

VIEWS OF NORMATIVE PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT IN KENTUCKY HIGHER
EDUCATION

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

By

Kenneth Ray Alford, B.A., M.A.E.

June 2011
University of the Cumberlands

This Dissertation is approved for recommendation to the faculty and administration of the University of the Cumberlands.

Dissertation Director:

Dr. Barry A. Vann

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Margaret Combs

Dr. Charles A. Pilant

Acknowledgements

Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths. – Proverbs 3:5-6

I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me. – Philippians 4:13

I would like to give thanks to God for giving me strength to see this project through to its completion and for providing a multitude of individuals to help me along this journey. I also wish to thank Dr. Barry A. Vann for his guidance throughout the program. To the faculty of the Ed.D. program at the University of the Cumberlands, thanks for constructive feedback and support throughout this journey.

I would like to sincerely thank my parents, Bobby and Sue Alford, for their constant and continued encouragement and support along life's journey. Without their guidance, love, and support, this work would never have been completed; therefore, I humbly and graciously dedicate this dissertation to them.

I would be remiss not to include the faculty and students of Ohio County High School who have supported, encouraged, and even nagged me along the way. I appreciate the kind words I have received from all of you. To Mrs. Pam Bradley, Ms. Brittany Fisher, Ms. Jo Gentry, and Mrs. Kristi Wiles, who read draft after draft, I give thanks.

To Dr. Mary Ruth Isaacs, thank you for the comments and suggestions that helped mold this work. To my fellow cohort members, I am thankful for the everlasting friendships that we have built and wish each of you the best as you complete your doctoral studies.

Abstract

Few studies have explored the ethical conduct of college faculty in Kentucky's institutions of higher education. This study used a causal-comparative design to determine that there were no differences among faculty at three church-affiliated and three non-church affiliated, public institutions in Kentucky. Full-time faculty employed at those colleges voluntarily completed a modified version of the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) instrument. Gender-based perceptions were also measured using the CTBI instrument. Using an independent samples *t*-test, female respondents ($M = 4.4667$) were shown to have significantly different views than male respondents ($M = 4.2702$) with regard to issues involving comments made about students and colleagues, $t(145) = 2.254, p < 0.03$. With respect to grading practices that consider non-academic performance in determining grades, female respondents ($M = 4.1651$) also indicated significantly different views than their male counterparts ($M = 3.9624$), $t(145) = 2.395, p < 0.02$.

Table of Contents

Chapter One.....	1
Overview.....	1
Background.....	1
Purpose of Study.....	3
Problem Statement.....	4
Hypothesis Statement.....	4
Limitations of the Study.....	5
Assumptions.....	6
Definitions.....	6
Summary.....	7
Chapter Two.....	8
Introduction.....	8
Teaching Conduct.....	10
Respect for Students as Individuals.....	15
Equal Consideration for all Students.....	16
Obligation to Prepare for Teaching.....	17
Obligation to Participate in the Governance and Life of the Institution.....	19
Ethical Conduct in Church-affiliated Institutions.....	19
Institutions.....	21
Bluegrass Community and Technical College.....	21
Brescia University.....	22
Owensboro Community and Technical College.....	22
Saint Catharine College.....	23

University of the Cumberland.....	23
Western Kentucky University.....	24
Summary.....	24
Chapter Three.....	26
Introduction.....	26
Paradigm.....	26
Research Design.....	27
Sampling Procedures.....	27
Measures.....	28
Statistical Tests.....	29
Summary.....	30
Chapter Four.....	31
Introduction.....	31
Description of Subjects.....	31
Analysis of Research Questions.....	32
Church-affiliated and Non-church Affiliated Findings.....	32
Gender-based Perceptions of Professorial Conduct.....	34
Summary.....	35
Chapter Five.....	37
Introduction.....	37
Discussion.....	37
Implications for Future Studies.....	38
Limitations of the Study.....	39

Summary.....	39
References.....	41
Appendix A: Informed Consent Statement.....	44
Appendix B: Permission to Use CTBI.....	45
Appendix C: Original CTBI.....	46
Appendix D: Modified CTBI.....	57
Appendix E: Table of Means and Standard Deviations for Behaviors Included in the Modified CTBI (by Institutional Type).....	66
Appendix F: Table of Means and Standard Deviations for Behaviors Including in the Modified CTBI (by Gender).....	71

List of Tables

2.1 Examples of the Inviolable Cluster.....	13
2.2 Examples of the Admonitory Cluster.....	14
3.1 Participants.....	28
4.1 Results of Independent-samples <i>t</i> -Tests (Assuming Equal Variances) for CTBI Scores Between Groups: Church-affiliated and Non-church Affiliated Institutions.....	33
4.2 Results of Independent-samples <i>t</i> -Tests (Assuming Equal Variances) for CTBI Scores Between Groups: Females and Males.....	35

Chapter One

Introduction

Overview

Until recently, studies on the conduct of college educators were not heavily pursued (Braxton & Bayer, 2002). Nevertheless, studies conducted by Braxton and Bayer (1999; 2002); Carr (2000); Lewis (1997); and Teven and McCroskey (1997) suggest that most college faculty members strive to conduct themselves in a professional and courteous manner. Some individuals, however, fail to meet appropriate levels of ethical conduct. Braxton and Bayer (1999; 2002) surveyed college faculty from institutions across the country to determine their views of what constitutes acceptable professional behavior. This study sets out to add to the body of knowledge on professorial ethics by exploring the views of faculty members in various colleges and universities across the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Faculty working in church-affiliated institutions, which were not examined by Braxton and Bayer (2002), will be included in this study.

Background

In 1966, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) established a professional code of ethics for university faculty (American Association of University Professors, 1966; 2009). During the 1990s, researchers explored educator conduct as it related to predetermined norms. Although the method and mode of instructional delivery are beyond the scope of the present study, Teven and McCroskey (1997) argued that effective teaching at the college level involves much more than simply delivering lecture

notes; college faculty should elicit ideas, encourage creativity, model behavior, impart attitudes, and demonstrate caring (Teven & McCroskey, 1997). Modeling “appropriate” behaviors and demonstrating caring for others are certainly important components of ethical conduct. Teven and McCroskey (1997) did not, however, adequately describe appropriate behaviors as they occur in the wider spaces of both the academic and residential communities.

In an effort to help fill the void in the literature, Braxton and Bayer (1999; 2002) formulated the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) to measure perceptions of professional conduct among college faculty. The CTBI instrument consists of 126 statements and was used in their 2002 study concerning perceptions of faculty with respect to their work environment (e.g., research institution; liberal arts; and two year community and technical colleges). The current study will include liberal arts and two year community and technical colleges. However, as noted above, the study will be expanded to include church-affiliated institutions. Specifically, this study will survey faculty at Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC), Brescia University (BU), Owensboro Community and Technical College (OCTC), Saint Catharine College (SCC), University of the Cumberlands (UC), and Western Kentucky University (WKU).

Most church-affiliated institutions in Kentucky insist that their faculty and staff abide by ethical codes rooted in biblical teachings, including Old Testament morality tied to many of the more than 600 mitzvahs written by Moses (Hitchcock & Esposito, 2004). For example, Christian denominations that support colleges in Kentucky (Southern Baptist, Wesleyan, United Methodists, and Presbyterians) believe that the Ten Commandments were handed down to Moses by God, although each denomination varies

in its stress on biblically-based morality (Vann, 2007; 2008). Each of those commandments influences standards of conduct in church-affiliated institutions. In colleges supported by more fundamentalist denominations like the Southern Baptist Church, expectations are that a faculty member adheres to ethical standards as he or she carries out his or her professional duties and personal lives. All colleges and universities expect faculty members to maintain high levels of ethical conduct; however, church-affiliated institutions seem to have greater responsibilities in ensuring faculty members conduct themselves in a manner above reproach (University of the Cumberlands Policies and Procedures, 2009; Western Kentucky University Faculty Handbook, 2010). This study will cast light on any perceptual differences that may exist between church-affiliated college faculty and their colleagues working in more secular institutions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine faculty perceptions of non-instructional professional conduct in colleges and universities across the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The study will be carried out for the following specific purposes:

1. To explore professorial views of normative professional conduct within church-affiliated institutions in Kentucky as compared with their secular counterparts.
2. To determine if a relationship exists between gender and professorial views of normative professional conduct of college faculty in Kentucky higher education.

Problem Statement

Patterns of professional conduct may exist among faculty with respect to their work environment and institutional affiliation. Few studies have been conducted to ascertain the professorial views of professional conduct in Kentucky colleges and universities. This study will assist professional educators and policy makers in understanding how to move forward and adapt current policies (such as the AAUP policy on professional ethics) and procedures. Institutions within the Commonwealth of Kentucky can utilize the information found in this study to better understand what faculty members perceive as ethical conduct.

Faculty at church-affiliated institutions are often thought to exhibit stronger views on what constitutes ethical conduct than faculty at secular institutions. Few studies have delved into how professors at church-affiliated institutions view professional conduct as compared to their secular counterparts. This study will build upon previous studies to determine the extent to which professorial conduct of church-affiliated faculty differs from faculty at secular institutions.

Hypothesis Statement

It is hypothesized that faculty perceptions of professional conduct in Kentucky colleges and universities will not be significantly different at institutions with a church affiliation as compared to their selected secular counterparts. This is due, in part, to the fact that the selected secular institutions are mostly an extension of the communities each serves and that Kentucky is firmly situated in the Bible Belt (Vann, 2007; 2008).

Limitations of the Study

Despite the researcher's best efforts, the results of the study will be affected by the following limitations:

1. The study will have an inherent limitation due to extraneous variables not addressed in the study. For example, this study asks college and university professors to rate their own professional conduct as well as the professional conduct of their colleagues. Some inherent bias is to be expected.
2. The study uses an online survey instrument. The conditions under which an individual completes the survey are unknown to the researcher.
3. The study does not explore possible differences in professional conduct with respect to denominational affiliation.
4. It was not possible to determine the cultural background of faculty participants, which may have influenced their perceptions of morality and professional behaviors.
5. The study does not include institutions that are members of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCCU). To include these institutions may have introduced additional bias because member institutions must use their educational programs and practices in support of the Christian mission to evangelize to non-believers.

Assumptions

The study was constructed with the following assumptions:

1. The survey was completed by willing participants.
2. Respondents were highly educated professionals with a professional attitude toward service to their university and students. As such, participants responded frankly and in a professional manner.

Definitions

The following terms are defined for the purpose of clarification:

Admonitory Norm: A collection of activities or practices that “evoke less condemnation than transgressions of inviolable norms do” (Braxton & Bayer, 2002, p. 7). Any behavior having a mean score of 3.00 to 3.99 on the CTBI is considered an admonitory norm behavior (Braxton & Bayer, 2002).

Bible Belt: A title given to sections of the Midwest and South in which a literal interpretation of the Bible is widely accepted (Vann, 2007).

Inviolable Norm: A collection of activities or practices violating norms that warrants “severe sanctions” against the transgressor. Any behavior having a mean score of 4.00 to 4.99 is considered an inviolable norm behavior (Braxton & Bayer, 2002, p. 7).

Instructor: Any full-time faculty member of a college or university. This term is used on the survey instrument.

Norm: A “shared belief within a particular social or professional group about behavior expected or desired in a given situation or circumstance” (Braxton and Bayer, 2002, p. 2).

