., & Speck, B. W. (2007). *Rights & wrongs in the college classroom*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Rochler, M. J. (Ed.). (2004). *Ethics in professional practice in education*. Phi Theta Kappa, Bloomington, IN.

Roworth, W. (2002). Professional ethics, day by day. *Academe, 88*(1), 24-28.

Saad, L. (2008, November 24). Nurse shine while bankers slump. *Gallup* , Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/112264/nurses-shine-while-bankers-slump-ethics-ratings.aspx

Scriven, M. (1982). Professorial ethics. *Journal of Higher Education, 53*(3), 307-317.

Schurr, G. (1982). Toward a code of ethics for academics. *The Journal of Higher Education, 53*, 318-334.

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovick, J. A. (2005). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Sherman, A. J. (2005). Schools for scoundrels. *New England Review, 2*(3), 82.

Sockett, H. (1990). *Accountability, trust, and ethical codes of practice in the moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco: CA, Jossey-Bass.

Swazey, J., Louis, K., & Anderson, M. (1994). The ethical training of graduate students requires serious and continuing action. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 40*(27), 2.

Tabachnick, B. G., Keith-Speigel, P. C., & Allen, M. (1993). Ethics in academia: Student's views of professor's actions. *Ethics and Behavior*, *3*(2), 149-163.

Tabachnick, B. G., Keith-Spiegel, P. C., & Pope, K. S. (1991). Ethics of teaching: Beliefs and behaviors of psychologists as educators. *American Psychologist, 46*, 506–515.

Twombley, S. B., & Townsend, B. K. (2008). Community college faculty members. *Community College Review, 36*(1), 5-24.

Vaughan, G. (1992). *Dilemmas of leadership*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.

Viewpoints. (1994). Faculty ethics: Expanding the AAUP ethics statement. California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Academic Senate. April, 1994.

Virginia Community College System. (2008). Proceedings of Chancellor's Faculty Advisory Committee, April 24-25, 2008. Retrieved: August 9, 2009, from http://www.vccs.edu/Portals/0/ContentAreas/Meetings/CFACMinutes-April2008.pdf

Wagner, P. (1996). *Understanding professional ethics* (1st ed.). Bloomington, IL: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Wilcox, J. R., & Ebbs, S. L. (1992). *The leadership compass: Values and ethics in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Yin, R. K. (2009). Case study research: design and methods. *Applied Social Research Method Series*, Vol. 5. Thousand Oaks: CA. Sage Publications.

Protocol Outline   Dan Mayo
Comparisons of perceptions of North Carolina Community College CAO's and Faculty on Codes of Conduct (Ethics)

A. Introduction to the Case Study and Purpose of Protocol
    a. Case Study questions and propositions
    b. Conceptual framework for the case study
    c. Role of protocol in guiding case study investigator
B. Data collection procedures
    a. Names of site to be visited, including contact persons
    b. Data collection plan (covers the type of evidence to be expected, including the roles of people to be interviewed, the events to be observed, and any other documents to be reviewed when on site)
    c. Expected preparation prior to site visits (identifies specific information to be reviewed and issues to be covered, prior to going on site)
C. Outline of case study report
    a. The current code of ethics at college
        i. When established
        ii. Where housed
        iii. What type and content
    b. Innovations or activity related
        i. Incidents of misconduct
        ii. Faculty conduct
        iii. Response to code
    c. College history/evolution of code
    d. Diagram/charts to be developed
        i. Interview data
        ii. Descriptive table of interviewees
        iii. Document review
D. Case Study Question
    a. How do CAO's and faculty perceptions of community college codes of conduct compare?
        i. Secondary Questions
            1. Are CAO's and faculty aware of institutional codes of conduct?
            2. Do CAO's and faculty differ in awareness of incidents of faculty misconduct?
            3. Do CAO's and faculty differ in awareness and perception of how codes are used by the college?
            4. Do CAO's and faculty differ in their awareness of how codes are learned by faculty?

> 5. Is faculty conduct primarily guided by institutional code or by disciplinary/profession code?