Summary

This chapter has presented an overview for the study of professorial views of professional conduct at the post-secondary level in Kentucky. Due in large part to deep rooted religious values and literal interpretation of the Bible, church-affiliated institutions often tout a heightened awareness of ethical conduct; however, few, if any, studies have demonstrated that church-affiliated institutions adhere to greater ethical standards. However, given that all of the faculty members who participated in the study live in an area of the country defined by Vann (2007) as the Bible Belt, contrastive views on professional conduct may not be as clearly defined as in other regions of the country. Braxton and Bayer (2002) provide a basic model for evaluating perceptions of professional conduct, but their work fails to delineate differences, if any, between church-affiliated and secular institutions. The next chapter provides a review of related literature on the subject of professional conduct among members of the professorate.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Introduction

From the dawn of time, the dilemma between choosing what is good over what is evil, what is right over what is wrong, and what is acceptable over what is unacceptable has plagued humanity. Beginning with the biblical account of the first sin by Adam and Eve and continuing through the present day, individuals have been confronted with ethical and moral decisions. As civilizations advanced, new ideas emerged; hence, the need for a discussion of ethical conduct in everyday life. Athenian philosopher Socrates led discussions throughout his life attempting to answer questions about moral philosophy. He believed that individuals should become critically reflective thinkers and that it was the teacher's responsibility to nurture that development (Baca & Stein, 1983). Plato, a student of Socrates, attempted to answer the question of ethics by applying principles from mathematical disciplines (Williams, 2006). Studying the work of Plato, Aristotle refined the view of ethics and propelled the topic into a subject still studied in institutions today. As institutions of higher learning engage students in the pursuit of truth and the acquisition of knowledge concerning the world, actions and indiscretions of the professorate have led to much debate. Professors have an obligation to guide students in the pursuit of truth as well as model appropriate behavior, encourage creativity, maintain impartiality, and exhibit a sense of care (Teven & McCroskey, 1997).

College faculty members find themselves in the middle of ethical debates when evaluating their own conduct to determine whether they are presenting themselves and their subject in an ethical and moral manner. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) first established its Statement on Professional Ethics in 1966 with revisions being made in 1987 and 2009: Professors' primary responsibility "is to seek and to state the truth as they see it" (AAUP, 2009, p. 1). The search for truth, however, is often diminished by the desire of some college faculty to promote themselves and their own causes without regard to the students' educational needs. This sense of disregard for meaningful education leads to consternation for department chairs, deans, provosts, regents, and other administrators who must deal with the turmoil created by unethical and insubordinate faculty (Holmes, 1996). Knight and Auster (1999) indicate that a heightened awareness of unethical conduct of collegiate faculty became paramount during the latter part of the twentieth century. This was due, in part, to the increased awareness of professional conduct in arenas other than education (Knight & Auster, 1999).

While much has been written about professional ethics at the collegiate level (Braxton & Bayer, 2002; Carr, 2000; Lewis, 1997; McKeachie & Svinicki, 2006; Strike & Ternasky, 1993), few, if any, studies exist regarding self-perceptions of college faculty ethics in Kentucky public and church-based institutions of higher education. Braxton and Bayer (2002) identify four domains of college faculty misconduct that are relevant to a model designed to assess those perceptions among members of the professorate in Kentucky. Those domains include the following: employee misconduct (e.g., embezzlement, falsification), scholarly misconduct (e.g., plagiarism, fabrication of data),

teaching misconduct (e.g., biased grading, ridicule of students), and service misconduct (e.g., failure to fulfill responsibilities within the department, college, and professional organizations) (Braxton & Bayer, 2002). This chapter will provide a brief review of selected literature related to professorial perception of ethical conduct in American universities and colleges. The chapter also provides a brief review of selected literature related to the ethos shared among some church-affiliated institutions and the potential impact these ideas have on the professional conduct of college faculty.

Teaching Conduct

Corey, Corey, and Callahan (2011) define professional ethics as “moral principles adopted by an individual or group to provide rules for right conduct” (p. 14). McKeachie and Svinicki (2006) indicate that “ethical standards are intended to guide us in carrying out the responsibilities we have to the different groups with whom we interact” (McKeachie & Svinicki, 2006, p. 326). As college faculty instruct undergraduate students in content-specific subjects and lead them on an expedition toward truth, each member of the professional community must make every effort to craft ethical judgments. Several researchers (Braxton & Bayer, 2002; Carr, 2000; Lewis, 1997; McKeachie & Svinicki, 2006; Strike & Ternasky, 1993) document activities that would call into question the ethical conduct of college faculty (e.g., falsification, plagiarism, biased grading, ridicule of students and colleagues, sexual misconduct). French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1957) concluded that conduct could be identified as unethical based upon the degree to which the conduct elicited outrage (Durkheim, 1957).

Braxton and Bayer (2002) describe a study conducted at a national level regarding professorial beliefs of ethical and moral conduct. Those researchers developed a list of 126 professional conduct practices exhibited by college faculty members. The statements were grouped into clusters based on the relationship each statement had to overall themes of a college faculty member's daily routine. The categories included the following: preparation for class, first-day activities, in-class behaviors, course content, interaction with students and other colleagues, and other out-of-class activities involved in the college teaching experience (Braxton & Bayer, 2002). The survey was administered to faculty members from approximate 3,000 institutions of higher education in the United States that are classified in the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching system. The survey was initially administered to Research I universities; a second survey was sent to institutions categorized as liberal arts colleges. A final survey was sent to two-year community and technical colleges.

The Braxton and Bayer (2002) study established a theoretical framework for analyzing professorial perceptions of professional conduct; furthermore, the survey instrument was designed in such a manner that it can be used to ascertain perceptions longitudinally. Institutions can use the survey to gauge effectiveness as a result of policy changes by institutions and departments as they relate to improved student-teacher relations, collegiality, course design, and preparation.

Braxton and Bayer (2002) identified four underlying values that support judgments of college faculty. Those values include "respect for students as individuals, equal consideration to all students, an obligation to prepare for teaching, and an obligation to participate in the governance and life of the institution" (McKeachie &

Svinicki, 2006, p. 328). From these underlying values and the results of the surveys conducted, Braxton and Bayer (2002) were able to categorize 16 normative patterns as either inviolable or admonitory. The inviolable normative cluster includes the following: condescending negativism, inattentive planning, moral turpitude, particularistic grading, personal disregard, uncommunicated course detail, and uncooperative cynicism (Braxton & Bayer, 2002). The admonitory normative cluster includes the following: advisement negligence, authoritarian classroom, inadequate communication, inadequate course design, inconvenience avoidance, instructional narrowness, insufficient syllabus, teaching secrecy, and undermining colleagues (Braxton & Bayer, 2002). Table 2.1 provides a list of the inviolable normative practices and selected examples of each. Table 2.2 provides a list of the admonitory normative practices and selected examples of each.

Table 2.1 Examples of the Inviolable Cluster

Normative Cluster	Example(s)
Condescending negativism	<p>A faculty member makes demeaning or embarrassing remarks to students in class.</p> <p>A faculty member makes inappropriate comments about another faculty member in front of students or other colleagues.</p>
Inattentive planning	A faculty member fails to order required texts in time for the first class meeting.
Moral turpitude	<p>A faculty member has a sexual relationship with a student.</p> <p>A faculty member makes sexual comments to a student.</p> <p>A faculty member attends class while intoxicated.</p>
Particularistic grading	A faculty member uses nonacademic information when assigning grades.
Personal disregard	<p>A faculty member routinely uses profanity in class.</p> <p>A faculty member routinely arrives late and/or dismisses class early.</p>
Uncommunicated course details	A faculty member does not notify students of room assignment changes or policies related to course examinations.
Uncooperative cynicism	<p>A faculty member does not participate in departmental advising.</p> <p>A faculty member fails to recognize his/her responsibility to the students and elects to focus on research at the expense of the students.</p>

(Braxton & Bayer, 2002)

Table 2.2 Examples of the Admonitory Clusters

Admonitory Cluster	Example(s)
Advisement Negligence	<p>A faculty member refuses to advise students.</p> <p>A faculty member fails to provide advice to advisees.</p>
Authoritarian classroom	<p>A faculty member disregards scholarly contributions of women and minorities in the content of the course.</p> <p>A faculty member fails to address inappropriate comments made by students.</p>
Inadequate communication	<p>A faculty member fails to provide students with contact information.</p> <p>A faculty member does not follow the course syllabus.</p>
Inadequate course design	<p>A faculty member fails to consider the cost of course materials.</p> <p>A faculty member fails to revise course content to reflect new theory or advancements in the field.</p>
Inconvenience avoidance	<p>A faculty member routinely holds class longer than the allotted time.</p> <p>A faculty member leaves examinations in an accessible location where all students can search for his or her work.</p>
Instructional narrowness	<p>A faculty member uses examination materials that encourage memorization over critical thinking.</p> <p>A faculty member discourages students from asking questions in class.</p>
Insufficient syllabus	<p>A faculty member fails to provide a detailed syllabus outlining course requirements.</p>
Teaching secrecy	<p>A faculty member refuses to share course syllabi and teaching methods with colleagues.</p> <p>A faculty member displays a cynical attitude toward the content.</p>
Undermining colleagues	<p>A faculty member makes negative comments in faculty meetings about courses offered by colleagues.</p> <p>A faculty member promotes his or her course over a colleague's course.</p>

(Braxton & Bayer, 2002)

Respect for Students as Individuals

College faculty members are expected to be educational guides for their students. In order to effectively communicate the content and aid the student in the pursuit of truth, a professor must recognize and respect the differences (and similarities) of individual students in his or her classroom. Professors must refrain from statements and actions that may be construed as insensitive to a person or group of people (Braxton & Bayer, 2002; Knight & Auster, 1999; McKeachie & Svinicki, 2006; Strike, 1993).

College faculty members in public colleges and universities must also ensure that classroom activities and discussions do not intentionally introduce bias toward one's own beliefs, although faculty members teaching in a church-affiliated institution are expected to support the religious mission of their employer (Brescia University Mission and Heritage, 2010; University of the Cumberland Policies and Procedures, 2009). For example, an education professor working in a state-funded, or secular, institution should refrain from any discussion of religious affiliation that would promote one religious view over another. Similarly, a writing professor should not represent his or her belief about abortion as the only acceptable view. Some argue that discussions of such topics are acceptable at the college level if all sides of the discussion are presented (Markie, 1994).

A professor who establishes a classroom free of bias can promote the search for truth more easily than a professor who limits the students' openness and freedom to think independently. Establishing a situational learning environment promotes effective ethical discussion of sensitive topics and provides for the attainment of independent thought and constructive establishment of a moral belief system (Markie, 1994). Jarvis (1992) states that individuals "have experiences, and these experiences tend to be patterned and

repetitive” (p. 157). These experiences create a mindset that allows for thoughtful contemplation and creation of individual beliefs that can be positive in the college classroom.

Braxton and Bayer (2002) also found that college faculty members should refrain from ridiculing students based on academic performance, past preparation, and classroom decorum. The AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics exemplifies the need for the college faculty to be genuine in their interactions with students and refrain from demeaning any student, colleague, or supervisor.

To promote mutual respect between college faculty and students, discussions of religious beliefs and political affiliation are often avoided and, in some cases, prohibited, especially in public institutions of higher education (Kentucky Community and Technical College Faculty Handbook, 2010). Public institutions have established standards of conduct or administrative procedures that prohibit (or restrict) faculty from promoting one religious belief or political party over another (Kentucky Community and Technical College Employee Handbook 3.1, 2010; Western Kentucky University Standards of Conduct, 2010). Faculty at church-affiliated institution, on the other hand, often allow classroom discussions on topics specific to the church affiliation. Braxton and Bayer (2002) did not discuss religious and political views in their work on acceptable conduct of college faculty.

Equal Consideration to all Students

Faculty members are expected to provide the same level of instruction to all students in the classroom while accommodating the needs of individual students. Professors should

never allow one student to have an unfair advantage over another. Lewis (1997) depicted a scenario in which a professor provides a student with extra time to complete a project but does not allow all students to the same opportunity for extra time.

McKeachie and Svinicki (2006) provide three similar situations involving students who exhibited poor performance on a course examination. The examples provide similar situations but different degrees of ethical concerns. For example, one student approaches the professor and offers a bribe for the opportunity to retake an exam. Another student approaches the professor and asks for a retake opportunity because of extenuating circumstances. The third student whom the teacher has seen struggle with class work is approached by the professor and given the opportunity to retake the exam. Each situation has a different outcome based upon the professor's response. Clearly, the professor has not provided equal opportunity for all students in the classroom if he or she accepts the bribe or if he or she allows a retake for a single student without affording the other students in the class the same opportunity if the same or similar situations exist.

Obligation to Prepare for Teaching

Professors are expected to present students with clear course expectations, methods of evaluation, and course topics. These items are typically presented in the form of a syllabus at the beginning of the semester (McKeachie & Svinicki, 2006). According to Braxton and Bayer (2002), syllabi preparation and revision were among the least documented teaching responsibilities by the colleges and universities surveyed. In other words, few colleges and universities actually had policies regarding the need for the syllabi. Braxton and Bayer (2002) performed an analysis of variance (ANOVA) test on

the data to compare means within the divisions of research institutions, liberal arts colleges and two-year community and technical colleges. The results of the Braxton and Bayer (2002) survey indicate the concept of insufficient syllabus yielded had an F-ratio of 6.62 ($p < .001$), which implies professors view their obligation to provide a detailed and accurate syllabus as highly important. Braxton and Bayer (2002) concluded that research institutions had a significantly lower mean score on this item (mean = 3.26) than did liberal arts (mean = 3.67) and comprehensive universities and colleges (mean = 3.55). Braxton and Bayer (2002) suggest that professors at liberal arts and comprehensive universities and colleges believe it is more important to communicate course detail to the students than do their counterparts at research institutions.

In the study, professors rated inattentive planning as an inviolable behavior. Thus, professors consider planning lectures and classroom activities to be important components of the ethical responsibilities of faculty members. Braxton and Bayer (2002) performed an ANOVA test using their data for the area of inattentive planning; the test yielded an F-ratio of 7.04 ($p < 0.001$). Furthermore, the test revealed research institutions had a lower mean score (mean = 3.94) than did liberal arts (mean = 4.31) and two-year community and technical colleges (mean = 4.29). Braxton and Bayer (2002) conclude that respondents from research institutions did not view inattentive planning as such an imperative part of a professor's duties. Lewis (1997) found that professors who shirk their obligation to maintain up-to-date classroom lectures and activities that reflect current research in the field are providing a disservice to students.

Obligation to Participate in the Governance and Life of the Institution

Professorial obligations extend beyond the need to prepare for class and present material in an unbiased manner; although some will argue academic freedom is an inherently biased proposition. Professors must be attentive to departmental needs and obligations including advising, course planning and design, and meetings with colleagues (Kentucky Community and Technical College System Handbook, 2010; University of the Cumberlands Policies and Procedures, 2009; Western Kentucky University Faculty Handbook, 2010). Braxton and Bayer (2002) found that advisement negligence was an admonitory normative practice. Using an ANOVA test for this item yielded an F-ratio of 12.32 ($p < 0.001$); the mean score for research institutions (3.43) was significantly less than the comprehensive universities and colleges (3.79) and liberal arts colleges (3.67). Again, respondents from research institutions appear to place less emphasis on advisement. This is perhaps explained by the nature of their work. Research professors toil with highly advanced students who require less advisement than inexperienced underclass students.

Ethical Conduct in Church-Affiliated Institutions

A number of church-affiliated institutions within the Bible Belt possess a strong belief in the values and moral codes rooted in the Bible as well as in tradition (Vann, 2007). Vann (2007) echoes Tweedie's (1978) characterization that the Bible Belt is "part of the country 'in which the literal accuracy of the Bible is credited and clergymen who preach it (whether in restricted localized space or through electronic means) have public influence'" (Vann, 2007, p. 89; Tweedie, 1978, p. 865). The concept of the Bible Belt

indicates a strong concentration of Protestant religions. However, other religiously-affiliated institutions in the Bible Belt region also adhere to strict moral codes. As a result of steadfast religious views of some church-affiliated institutions toward what is right and what is wrong, some institutions of higher education in this region often require faculty members to agree to a statement of faith and adhere to the principles of the institution (Saint Catharine College Facts, 2010; University of the Cumberlands Policies and Procedures, 2009). In fact, members of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) are required to have a Christ-centered mission and a faculty and administrative staff “who profess faith in Jesus Christ” (Council on Christian Colleges and Universities Member Application, 2010). Asbury College, Campbellsville University, and Kentucky Christian College are the only Kentucky institutions of higher education to be members of the CCCU. It should be noted that these institutions are not represented in this study.

Faculty members of church-affiliated institutions work to impart wisdom and knowledge; they presumably work equally as hard to impart teachings that reflect moral and ethical underpinnings reflective of the religious communities that support their institutions. Religious leaders in the community typically work closely with church-affiliated institutions to ensure both entities are promoting a message consistent with biblical teaching. Church-affiliated institutions such as University of the Cumberlands and Saint Catharine College derive financial support from alumni and associations that share common, faith-based interests. These stakeholders have a vested interest in ensuring the principles and moral conduct of the institutions are in line with the beliefs and values of the church.

Institutions

Six institutions were chosen by this researcher to assess if professorial views of ethical conduct are consistent with the views of the national study conducted by Braxton and Bayer (2002). The institutions to be included in this study represent some of the same types of institutions included in the Braxton and Bayer (2002) study but also include three church-affiliated institutions that were not in the aforementioned study. Institutions in this study include the following: Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC), Brescia University (BU), Owensboro Community and Technical College (OCTC), Saint Catharine College (SCC), University of the Cumberland (UC), and Western Kentucky University (WKU).

Bluegrass Community and Technical College. Bluegrass Community and Technical College is located in Lexington, Kentucky. Central Kentucky Technical College and Lexington Community College were united to become BCTC in 2005 (http://legacy.bluegrass.kctcs.edu/fa/iesp/strategic_plan/). During the fall 2009 academic semester, BCTC had a full-time enrollment of more than 6,400; during the previous academic period (2008-09), the college awarded 1,055 associate degrees (http://www.kctcs.edu/en/Colleges_and_Campuses/Bluegrass.aspx). According to the 2010 BCTC Fact Book, the community college employs approximately 239 full-time faculty members (http://www.kctcs.edu/About_KCTCS/2010_Factbook.aspx). BCTC has ten academic divisions (allied health; business; computer science and information systems; communications, history, languages, and social sciences; humanities;

manufacturing industrial technology; mathematics and statistics; natural sciences; nursing; and, trades and technologies) (<http://bluegrass.kctcs.edu/Academics/Divisions>).

Brescia University. Brescia University, a Roman Catholic affiliated institution, is located in Owensboro, Kentucky. BU was originally established in 1925 as Mount Saint Joseph Junior College for Woman in Maple Mount, Kentucky. Twenty-four years later, a consolidation effort brought all classes to the new Owensboro campus. The college began offering graduate coursework in 1998. Today, BU serves approximately 635 undergraduates with a student to teacher ratio of 14 to one. The university employs over 60 full- and part-time faculty (http://www.brescia.edu/_documents/2010-2012-catalog.pdf).

Owensboro Community and Technical College. Owensboro Community and Technical College is located in Owensboro, Kentucky. Originally part of the University of Kentucky Community College System, OCTC was incorporated into the Kentucky Community and Technical College System by the Kentucky General Assembly in 1997 (http://www.kctcs.edu/en/About_KCTCS/Our_History.aspx). The community college serves approximately 3,200 students and awarded 391 associate degrees during the 2008-09 academic year (http://www.kctcs.edu/en/Colleges_and_Campuses/Owensboro.aspx). OCTC employs approximately 100 full-time faculty members. OCTC has six academic divisions (advanced technology and trades; allied health; humanities; mathematics and sciences; nursing; and social sciences, business, and public service) (<http://www.octc.kctcs.edu/Academics/Departments>).

Saint Catharine College. Saint Catharine College is located in St. Catharine, Kentucky. In 1823, the Sisters of St. Dominic established a school to help educate the local population. After receiving a charter to award degrees in 1839, the original school grew rapidly (<http://www.sccky.edu/aboutus/history-stcatharine.php>). In 1931, the school was officially named St. Catharine College (SCC). As a Catholic-based liberal arts college, SCC serves approximately 850 undergraduate students (<http://www.sccky.edu/aboutus/collegefacts.php>). The university employs approximately 55 full-time faculty members.

University of the Cumberlands. University of the Cumberlands is located in Williamsburg, Kentucky. Originally established as the Williamsburg Institute on January 7, 1889, by a group of Baptist men who wished to bring education to the southern Kentucky Appalachian region, the college was later renamed Cumberland College (CC) in 1913 (<http://www.ucumberlands.edu/about/history.html>). Because of expanded graduate level course offerings and degrees, CC became University of the Cumberlands on January 7, 2005, exactly 116 years following its inception (<http://www.ucumberlands.edu/academics/catalog/0809MBA.pdf>). The university maintains strong ties with the Kentucky Baptist Association and the Southern Baptist Convention (<http://www.ucumberlands.edu/about/index.html>). The university had a fall 2010 enrollment of 1,743 undergraduates and awarded approximately 240 undergraduate degrees during the 2009-10 academic year

(<http://www.ucumberlands.edu/about/history.html>). UC employs approximately 105 full-time faculty members. The university is not divided into specific divisions or colleges.

Western Kentucky University. Western Kentucky University is located in Bowling Green, Kentucky. Established in 1906, WKU serves 17,800 undergraduates and awards approximately 2,175 undergraduate degrees annually. WKU employs approximately 735 full-time faculty members. WKU has five undergraduate colleges (arts and letters; business; education and behavioral sciences; health and human services; and science and engineering)

(<https://sasweb1.wku.edu/SASPortal/mainUnchallenged.do?unchallenged=yes>).

Summary

After reading a small portion of the available literature regarding professorial views of ethical conduct, this researcher was unable to ascertain a clear understanding of the views of college professors in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The findings of Braxton and Bayer (2002) provide a comprehensive view of professorial perceptions of ethical conduct for faculty across the country, but their research does not provide a clear view of the regional assessment of ethical conduct. Inasmuch as the Braxton and Bayer (2002) research fails to delineate regional views of ethical conduct, the understanding of ethical conduct at the collegiate faculty level will be enhanced by determining the views of college faculty within Kentucky. The faculty members at the institutions aforementioned may have similar beliefs regarding what constitutes ethical conduct by their profession, but without further research it is unclear if similarities exist with the national findings and

if the church-affiliated institutions have differing views from non-church affiliated institutions. The next chapter will discuss how the study will be conducted.

Chapter Three

Methods and Procedures

Introduction

The literature review presented in Chapter Two illustrates the existence of little, if any, research specifically regarding professorial views of ethical conduct within colleges and universities in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The purpose of Chapter Three is to present a model for ascertaining the perceptions of Kentucky full-time college faculty based on institutional affiliation (e.g., church-affiliated; non-church affiliated). To describe the model, this chapter focuses on research design, sampling procedures, measures, and statistical tests.

Paradigm

The model used in this study consists of a quantitative approach and replicates the previous research design of Braxton and Bayer (2002). The previous study delineated patterns of inviolable and admonitory normative practices of college professors. While it was conducted on a national scale, its results are only somewhat applicable to higher education in Kentucky, and the previous study did not consider church affiliation as a categorical factor in measuring perceptions of professional conduct. Nevertheless, the study does lay the foundation for a study that can be specifically applied in the Commonwealth. This study, therefore, adds to the body of knowledge by taking a more localized view of ethical conduct of college faculty. In following the method used by

Braxton and Bayer (2002), the present study employs a similar quantitative methodology to determine if the same patterns exist among college faculty in Kentucky.