E. Report
    a. Data format
    b. Field notes-analysis-Chapter 3
    c. Results-Chapter 4
    d. Rival explanations

Interview Protocol (Yin, 2009): Comparisons of Perceptions of NCCCS CAO's and Faculty on Codes of Ethics

Time of Interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:
Position of Interviewee:
Briefly describe project
Questions, (Kvale, 1996): Standardized, open-ended interview; General Interview Guide Approach- to ensure same general information is collected from each interviewee; has focus, but allows a degree of freedom and adaptability)

1. **Involvement of Interviewee (Facts)**

   a. **Brief job description, role at the college, etc.**

2. **Awareness of codes**

   a. Does your college have a code of ethics? (*Tell me about your code of ethics here at*

   ____*CC*)

   b. What does it mean? Intent? Purpose? Function? [Familiarity]

   c. How did you learn about it? [Orientation]

   d. Where would I find it? Can you tell me how to locate the __CC code of ethics?

3. **Awareness of misconduct**

   a. During your experience with the college are you aware of faculty incidents of:

      i. Sexual harassment

      ii. Cheating

      iii. Grade changes

      iv. Improper relationships

      v. False credentials or deception

      vi.   Teaching misconduct

         1.   Improper planning/ old syllabi, etc

         2.   Class time issues (early dismissals, etc)

         3.   Favoritism

         4.   Racism

         5.   Gender biases

4. How are codes used by the college? Can you describe to me how the college uses the code?

   a.   How is implemented?

   b.   How is it displayed or accessed? Is it visible?

   c.   Do faculty contracts require signature and agreement to abide by code?

   d.   Is it integral to the function/duties of instruction and faculty responsibilities?

5. How is it learned?

   a.   Is it ever reviewed/relearned?

      i.   Convocation or professional development days

6. Does a disciplinary /professional code exist for your department/specialty?

   a.   Does it supersede institutional code?

7. Do you recommend anyone I should speak with? Or anything I should be aware of regarding

codes at your college?

8. Age_____ Race_____ Gender_____ Years
Experience_____ Degrees_____

(Thank for participating in the interview. Assure of confidentiality and will follow up for

interview confirmation transcription)

APPENDIX C: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board
East Carolina University • Brody School of Medicine
600 Moye Boulevard • Old Health Sciences Library, Room 1L-09 • Greenville, NC 27834
Office **252-744-2914** • Fax **252-744-2284** • www.ecu.edu/irb
Chair and Director of Biomedical IRB: L. Wiley Nifong, MD
Chair and Director of Behavioral and Social Science IRB: Susan L. McCammon, PhD

TO: Dan Mayo, College of Education, ECU

FROM: UMCIRB

DATE: November 30, 2009

RE: Expedited Category Research Study

TITLE: "Comparison of Perceptions of Chief Academic Officers and Faculty at Community Colleges with Published Codes of Ethics"

UMCIRB #09-0841

This research study has undergone review and approval using expedited review on 11/20/09. This research study is eligible for review under an expedited category because it is a collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes and it is research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) and (b)(3). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.). The Chairperson (or designee) deemed this **unfunded** study **no more than minimal risk** requiring a continuing review in **12 months**. Changes to this approved research may not be initiated without UMCIRB review except when necessary to eliminate an apparent immediate hazard to the participant. All unanticipated problems involving risks to participants and others must be promptly reported to the UMCIRB. The investigator must submit a continuing review/closure application to the UMCIRB prior to the date of study expiration. The investigator must adhere to all reporting requirements for this study.

The above referenced research study has been given approval for the period of **11/20/09** to **11/19/10**. The approval includes the following items:

* Internal Processing Form (dated 10/26/09)
* Informed Consent (received 11/20/09)
* Letter of Support: Edgecombe Community College, Gaston College, Sampson Community College
* Protocol
* Interview Questions

The Chairperson (or designee) does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.

The UMCIRB applies 45 CFR 46, Subparts A-D, to all research reviewed by the UMCIRB regardless of the funding source. 21 CFR 50 and 21 CFR 56 are applied to all research studies under the Food and Drug Administration regulation. The UMCIRB follows applicable International Conference on Harmonisation Good Clinical Practice guidelines.

IRB00000705 East Carolina U IRB #1 (Biomedical) IORG0000418
IRB00003781 East Carolina U IRB #2 (Behavioral/SS) IORG0000418
IRB00004973 East Carolina U IRB #4 (Behavioral/SS Summer) IORG0000418

UMCIRB #09-0841
Page 1 of 1