Research design

The study compares views of college faculty members from pre-determined institutions with respect to ethical conduct exhibited by themselves and those within their institution. The causal-comparative research design has been selected because the study seeks to compare mean responses from faculty working in the various institutional types. Institutional type is important to consider because it is assumed that the ethos of the affiliated institution (public or religious based) likely influences attitudes and normative behaviors in the college.

Sampling Procedures

The sampling population for this study includes faculty members of Bluegrass Community and Technical Community College (BCTC), Brescia University (BU), Owensboro Community and Technical College (OCTC), Saint Catharine College (SCC), University of the Cumberlands (UC), and Western Kentucky University (WKU). There were 147 respondents (see Table 3.1) which represents approximately eight percent of the total faculty population at the institutions included. In order to ensure anonymity, protect confidentiality, and ensure truthful responses, each faculty member was asked to respond to a questionnaire using an online, anonymous survey-hosting website called SurveyGizmo. Participation in the survey was strictly voluntary, and no identifiable information was collected (see Appendix A: Informed Consent Statement).

Table 3.1 Participants

Institution	Number of full time faculty
Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC)	53
Brescia University (BU)	6
Owensboro Community and Technical College (OCTC)	32
Saint Catharine College (SCC)	13
University of the Cumberlands (UC)	32
Western Kentucky University (WKU)	11
	Total Participants: 147

Measures

The data was generated using a modified version of the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) instrument (Braxton and Bayer, 2002). Permission to use the CTBI instrument was obtained from the authors (see Appendix B: Permission to Use CTBI). The original instrument is presented in Appendix C: Original CTBI; the modified version which contains 68 of the original 126 statements is presented in Appendix D: Modified CTBI. The purpose of replicating the CTBI is to ensure that results are comparable with the national trends as described by Braxton and Bayer (2002). Reliability and validity have previously been established for the instrument (Braxton & Bayer, 2002; Green, 2008). Participants were asked to respond to 68 Likert-scaled statements regarding professorial ethics and professional conduct of college faculty. Each statement was rated using a scale of 1 to 5 as described next:

(1) appropriate behavior, should be encouraged; (2) discretionary behavior, neither particularly appropriate or inappropriate; (3) mildly inappropriate behavior, generally to be ignored; (4) inappropriate behavior, to be handled informally by colleagues or administrators suggesting change or improvement; and, (5) very inappropriate behavior requiring formal administrative intervention (Braxton & Bayer, 2002, p. 14).

Behaviors having mean scores greater than 4.00 will be deemed inviolable (Braxton & Bayer, 2002). Similarly, behaviors having mean scores between 3.00 and 3.99 will be deemed admonitory. Braxton and Bayer (2002) organized the original 126 Likert-style items regarding professional conduct into sixteen clusters. The clusters were identified as inviolable or admonitory based on the mean score determined for each cluster. The following seven clusters were deemed inviolable: condescending negativism; inattentive planning; moral turpitude; particularistic grading; personal disregard; uncommunicated course details; and uncooperative cynicism (Braxton & Bayer, 2002). The remaining nine clusters deemed admonitory include the following: advisement negligence, authoritarian classroom, inadequate communication, inadequate course design, inconvenience avoidance, instructional narrowness, insufficient syllabus, teaching secrecy, and undermining colleagues (Braxton & Bayer, 2002).

Statistical Tests

Professorial views of normative conduct for both types of institutions (i.e., church-affiliated and non-church affiliated) were compared using a series of independent-samples *t*-tests. To determine if a significant relationship exists between professorial views of normative conduct and gender, a series of independent-samples *t*-tests were also used. Independent-samples *t*-test is the appropriate statistical test because its design allows the research to compare the statistical significance of possible differences “among two population means” (Spatz, 2008, p. 223).

Summary

The literature review established a basis for a model that would examine professorial views of professional conduct within the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The previous study conducted by Braxton and Bayer (2002) used the CTBI instrument to delineate seven inviolable and nine admonitory clusters of professorial behavior. The present study utilized a modified version of the CTBI instrument to determine if the views of college faculty in Kentucky are consistent among church-affiliated and non-church affiliated institutions. Independent-samples *t*-tests were used to determine if differences exist between church-affiliated and non-church affiliated faculty; similarly, the independent-samples *t*-test was used to compare professorial views with respect to gender.

Chapter Four

Research Findings

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study in which professorial views of professional conduct were ascertained for church-affiliated and non-church affiliated institutions of higher education in Kentucky. Data were generated using a modified version of the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI). Independent-samples t-tests were used to compare mean scores for each of the identified clusters relating to professorial views of professional conduct between groups (i.e., church-affiliated and non-church affiliated). Independent-samples t-tests were also used to determine if there is a relationship between gender and professorial views of normative conduct.

Description of Subjects

College faculty from six institutions of higher education in Kentucky completed the survey instrument. Fifty-one respondents (35 percent) work in church-affiliated institutions and 96 respondents (65 percent) were employed in non-church affiliated institutions. Sixty-one percent of the respondents were female. Twenty-seven respondents (18 percent) were females working at church-affiliated institutions. Twenty-four respondents (16 percent) were males working at church-affiliated institutions. Seventy-six percent of the respondents identified themselves as full-time faculty members. Sixty-six percent of the respondents indicated a rank of associate professor or higher.

Analysis of Research Questions

Analyses of professorial views of professional conduct between church-affiliated and non-church affiliated institutions are presented in Table 4.1. Analyses of gender views of professional conduct in Kentucky institutions of higher education are presented in Table 4.2. Data generated from the survey instrument were clustered into descriptive groups. The clusters include the following: condescending negativism; uncommunicated course details; moral turpitude; particularistic grading; personal disregard; uncooperative cynicism; advisement negligence; authoritarian classroom; inadequate communication; inconvenience avoidance; instructional narrowness; and undermining colleagues. To compare cluster means between church-affiliated and non-church affiliated institutions, independent-samples *t*-tests were performed. To compare means between male and female respondents, independent-samples *t*-tests were performed. The following section provides a detailed explanation of the findings.

Church-affiliated and Non-church Affiliated Findings

Independent-samples *t*-test was used to compare data generated from college faculty at church-affiliated and non-church affiliated institutions with regard to professorial views of professional conduct (see Table 4.1). The table shows that the independent-samples *t*-tests failed to find differences between means for church-affiliated and non-church affiliated institutions. In other words, the independent samples *t*-tests indicate that church-affiliated and non-church affiliated faculty do not have opposing views with regard to condescending negativism; uncommunicated course details; moral turpitude;

particularistic grading; personal disregard; uncooperative cynicism; advisement
negligence; authoritarian classroom; inadequate communication; inconvenience
avoidance; instructional narrowness; and undermining colleagues.

Table 4.1 Results of Independent-samples *t*-Tests (Assuming Equal Variances) for CTBI Scores Between Groups: Church-affiliated and Non-church Affiliated Institutions

	Mean		<i>t</i>	p
	<i>Church-affiliated</i> <i>n = 51</i>	<i>Non-church affiliated</i> <i>n= 96</i>		
Condescending Negativism	4.4157	4.3771	0.426	0.671
Uncommunicated Course Details	4.2039	4.1167	0.859	0.392
Moral Turpitude	4.9673	4.8924	1.775	0.078
Particularistic Grading	4.0308	4.1161	-0.969	0.334
Personal Disregard	3.8126	3.7234	1.702	0.286
Uncooperative Cynicism	4.2275	4.1458	0.809	0.420
Advisement Negligence	3.5654	3.3490	1.711	0.089
Authoritarian Classroom	3.4275	3.3812	0.422	0.673
Inadequate Communication	3.7364	3.6887	0.491	0.624
Inconvenience Avoidance	3.5980	3.6120	-0.151	0.880
Instructional Narrowness	3.6078	3.4740	1.082	0.281
Undermining Colleagues	3.5042	3.3497	1.493	0.138

Gender-Based Perceptions of Professorial Conduct

Independent-samples *t*-test was used to compare data generated from college faculty at Kentucky institutions with regard to professorial views of professional conduct based on the gender of the respondent (see Table 4.2). The table shows that the independent-samples *t*-tests failed to find differences between gender-based perceptions in the areas of uncommunicated course details, moral turpitude, personal disregard, uncooperative cynicism, advisement negligence, authoritarian classroom, inadequate communication, inconvenience avoidance, instructional narrowness, and undermining colleagues. The *t*-test for means of female respondents ($M = 4.4667$) and male respondents ($M = 4.2702$) in regards to condescending negativism, however, was significant: $t(145) = 2.254, p < 0.03$. This test suggests that compared to male college faculty members, female college faculty members perceived the treatment of students and faculty in a condescending or demeaning manner as a more severe offense. The *t*-test for means of female respondents ($M = 4.1651$) and male respondents ($M = 3.9624$) in regards to particularistic grading also yielded significant results: $t(145) = 2.395, p < 0.02$. This test suggests that compared to male college faculty members, female college faculty perceived grading practices that award credit for any reason other than academic performance as a more severe offense.

Table 4.2 Results of Independent-samples *t*-Tests (Assuming Equal Variances) for CTBI Scores Between Groups: Females and Males

	Mean		<i>t</i>	p
	<i>Female</i> <i>n</i> = 90	<i>Male</i> <i>n</i> = 57		
Condescending Negativism	4.4667	4.2702	2.254	0.026
Uncommunicated Course Details	4.1867	4.0842	1.033	0.303
Moral Turpitude	4.9444	4.8772	1.627	0.106
Particularistic Grading	4.1651	3.9624	2.395	0.018
Personal Disregard	3.8025	3.6784	1.532	0.128
Uncooperative Cynicism	4.2044	4.1263	0.793	0.429
Advisement Negligence	3.4222	3.4269	-0.037	0.970
Authoritarian Classroom	3.4333	3.3404	0.872	0.385
Inadequate Communication	3.7494	3.6355	1.204	0.231
Inconvenience Avoidance	3.6694	3.5088	1.799	0.074
Instructional Narrowness	3.5667	3.4474	0.986	0.326
Undermining Colleagues	3.4508	3.3283	1.208	0.229

Summary

The researcher compared professorial perception of college faculty using data generated by the CTBI instrument. The study was administered voluntarily to faculty members at three church-affiliated and three non-church affiliated institutions of higher education in

Kentucky. The study examined data based on the respondent's church-affiliation and gender.

Analyses of the findings indicated that no statistical differences in professorial perception of professional conduct existed among the college faculty surveyed in this study with regard to institutional affiliation. However, differences were measured with regard to gender perception of professorial conduct in the areas of condescending negativism and particularistic grading. Female respondents indicated a significantly higher mean score in the areas of condescending negativism and particularistic grading. In particular, female respondents indicated ridiculing students and colleagues in front of others was to be considered a more severe infraction than did their male counterparts. Female respondents also indicated that grading bias was a more severe infraction. Chapter Five will present the practical significance of this study.

Chapter Five

Summary, Discussion, and Implications

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to compare professorial views of professional conduct among faculty employed in six institutions of higher education in Kentucky. Chapter Four compared professorial views of college faculty at church-affiliated institutions to their counterparts in non-church affiliated institutions. Comparisons of perceptions were also made with respect to the gender of faculty members. Chapter Five provides a summary of the study along with its implications. The study was conducted for the following specific purposes:

- 1) To explore professorial views of normative professional conduct within church-affiliated institutions in Kentucky as compared with their secular counterparts.
- 2) To determine if a relationship exists between gender and professorial views of normative professional conduct of college faculty in Kentucky higher education.

Discussion

Six institutions of higher education in Kentucky were chosen to participate in this study. Three schools (Brescia University, Saint Catharine College, and University of the Cumberlands) were chosen because of their church-affiliation. Three schools (Bluegrass Community and Technical College, Owensboro Community and Technical

College, and Western Kentucky University) were chosen to represent non-church affiliated institutions. Data were obtained from voluntarily participants using a modified version of the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI). Data analyses failed to measure significant differences between three church-affiliated and three non-church affiliated institutions. Analyses did, however, show a statistical significance between gender perception with regard to condescending negativism and particularistic grading. In both cases, female respondents indicated a higher mean score for both areas. This indicates that female respondents perceived those areas as more inviolable areas than their male counterparts.

Implications for Future Studies

Future studies in this area might look at specific church-affiliations with regard to professorial views. In addition, future research in this area should also explore gender perceptions based on church-affiliation. There were too few respondents from church-affiliated institutions to make a statistical comparison with respect to gender. Future researchers may also wish to consider professorial rank as it relates to views of professional conduct. Future research might also look at a larger number of institutions within Kentucky. Additionally, future researchers may explore how rank and length of service to institutions affect professorial conduct.

Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study are specific to the institutions included in the study. The study did not consider how faculty members working in Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) institutions perceive professional conduct.

Summary

The main purpose of this study was to examine faculty perceptions of non-instructional professional conduct in colleges and universities across the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The study also explored gender perceptions of college faculty in Kentucky. This study was designed to measure the professorial perceptions using a modified version of the CTBI which contained 68 Likert-scale statements regarding professional conduct of college faculty. A review of relevant literature indicated professional perceptions of college faculty may be influenced by church-affiliation. This study was unable to substantiate that claim for the institutions included in the study. As a result, the researcher suggests that future studies in this area increase the sampling size to determine if a larger sample results in different findings.

With regard to gender perception of professorial conduct, significant differences were established using independent-samples *t*-tests for the areas of condescending negativism and particularistic grading. In particular, female respondents ($M = 4.4667$) indicated significantly higher mean scores for the area of condescending negativism than their male counterparts ($M = 4.2702$): $t(145) = 2.254, p < 0.03$. The area of particularistic grading yielded a similar finding. Female respondents ($M = 4.1651$) scored

particularistic grading higher than male respondents ($M = 3.9624$) which was significant:
 $t(145) = 2.395, p < 0.02$.

In addition to increasing sample size and expanding the number of institutions included in the study, future research in this area should explore professorial conduct as it relates to rank and length of service among college faculty.

References

- Advameg Inc. (2010). *Kentucky religions*. Retrieved from: <http://www.city-data.com/states/Kentucky-Religions.html>.
- Baca, M.C., & Stein, R. H. (1983). *Ethical principles, practices, and problems in higher education*. Springfield, IL: Thomas Publishers.
- Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A.E. (1999). *Faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A.E. (2002). *Faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Brescia University. (2009). *Mission and Heritage of Brescia University*. Retrieved from: http://www.brescia.edu/about_brescia/mission_and_heritage/
- Carr, D. (2000). *Professionalism and ethics in teaching*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Corey, G., Corey, M. S., Callahan, P. (2011). *Issues and ethics in helping professions* (8th ed.). New York: Cengage.
- Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (2011). *CCCU Member Application*. Retrieved from: http://www.cccu.org/filefolder/CCCU_Member_Application_Form.pdf.
- Eastern Kentucky University. (2010). *Fast facts*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ir.eku.edu/web/FastFacts/pdf/0910FastFacts.pdf>.
- Gibbs, J. P. (1981). *Norms, deviance and social control: Conceptual matters*. New York: Elsevier.
- Green, M. H. (2008). *Academic Impropriety: Violation of Normative Teaching Behaviors as identified by nursing educators*. (Doctoral dissertation). Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Hitchcock, S. T., & Esposito J. L. (2004). *Geography of religion: Where God lives, where pilgrims walk*. Washington, DC: National Geographic.
- Holmes, A. B. (1996). *Ethics in higher education*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Jarvis, P. (1992). *Paradoxes of learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kentucky Community and Technical College System (2010). *2006-2010 Strategic plan*. Retrieved from: http://legacy.bluegrass.kctcs.edu/fa/iesp/strategic_plan/

- Kentucky Community and Technical College System (2010). *Bluegrass Community and Technical College Divisions*. Retrieved from: <http://bluegrass.kctcs.edu/Academics/Divisions>
- Kentucky Community and Technical College System. (2010). *Bluegrass Community and Technical College*. Retrieved from: http://www.kctcs.edu/en/Colleges_and_Campuses/Bluegrass.aspx
- Kentucky Community and Technical College System. (2010). *Our History*. Retrieved from: http://kctcs.edu/en/About_KCTCS/Our_History.aspx
- Kentucky Community and Technical College System. (2010). *Owensboro Community and Technical College*. Retrieved from: http://www.kctcs.edu/en/Colleges_and_Campuses/Owensboro.aspx
- Kentucky Community and Technical College System. (2010). *Owensboro Community and Technical College Departments*. Retrieved from: <http://www.octc.kctcs.edu/Academics/Departments>
- Kentucky Community and Technical College System (2010). *KCTCS administrative policies and procedures 2.0.2: Employee rights and responsibilities*. Retrieved from: <http://legacy.kctcs.edu/employee/policies/volumeII/volII2-0-2.pdf>
- Kentucky Community and Technical College System (2010). *KCTCS administrative policies and procedures 3.4: Political action*. Retrieved from: <http://legacy.kctcs.edu/employee/policies/volumeII/volII3-4.pdf>
- Kentucky Wesleyan College. (2010). *Institutional Profile*. Retrieved from: <http://www.kwc.edu/radiate/radiateUploadFiles/InstitutionalProfile2009-2010.pdf>
- Knight, J., & Auster, C. J. (1999). Faculty conduct. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70(2), 188-210.
- Lewis, M. (1997). *Poisoning the ivy: The seven deadly sins and other vices of higher education in America*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe Publishing.
- Markie, P. J. (1994). *Professor's duties: Ethical issues in college teaching*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- McKeachie, W. J., & Svinicki, M. (2006). *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rossi, R. H., & Beck, R. A. (1985). Varieties of normative consensus. *American Sociological Review*, 50:333-347.

- Saint Catharine College (2011). *History of Saint Catharine College*. Retrieved from: <http://www.sccky.edu/aboutus/history-stcatharine.php>.
- Saint Catharine College (2011). *Quick Facts: Saint Catharine College*. Retrieved from: <http://www.sccky.edu/aboutus/collegefacts.php>.
- Spatz, C. (2008). *Basic statistics: Tales of distribution*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Strike, K. A., & Ternasky, P. L. (1993). *Ethics for professionals in education: Perspectives for preparation and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Teven, J.J., & McCroskey, J.C. (1997). The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation. *Communication Education*, 46(1), 1-9.
- Tweedie, S.W. (1978). Viewing the Bible belt. *Journal of Popular Culture*, XI: 865-876.
- University of Cumberlands. (2008). *2008-09 MBA catalog*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ucumberlands.edu/academics/0809MBA.pdf>.
- University of the Cumberlands. (2010). *About University of the Cumberlands*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ucumberlands.edu/about/index.html>.
- University of the Cumberlands. (2010). *History of Cumberland College/University of the Cumberlands*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ucumberlands.edu/about/history.html>.
- University of the Cumberlands. (2009). *Policies and procedures for all employees*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ucumberlands.edu/humanresources/downloads/policies.pdf>
- Vann, B. A. (2007). Irish protestants and the creation of the Bible belt. *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, 5(1): 87-106.
- Vann, B. A. (2008). *In search of Ulster-Scots land: The birth and geotheological imagings of a transatlantic people, 1603-1703*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Western Kentucky University. (2010). *Fact book*. Retrieved from: <https://sasweb1.wku.edu/SASPortal/mainUnchallenged.do?unchallenged=yes>
- Western Kentucky University. (2010). *Faculty handbook*. Retrieved from: <http://www.wku.edu/Dept/Support/AcadAffairs/pdf/WKU%20FACULTY%20HANDBOOK%2017th%20edition.pdf>
- Williams, B. A. O. (2006). *Ethics and the limits of philosophy*. Milton Park, Abington, Oxford: Routledge.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Statement

I am completing the dissertation phase for the degree of Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) at the University of the Cumberlands. I am asking that you participate in a survey on college faculty behaviors. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time. Anonymity is guaranteed. There will be no consequences or harm to you if you choose not to participate, and there are also no consequences or anticipated instances of harm if you elect to participate.

The survey that will take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated!

Results from this study will be available by the end of the fall 2011 academic semester. If you would like a copy of the final results, please feel free to email the researcher Kenneth R. Alford at kenneth.alford@ohio.kyschools.us.

Kenneth R. Alford
April 5, 2011

Appendix B

Permission to Use CTBI

Mr. Alford. You are most welcome to use the CTBI in your dissertation research. You need only to cite it or acknowledge the source of the instrument. Keep me posted on your research. Best wishes, Professor John M. Braxton

John M. Braxton
Editor, Journal of College Student Development
Associate Editor, Higher Education: A Handbook of Theory and Research
Professor of Education
Higher Education Leadership and Policy Program
Department of Leadership, Policy and Organizations
Peabody College
Box 414
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37203

----- Original Message -----

From: Alford, Kenneth

To: Braxton, John M

Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2011 11:30 PM

Subject: permission to use College Teaching Behaviors Inventory

Dr. Braxton,

I am a doctoral student at the University of the Cumberland in Williamsburg, KY. My dissertation focuses on ethical conduct among college faculty members at select universities and colleges in Kentucky. I am writing to request permission to use the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) as presented in the 2002 edition of *Faculty Misconduct in Collegiate Teaching*. It is my intent to distribute the CTBI to faculty members at six undergraduate institutions within the Commonwealth of Kentucky to ascertain the current views regarding inviolable and admonitory behaviors.

I appreciate the time and effort you and Dr. Bayer spent on the original work and it is my hope that you will allow me to further contribute to the body of knowledge regarding this topic by allowing me to use the CTBI instrument.

If you need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,
Kenneth R. Alford

Appendix C

Original CTBI

COLLEGE TEACHING BEHAVIORS INVENTORY[®]

Teaching is a complex activity composed of many behaviors and expectations. Listed below are some behaviors related to college teaching. These may appear to be inappropriate to some faculty members but not to others. Using the response codes listed below, please indicate your opinion on each of the listed behaviors as you think they might best ideally apply to a faculty member teaching a *lower division college course in your field of about 40 enrolled students, whether or not you teach such a course yourself*. The response categories are as follows:

- 1 = Appropriate behavior, should be encouraged
- 2 = Discretionary behavior, neither particularly appropriate nor inappropriate
- 3 = Mildly inappropriate behavior, generally to be ignored
- 4 = Inappropriate behavior, to be handled informally by colleagues or administrators suggesting change or improvement.
- 5 = Very inappropriate behavior, requiring formal administrative intervention

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires intervention
<u>A. PRE-PLANNING FOR THE COURSE</u>					
A1. Required text and other reading materials are not routinely ordered by the instructor in time to be available for the first class session.	1	2	3	4	5
A2. A course outline or syllabus is not prepared for a course.	1	2	3	4	5
A3. Prior to the first meeting of a class, the instructor does not visit the assigned classroom and assess its facilities.	1	2	3	4	5
A4. A course outline or syllabus does not contain dates for assignments and/or examinations.	1	2	3	4	5
A5. Objectives for the course are not specified by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
A6. Changes in a course are made without seeking information from students who have previously taken the course.	1	2	3	4	5
A7. The instructor does not read reviews of appropriate textbooks.	1	2	3	4	5
A8. The course is designed without taking into account the needs or abilities of students enrolling in the course.	1	2	3	4	5
A9. Colleagues teaching the same or similar courses are not consulted on	1	2	3	4	5

ways to teach the particular course.

A10. Required course materials are not kept within reasonable cost limits as perceived by students.	1	2	3	4	5
A11. New lectures or revised lectures which reflect advancements in the field are not prepared.	1	2	3	4	5
A12. In-class activities are not prepared and anticipated in advance, but are developed while the class is in session.	1	2	3	4	5
A13. The instructor does not request necessary audio visual materials in time to be available for class.	1	2	3	4	5
A14. Assigned books and articles are not put on library reserve by the instructor on a timely basis for student use.	1	2	3	4	5

B. FIRST DAY OF CLASS

B1. Class roll is not taken.	1	2	3	4	5
B2. The instructor does not introduce her/himself to the class.	1	2	3	4	5
B3. Office hours are not communicated to the students.	1	2	3	4	5
B4. The instructor changes classroom location to another building without informing students in advance.	1	2	3	4	5
B5. The instructor changes class meeting time without consulting students.	1	2	3	4	5
B6. Students are not informed of the instructor's policy on missed or make-up examinations.	1	2	3	4	5
B7. Students are not informed of extra credit opportunities which are available in the course during the term.	1	2	3	4	5
B8. Students are not asked to record their background, experiences, and interests for reference by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
B9. An overview of the course is not presented to students on the first day.	1	2	3	4	5
B10. An introduction to the first course topic is not begun on the first day.	1	2	3	4	5
B11. The first class meeting is dismissed early.	1	2	3	4	5
B12. The first reading assignment is not communicated to the class.	1	2	3	4	5
B13. A course outline or syllabus is not prepared and passed out to students.	1	2	3	4	5
B14. The instructor does not ask students if they have questions regarding the course.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires intervention
<u>C. IN-CLASS BEHAVIORS</u>					
C1. Class sessions are begun without an opportunity for students to ask questions.	1	2	3	4	5
C2. The topics or objectives to be covered for the day are not announced at the beginning of the class.	1	2	3	4	5
C3. Joke-telling and humor unrelated to course content occurs routinely in class.	1	2	3	4	5
C4. The instructor frequently uses profanity in class.	1	2	3	4	5
C5. Class is usually dismissed early.	1	2	3	4	5
C6. The instructor meets the class without having reviewed pertinent materials for the day.	1	2	3	4	5
C7. The instructor routinely allows one or a few students to dominate class discussions.	1	2	3	4	5
C8. Instructions and requirements for course assignments are not clearly described to students.	1	2	3	4	5
C9. Class does not begin with a review of the last class session.	1	2	3	4	5
C10. Joke-telling and humor related to course content occurs frequently in class.	1	2	3	4	5
C11. The instructor does not end the class session by summarizing material covered during the class.	1	2	3	4	5
C12. The instructor is routinely late for class meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
C13. The instructor routinely holds the class beyond its scheduled ending time.	1	2	3	4	5
C14. The instructor does not take class attendance every class meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
C15. The instructor does not introduce new teaching methods or procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
C16. The instructor does not provide in-class opportunities for students to voice their opinion about the course.	1	2	3	4	5
C17. The instructor calls on students to answer questions in class on a non-voluntary basis.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires intervention
C18. The instructor does not follow course outline or syllabus for most of the course.	1	2	3	4	5
C19. The instructor practices poor personal hygiene and regularly has offensive body odor.	1	2	3	4	5
C20. The instructor routinely wears a sloppy sweatshirt and rumpled blue jeans to class.	1	2	3	4	5
C21. While able to conduct class, the instructor frequently attends class while obviously intoxicated.	1	2	3	4	5

D. TREATING COURSE CONTENT

D1. The instructor does not have students evaluate the course at the end of the term.	1	2	3	4	5
D2. The instructor insists that students take one particular perspective on course content.	1	2	3	4	5
D3. The instructor's professional biases or assumptions are not explicitly made known to students.	1	2	3	4	5
D4. The instructor frequently introduces opinion on religious, political or social issues clearly outside the realm of the course topics.	1	2	3	4	5
D5. The instructor does not include pertinent scholarly contributions of women and minorities in the content of the course.	1	2	3	4	5
D6. Memorization of course content is stressed at the expense of analysis and critical thinking.	1	2	3	4	5
D7. Connections between the course and other courses are not made clear by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
D8. The relationship of the course content to the overall departmental curriculum is not indicated.	1	2	3	4	5
D9. A cynical attitude toward the subject matter is expressed by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires intervention
<u>E. EXAMINATION AND GRADING PRACTICES</u>					
E1. The instructor does not give assignments or examinations requiring student writing skills.	1	2	3	4	5
E2. When examinations or papers are returned, student questions are not answered during class time.	1	2	3	4	5
E3. Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
E4. Individual student course evaluations, where students can be identified, are read prior to the determination of final course grades.	1	2	3	4	5
E5. Examination questions do not represent a range of difficulty.	1	2	3	4	5
E6. Grades are distributed on a “curve.”	1	2	3	4	5
E7. An instructor lowers course standards in order to be popular with students.	1	2	3	4	5
E8. The standards for a course are set so high that most of the class receives failing grades for the course.	1	2	3	4	5
E9. Individual students are offered extra-credit work in order to improve their final course grade <i>after</i> the term is completed.	1	2	3	4	5
E10. Explanation of the basis for grades given for essay questions or papers is not provided to students.	1	2	3	4	5
E11. Written comments on tests and papers are consistently not made by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
E12. The instructor allows personal friendships with a student to intrude on the objective grading of their work.	1	2	3	4	5
E13. Student papers or essay examination questions are not read at least twice before a grade is given.	1	2	3	4	5
E14. Social, personal or other non-academic characteristics of students are taken into account in the awarding of student grades.	1	2	3	4	5
E15. Final examinations are administered during a regular class period rather than at the official examination period.	1	2	3	4	5
E16. Student class participation is considered in awarding the final course grade.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires intervention
E17. Student attendance in class is weighed in determining the final course grade.	1	2	3	4	5
E18. Student opinions about the method of grading are not sought.	1	2	3	4	5
E19. Students' work is not graded anonymously.	1	2	3	4	5
E20. The final course grade is based on a single course assignment or a single examination.	1	2	3	4	5
E21. Examination questions do not tap a variety of education objectives ranging from the retention of facts to critical thinking.	1	2	3	4	5
E22. Sexist or racist comments in students' written work are not discouraged.	1	2	3	4	5
E23. An instructor does not hold review sessions before examinations.	1	2	3	4	5
E24. All student grades are publicly posted with social security numbers and without names.	1	2	3	4	5
E25. Graded papers and examinations are left in an accessible location where students can search through to get back their own.	1	2	3	4	5

F. FACULTY-STUDENT IN-CLASS INTERACTIONS

F1. Stated policies about late work and incompletes are not universally applied to all students.	1	2	3	4	5
F2. Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
F3. The instructor expresses impatience with a slow learner in class.	1	2	3	4	5
F4. The instructor does not encourage student questions during class time.	1	2	3	4	5
F5. An instructor makes condescending remarks to a student in class.	1	2	3	4	5
F6. The instructor does not learn the names of all students in the class.	1	2	3	4	5
F7. A clear lack of class members' understanding about course content is ignored by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
F8. Shy students are not encouraged to speak in class.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires intervention
F9. The instructor does not allow students to direct their comments to other members of the class.	1	2	3	4	5

G. RELATIONSHIPS WITH COLLEAGUES

G1. A faculty member refuses to share academic information about mutual students with colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
G2. A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committee that there are very low grading standards in a colleague's course.	1	2	3	4	5
G3. A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committee that a colleague's course content largely includes obsolete material.	1	2	3	4	5
G4. A faculty member refuses to share course syllabi with colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
G5. A faculty member avoids sharing ideas about teaching methods with colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
G6. A faculty member refuses to allow colleagues to observe his/her classroom teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
G7. A faculty member assumes new teaching responsibilities in the specialty of a colleague without discussing appropriate course content with that colleague.	1	2	3	4	5
G8. A faculty member makes negative comments in a faculty meeting about the courses offered by a colleague.	1	2	3	4	5
G9. A faculty member makes negative comments about a colleague in public before students.	1	2	3	4	5
G10. A faculty member aggressively promotes enrollment in his/her courses at the expense of the courses of departmental colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
G11. The requirements in a course are so great that they prevent enrolled students from giving adequate attention to their other courses.	1	2	3	4	5
G12. A faculty member refuses to team teach a course.	1	2	3	4	5
G13. A faculty member avoids talking about his/her academic specialty with departmental colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires intervention
G14. A faculty member gives unsolicited advice on the content of a colleague's course.	1	2	3	4	5
G15. A faculty member gives unsolicited advice to a colleague about teaching methods.	1	2	3	4	5
G16. A faculty member refuses to participate in departmental curricular planning.	1	2	3	4	5

H. OUT-OF-CLASS PRACTICES

H1. Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept.	1	2	3	4	5
H2. Individual counseling on matters unrelated to course content is not provided to students enrolled in one's courses.	1	2	3	4	5
H3. A faculty member criticizes the academic performance of a student in front of other students.	1	2	3	4	5
H4. A faculty member avoids spending time with students outside of class time and/or regular office hours.	1	2	3	4	5
H5. A faculty member insists that they never be phoned at home by students, regardless of circumstances.	1	2	3	4	5
H6. A faculty member makes suggestive sexual comments to a student enrolled in the course.	1	2	3	4	5
H7. A faculty member has a sexual relationship with a student enrolled in the course.	1	2	3	4	5
H8. A faculty member does not refer a student with a special problem to the appropriate campus service.	1	2	3	4	5
H9. An advisee is treated in a condescending manner.	1	2	3	4	5
H10. A faculty member avoids giving career or job advice when asked by students.	1	2	3	4	5
H11. A faculty member refuses to write letters of reference for any student.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires intervention
H12. A faculty member neglects to send a letter of recommendation that they had agreed to write.	1	2	3	4	5
H13. A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors.	1	2	3	4	5
H14. A cynical attitude toward the role of teaching is expressed by an instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
H15. A faculty member's involvement in scholarship is so great that he/she fails to adequately prepare for class.	1	2	3	4	5
H16. Scholarly literature is not read for the purpose of integrating new information into one's courses.	1	2	3	4	5
H17. A faculty member avoids reading literature on teaching techniques or methods.	1	2	3	4	5
H18. A faculty member avoids professional development opportunities that would enhance their teaching.	1	2	3	4	5

A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR AND YOUR INSTITUTION'S TEACHING OBJECTIVES

1. How important is *each* of the following as: (a) your personal goal or aim in your teaching of undergraduate students, and (b) your institution's goal in undergraduate education?

1 = Essential

2 = Very important

3 = Somewhat important

4 = Not important, or irrelevant

(a) My teaching
goals.
(circle one)

(b) Overall Instit-
utional goals.
(circle one)

To master knowledge in a discipline	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To convey a basic appreciation of the liberal arts	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To increase the desire and ability to undertake self-directed learning	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To develop the ability to think clearly	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To develop creative capacities	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To develop the ability to pursue research	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To prepare students for employment after college	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To prepare students for graduate or advanced education	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To develop moral character	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To develop religious beliefs or convictions	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To provide for students' emotional development	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To achieve deeper levels of students' self-understanding	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To develop responsible citizens	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To provide the local community with skilled human resources	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To provide tools for the critical evaluation of contemporary society	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
To prepare students for family living	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU AND YOUR INSTITUTION

1. Are you considered a full-time faculty member by your institution for the current academic year? (check one)

_____ Yes, full-time

_____ No, part-time, but more than half-time

_____ No, half-time

_____ No, less than half-time

2. Your academic rank: (check one)

_____ Professor

_____ Associate Professor

_____ Assistant Professor

_____ Instructor

_____ Lecturer

_____ Other(specify: _____)

3. Your tenure status: (check one)

_____ Tenured

_____ Untenured, but on tenure track

_____ Untenured, and
not on tenure track

4. Are you, or have you ever been, a Department Head/Chair or a Dean? (check one)

_____ No

_____ Yes, but not now

_____ Yes, and am currently

5. Your gender:

_____ Female

_____ Male

Appendix D

Modified CTBI

COLLEGE TEACHING BEHAVIORS INVENTORY ©

Teaching is a complex activity composed of many behaviors and expectations. Listed below are some behaviors related to college teaching. These may appear to be inappropriate to some faculty members but not to others. Using the response codes listed below, please indicate your opinion on each of the listed behaviors as you think they might best ideally apply to a faculty member teaching a *lower division college course in your field of about 40 enrolled students, whether or not you teach such a course yourself*. The response categories are as follows:

- 1 = Appropriate behavior, should be encouraged
- 2 = Discretionary behavior, neither particularly appropriate nor inappropriate
- 3 = Mildly inappropriate behavior, generally to be ignored
- 4 = Inappropriate behavior, to be handled informally by colleagues or administrators suggesting change or improvement.
- 5 = Very inappropriate behavior, requiring formal administrative intervention

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires
<u>A. PRE-PLANNING FOR THE COURSE</u>					
A course outline or syllabus is not prepared for a course.	1	2	3	4	5
The course is designed without taking into account the needs or abilities of students enrolling in the course.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor does not request necessary audio visual materials in time to be available for class.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires
Assigned books and articles are not put on library reserve by the instructor on a timely basis for student use.	1	2	3	4	5
<u>B. FIRST DAY OF CLASS</u>					
The instructor does not introduce her/himself to the class.	1	2	3	4	5
Office hours are not communicated to the students.	1	2	3	4	5
Students are not informed of the instructor's policy on missed or make-up examinations.	1	2	3	4	5
Students are not informed of extra credit opportunities which are available in the course during the term.	1	2	3	4	5
The first class meeting is dismissed early.	1	2	3	4	5
A course outline or syllabus is not prepared and passed out to students.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor does not ask students if they have questions regarding the course.	1	2	3	4	5
<u>C. IN-CLASS BEHAVIORS</u>					
Joke-telling and humor unrelated to course content occur routinely in class.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor frequently uses profanity in class.	1	2	3	4	5
Class is usually dismissed early.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires
The instructor routinely allows one or a few students to dominate class discussions.	1	2	3	4	5
Joke-telling and humor related to course content occur frequently in class.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor is routinely late for class meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor routinely holds the class beyond its scheduled ending time.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor does not take class attendance every class meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor does not provide in-class opportunities for students to voice their opinion about the course.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor does not follow course outline or syllabus for most of the course.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor practices poor personal hygiene and regularly has offensive body odor.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor routinely wears a sloppy sweatshirt and rumpled blue jeans to class.	1	2	3	4	5
While able to conduct class, the instructor frequently attends class while obviously intoxicated.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires
<u>D. TREATING COURSE CONTENT</u>					
The instructor does not have students evaluate the course at the end of the term.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor's professional biases or assumptions are not explicitly made known to students.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor frequently introduces opinion on religious, political or social issues clearly outside the realm of the course topics.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor does not include pertinent scholarly contributions of women and minorities in the content of the course.	1	2	3	4	5
Connections between the course and other courses are not made clear by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
A cynical attitude toward the subject matter is expressed by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
<u>E. EXAMINATION AND GRADING PRACTICES</u>					
Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
Grades are distributed on a "curve."	1	2	3	4	5
An instructor lowers course standards in order to be popular with students.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires
The standards for a course are set so high that most of the class receives failing grades for the course.	1	2	3	4	5
Individual students are offered extra-credit work in order to improve their final course grade <i>after</i> the term is completed.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor allows personal friendships with a student to intrude on the objective grading of his/her work.	1	2	3	4	5
Social, personal or other non-academic characteristics of students are taken into account in the awarding of student grades.	1	2	3	4	5
The final course grade is based on a single course assignment or a single examination.	1	2	3	4	5
Sexist or racist comments in students' written work are not discouraged.	1	2	3	4	5
All student grades are publicly posted with Social Security numbers and without names.	1	2	3	4	5
Graded papers and examinations are left in an accessible location where students can search through to get back their own.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires
<u>F. FACULTY-STUDENT IN-CLASS INTERACTIONS</u>					
Stated policies about late work and incompletes are not universally applied to all students.	1	2	3	4	5
Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor expresses impatience with a slow learner in class.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor does not encourage student questions during class time.	1	2	3	4	5
An instructor makes condescending remarks to a student in class.	1	2	3	4	5
The instructor does not learn the names of all students in the class.	1	2	3	4	5
A clear lack of class members' understanding about course content is ignored by the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5

G. RELATIONSHIPS WITH COLLEAGUES

A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committee that there are very low grading standards in a colleague's course.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member refuses to share course syllabi with colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires
A faculty member makes negative comments in a faculty meeting about the courses offered by a colleague.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member makes negative comments about a colleague in public before students.	1	2	3	4	5
The requirements in a course are so great that they prevent enrolled students from giving adequate attention to their other courses.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member gives unsolicited advice on the content of a colleague's course.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member refuses to participate in departmental curricular planning.	1	2	3	4	5

H. OUT-OF-CLASS PRACTICES

Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member criticizes the academic performance of a student in front of other students.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member insists that they never be phoned at home by students, regardless of circumstances.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member makes suggestive sexual comments to a student enrolled in the course.	1	2	3	4	5

	Appropriate/encourage	Discretionary	Mildly inappropriate/ignore	Inappropriate/handle informally	Very inappropriate/requires
A faculty member has a sexual relationship with a student enrolled in the course.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member does not refer a student with a special problem to the appropriate campus service.	1	2	3	4	5
An advisee is treated in a condescending manner.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member avoids giving career or job advice when asked by students.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member refuses to write letters of reference for any student.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors.	1	2	3	4	5
A cynical attitude toward the role of teaching is expressed by an instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
A faculty member's involvement in scholarship is so great that he/she fails to adequately prepare for class.	1	2	3	4	5
Scholarly literature is not read for the purpose of integrating new information into one's courses.	1	2	3	4	5

A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU AND YOUR INSTITUTION

1. Which institution are you affiliated with?
- _____ Bluegrass Community and Technical College
- _____ Brescia University
- _____ Owensboro Community and Technical College
- _____ Saint Catharine College
- _____ University of the Cumberlands
- _____ Western Kentucky University
2. Are you considered a full-time faculty member by your institution for the current academic year? (check one)
- _____ Yes, full-time
- _____ No, part-time, but more than half-time
- _____ No, half-time
- _____ No, less than half-time
3. Your academic rank: (check one)
- _____ Professor
- _____ Associate Professor
- _____ Assistant Professor
- _____ Instructor
- _____ Lecturer
- _____ Other(specify: _____)
4. Your tenure status: (check one)
- _____ Tenured
- _____ Untenured, but on tenure track
- _____ Untenured, and not on tenure track
5. Your gender:
- _____ Female _____ Male

Appendix E

Table of Means and Standard Deviation for Behaviors Included in the Modified CTBI
(by Institutional Type)

Behavior	2011 Composite n = 147		2011 Church- Affiliated n = 51		2011 Non-church Affiliated n = 96	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
A course outline or syllabus is not prepared for a course.	4.551	0.930	4.686	0.761	4.479	1.005
The course is designed without taking into account the needs or abilities of students enrolling in the course.	4.034	0.982	4.020	0.990	4.042	0.983
The instructor does not request necessary audio visual materials in time to be available for class.	3.776	0.874	3.863	0.917	3.729	0.852
Assigned books and articles are not put on library reserve by the instructor on a timely basis for student use.	3.952	0.822	4.020	0.761	3.917	0.854
The instructor does not introduce her/himself to the class.	3.735	0.855	3.784	0.832	3.708	0.870
Office hours are not communicated to the students.	4.068	0.755	4.177	0.684	4.010	0.788
Students are not informed of the instructor's policy on missed or make-up examinations.	4.265	0.822	4.333	0.817	4.229	0.827
Students are not informed of extra credit opportunities which are available in the course during the term.	3.374	1.001	3.392	1.021	3.365	0.996
The first class meeting is dismissed early.	2.517	0.871	2.490	0.857	2.531	0.882
A course outline or syllabus is not prepared and passed out to students.	4.408	0.858	4.412	0.804	4.406	0.889
The instructor does not ask students if they have questions regarding the course.	3.429	0.936	3.471	0.967	3.406	0.924
Joke-telling and humor unrelated to course content occur routinely in class.	2.796	1.066	2.765	1.088	2.813	1.059
The instructor frequently uses profanity in class.	4.265	0.901	4.412	0.779	4.188	0.955
Class is usually dismissed early.	3.571	1.085	3.471	1.102	3.625	1.079

Behavior	2011 Composite n = 147		2011 Church-Affiliated n = 51		2011 Non-church Affiliated n = 96	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
The instructor routinely allows one or a few students to dominate class discussions.	3.415	0.851	3.529	0.857	3.354	0.846
Joke-telling and humor related to course content occur frequently in class.	2.014	0.965	2.020	0.969	2.010	0.968
The instructor is routinely late for class meetings.	4.347	0.689	4.412	0.606	4.313	0.730
The instructor routinely holds the class beyond its scheduled ending time.	3.973	0.852	4.137	0.800	3.885	0.869
The instructor does not take class attendance every class meeting.	2.857	1.098	3.177	1.195	2.688	1.009
The instructor does not provide in-class opportunities for students to voice their opinion about the course.	3.000	1.027	3.039	1.131	2.979	0.973
The instructor does not follow course outline or syllabus for most of the course.	3.939	1.080	3.667	1.178	4.083	1.002
The instructor practices poor personal hygiene and regularly has offensive body odor.	4.306	0.833	4.510	0.703	4.198	0.878
The instructor routinely wears a sloppy sweatshirt and rumpled blue jeans to class.	3.503	1.081	3.647	1.074	3.427	1.083
While able to conduct class, the instructor frequently attends class while obviously intoxicated.	4.959	0.230	5.000	0.000	4.938	0.283
The instructor does not have students evaluate the course at the end of the term.	3.476	1.246	3.569	1.188	3.427	1.279
The instructor's professional biases or assumptions are not explicitly made known to students.	2.612	1.119	2.686	1.208	2.573	1.074
The instructor frequently introduces opinion on religious, political or social issues clearly outside the realm of the course topics.	3.680	1.053	3.529	1.065	3.760	1.044

Behavior	2011 Composite n = 147		2011 Church-Affiliated n = 51		2011 Non-church Affiliated n = 96	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
The instructor does not include pertinent scholarly contributions of women and minorities in the content of the course.	3.435	1.079	3.490	1.027	3.406	1.111
Connections between the course and other courses are not made clear by the instructor.	3.000	0.936	3.157	0.925	2.917	0.937
A cynical attitude toward the subject matter is expressed by the instructor.	3.810	1.056	3.961	1.038	3.729	1.061
Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor.	3.660	0.880	3.726	0.874	3.625	0.886
Grades are distributed on a "curve."	2.633	1.041	2.549	1.026	2.677	1.051
An instructor lowers course standards in order to be popular with students.	4.333	0.847	4.353	0.658	4.323	0.935
The standards for a course are set so high that most of the class receives failing grades for the course.	4.041	1.072	4.137	1.000	3.990	1.110
Individual students are offered extra-credit work in order to improve their final course grade after the term is completed.	4.122	1.140	3.882	1.194	4.250	1.095
The instructor allows personal friendships with a student to intrude on the objective grading of his/her work.	4.694	0.544	4.647	0.627	4.719	0.496
Social, personal or other non-academic characteristics of students are taken into account in the awarding of student grades.	4.456	0.830	4.490	0.758	4.438	0.868
The final course grade is based on a single course assignment or a single examination.	4.095	1.143	4.000	1.217	4.146	1.105
Sexist or racist comments in students' written work are not discouraged.	4.272	0.933	4.196	1.114	4.313	0.825
All student grades are publicly posted with Social Security numbers and without names.	4.673	0.714	4.431	0.964	4.802	0.495
Graded papers and examinations are left in an accessible location where students can search through to get back their own.	4.408	0.817	4.333	0.887	4.448	0.780

Behavior	2011 Composite n = 147		2011 Church- Affiliated n = 51		2011 Non-church Affiliated n = 96	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Stated policies about late work and incompletes are not universally applied to all students.	4.367	0.876	4.333	0.817	4.385	0.910
Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor.	4.048	0.886	3.980	1.086	4.083	0.763
The instructor expresses impatience with a slow learner in class.	4.211	0.695	4.196	0.775	4.219	0.652
The instructor does not encourage student questions during class time.	3.483	1.016	3.628	0.937	3.406	1.052
An instructor makes condescending remarks to a student in class.	4.469	0.675	4.471	0.703	4.469	0.664
The instructor does not learn the names of all students in the class.	2.918	0.955	3.059	0.968	2.844	0.944
A clear lack of class members' understanding about course content is ignored by the instructor.	3.667	1.009	3.726	1.060	3.635	0.985
A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committee that there are very low grading standards in a colleague's course.	2.966	1.030	2.941	1.008	2.979	1.046
A faculty member refuses to share course syllabi with colleagues.	3.272	0.983	3.392	1.078	3.208	0.928
A faculty member makes negative comments in a faculty meeting about the courses offered by a colleague.	3.986	0.844	4.177	0.994	3.885	0.738
A faculty member makes negative comments about a colleague in public before students.	4.510	0.666	4.510	0.644	4.510	0.680
The requirements in a course are so great that they prevent enrolled students from giving adequate attention to their other courses.	3.646	1.019	3.902	0.900	3.510	1.056
A faculty member gives unsolicited advice on the content of a colleague's course.	3.347	0.977	3.392	1.041	3.323	0.946

Behavior	2011 Composite n = 147		2011 Church- Affiliated n = 51		2011 Non-church Affiliated n = 96	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
A faculty member refuses to participate in departmental curricular planning.	4.252	0.867	4.255	0.977	4.250	0.808
Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept.	4.286	0.731	4.333	0.712	4.260	0.743
A faculty member criticizes the academic performance of a student in front of other students.	4.585	0.775	4.647	0.627	4.552	0.844
A faculty member insists that he/she never be phoned at home by students, regardless of circumstances.	2.367	1.054	2.392	0.961	2.354	1.105
A faculty member makes suggestive sexual comments to a student enrolled in the course.	4.932	0.278	4.941	0.238	4.927	0.299
A faculty member has a sexual relationship with a student enrolled in the course.	4.864	0.477	4.961	0.280	4.813	0.549
A faculty member does not refer a student with a special problem to the appropriate campus service.	4.000	0.891	4.059	0.947	3.969	0.864
An advisee is treated in a condescending manner.	4.177	0.719	4.255	0.771	4.135	0.690
A faculty member avoids giving career or job advice when asked by students.	3.095	1.029	3.275	1.078	3.000	0.995
A faculty member refuses to write letters of reference for any student.	3.095	1.036	3.314	1.157	2.979	0.951
A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors.	4.259	0.845	4.373	0.848	4.198	0.841
A cynical attitude toward the role of teaching is expressed by an instructor.	4.075	0.845	4.137	0.749	4.042	0.893
A faculty member's involvement in scholarship is so great that he/she fails to adequately prepare for class.	4.245	0.773	4.235	0.839	4.250	0.740
Scholarly literature is not read for the purpose of integrating new information into one's courses.	3.500	0.970	3.600	0.904	3.448	1.004

Appendix F

Table of Means and Standard Deviation for Behaviors Included in the Modified CTBI
(by Gender)

Behavior	2011 Composite n = 147		Female n = 90		Male n = 57	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
A course outline or syllabus is not prepared for a course.	4.551	0.930	4.511	1.019	4.614	0.774
The course is designed without taking into account the needs or abilities of students enrolling in the course.	4.034	0.982	4.100	0.949	3.930	1.033
The instructor does not request necessary audio visual materials in time to be available for class.	3.776	0.874	3.833	0.811	3.684	0.967
Assigned books and articles are not put on library reserve by the instructor on a timely basis for student use.	3.952	0.822	4.000	0.779	3.877	0.888
The instructor does not introduce her/himself to the class.	3.735	0.855	3.789	0.828	3.649	0.896
Office hours are not communicated to the students.	4.068	0.755	4.133	0.690	3.965	0.844
Students are not informed of the instructor's policy on missed or make-up examinations.	4.265	0.822	4.400	0.684	4.053	0.971
Students are not informed of extra credit opportunities which are available in the course during the term.	3.374	1.001	3.567	0.925	3.070	1.050
The first class meeting is dismissed early.	2.517	0.871	2.489	0.864	2.561	0.887
A course outline or syllabus is not prepared and passed out to students.	4.408	0.858	4.411	0.873	4.404	0.842
The instructor does not ask students if they have questions regarding the course.	3.429	0.936	3.456	0.889	3.386	1.013
Joke-telling and humor unrelated to course content occur routinely in class.	2.796	1.066	2.889	1.043	2.649	1.094
The instructor frequently uses profanity in class.	4.265	0.901	4.356	0.852	4.123	0.965
Class is usually dismissed early.	3.571	1.085	3.589	1.131	3.544	1.019

Behavior	2011 Composite n = 147		Female n = 90		Male n = 57	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
The instructor routinely allows one or a few students to dominate class discussions.	3.415	0.851	3.367	0.893	3.491	0.782
Joke-telling and humor related to course content occur frequently in class.	2.014	0.965	2.133	0.950	1.825	0.966
The instructor is routinely late for class meetings.	4.347	0.689	4.389	0.631	4.281	0.774
The instructor routinely holds the class beyond its scheduled ending time.	3.973	0.852	3.911	0.920	4.070	0.728
The instructor does not take class attendance every class meeting.	2.857	1.098	2.922	1.124	2.754	1.057
The instructor does not provide in-class opportunities for students to voice their opinion about the course.	3.000	1.027	2.978	1.049	3.035	0.999
The instructor does not follow course outline or syllabus for most of the course.	3.939	1.080	4.033	0.953	3.790	1.250
The instructor practices poor personal hygiene and regularly has offensive body odor.	4.306	0.833	4.444	0.751	4.088	0.912
The instructor routinely wears a sloppy sweatshirt and rumped blue jeans to class.	3.503	1.081	3.622	1.087	3.316	1.055
While able to conduct class, the instructor frequently attends class while obviously intoxicated.	4.959	0.230	4.989	0.105	4.912	0.342
The instructor does not have students evaluate the course at the end of the term.	3.476	1.246	3.511	1.220	3.421	1.295
The instructor's professional biases or assumptions are not explicitly made known to students.	2.612	1.119	2.567	1.122	2.684	1.121
The instructor frequently introduces opinion on religious, political or social issues clearly outside the realm of the course topics.	3.680	1.053	3.744	1.001	3.579	1.133

Behavior	2011 Composite n = 147		Female n = 90		Male n = 57	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
The instructor does not include pertinent scholarly contributions of women and minorities in the content of the course.	3.435	1.079	3.533	1.051	3.281	1.114
Connections between the course and other courses are not made clear by the instructor.	3.000	0.936	3.000	0.960	3.000	0.906
A cynical attitude toward the subject matter is expressed by the instructor.	3.810	1.056	3.856	1.023	3.737	1.110
Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor.	3.660	0.880	3.567	0.849	3.807	0.915
Grades are distributed on a "curve."	2.633	1.041	2.744	1.055	2.456	1.001
An instructor lowers course standards in order to be popular with students.	4.333	0.847	4.322	0.872	4.351	0.813
The standards for a course are set so high that most of the class receives failing grades for the course.	4.041	1.072	4.033	1.106	4.053	1.025
Individual students are offered extra-credit work in order to improve their final course grade after the term is completed.	4.122	1.140	4.256	1.117	3.912	1.154
The instructor allows personal friendships with a student to intrude on the objective grading of his/her work.	4.694	0.544	4.722	0.561	4.649	0.517
Social, personal or other non-academic characteristics of students are taken into account in the awarding of student grades.	4.456	0.830	4.600	0.684	4.228	0.982
The final course grade is based on a single course assignment or a single examination.	4.095	1.143	4.144	1.117	4.018	1.188
Sexist or racist comments in students' written work are not discouraged.	4.272	0.933	4.344	0.914	4.158	0.960
All student grades are publicly posted with social security numbers and without names.	4.673	0.714	4.711	0.691	4.614	0.750
Graded papers and examinations are left in an accessible location where students can search through to get back their own.	4.408	0.817	4.522	0.707	4.228	0.945

Behavior	2011 Composite n = 147		Female n = 90		Male n = 57	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Stated policies about late work and incompletes are not universally applied to all students.	4.367	0.876	4.456	0.706	4.228	1.086
Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor.	4.048	0.886	4.089	0.830	3.983	0.973
The instructor expresses impatience with a slow learner in class.	4.211	0.695	4.356	0.547	3.983	0.834
The instructor does not encourage student questions during class time.	3.483	1.016	3.500	1.019	3.456	1.019
An instructor makes condescending remarks to a student in class.	4.469	0.675	4.511	0.658	4.404	0.704
The instructor does not learn the names of all students in the class.	2.918	0.955	3.000	0.948	2.790	0.959
A clear lack of class members' understanding about course content is ignored by the instructor.	3.667	1.009	3.744	0.978	3.544	1.053
A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committee that there are very low grading standards in a colleague's course.	2.966	1.030	2.944	1.064	3.000	0.982
A faculty member refuses to share course syllabi with colleagues.	3.272	0.983	3.344	0.950	3.158	1.031
A faculty member makes negative comments in a faculty meeting about the courses offered by a colleague.	3.986	0.844	4.067	0.747	3.860	0.972
A faculty member makes negative comments about a colleague in public before students.	4.510	0.666	4.633	0.550	4.316	0.783
The requirements in a course are so great that they prevent enrolled students from giving adequate attention to their other courses.	3.646	1.019	3.633	1.054	3.667	0.970
A faculty member gives unsolicited advice on the content of a colleague's course.	3.347	0.977	3.422	0.874	3.228	1.118

Behavior	2011 Composite n = 147		Female n = 90		Male n = 57	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
A faculty member refuses to participate in departmental curricular planning.	4.252	0.867	4.278	0.848	4.211	0.901
Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept.	4.286	0.731	4.289	0.782	4.281	0.648
A faculty member criticizes the academic performance of a student in front of other students.	4.585	0.775	4.600	0.790	4.561	0.756
A faculty member insists that he/she never be phoned at home by students, regardless of circumstances.	2.367	1.054	2.500	1.144	2.158	0.862
A faculty member makes suggestive sexual comments to a student enrolled in the course.	4.932	0.278	4.967	0.181	4.877	0.381
A faculty member has a sexual relationship with a student enrolled in the course.	4.864	0.477	4.878	0.516	4.842	0.414
A faculty member does not refer a student with a special problem to the appropriate campus service.	4.000	0.891	4.000	0.848	4.000	0.964
An advisee is treated in a condescending manner.	4.177	0.719	4.233	0.637	4.088	0.830
A faculty member avoids giving career or job advice when asked by students.	3.095	1.029	3.089	1.002	3.105	1.080
A faculty member refuses to write letters of reference for any student.	3.095	1.036	3.056	1.010	3.158	1.082
A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors.	4.259	0.845	4.311	0.788	4.175	0.928
A cynical attitude toward the role of teaching is expressed by an instructor.	4.075	0.845	4.156	0.763	3.947	0.953
A faculty member's involvement in scholarship is so great that he/she fails to adequately prepare for class.	4.245	0.773	4.244	0.754	4.246	0.808
Scholarly literature is not read for the purpose of integrating new information into one's courses.	3.500	0.970	3.544	0.938	3.429	1.024