Exploring Ethics and Teacher Conduct in a Suburban School District: Implications for School Leaders

This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of school administration and K-12 education.

Mario Torres
Texas A&M University

Talesa Kidd
Texas A&M University

Jean Madsen
Texas A&M University

The relationship between academic dishonesty and ethics has received minimal attention in the research literature. Due in part to the added pressure and stress induced by accountability mandates, researchers hypothesized new demands could trigger an array of undesirable responses. This study examined the relationship between teachers' perspectives of their ethical orientation and their self-reported behavior regarding academic policies. Utilizing a survey instrument to capture perspectives on academic decisions, data were collected from elementary teachers (N=155) in one suburban school district within a large metropolitan area in Southeast Texas. The data were then analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical tests. The results suggest elementary teachers did report engaging in academic misconduct to some degree. The findings suggest, as well, that reported misconduct was significantly related to the ethical viewpoint of the respondent. Collaboration and professional development are discussed as potential interventions at reducing academic impropriety.

Introduction

Since the initiation of Public Law 107-110 (i.e., the No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB), reports of teachers violating academic policies have been occurring with greater regularity (Bruhn, Zajac. Al-Kazemi, & Prescott, 2002; Cummings, Maddux, Harlow, & Dyas, 2002; Evetts, 2006; Storm & Storm, 2007). Cases have been reported where teachers and administrators have illegally engaged in fraudulent test activity such as altering scoring sheets of children on high stakes exams (Almasy, 2015). Noting the added pressure and stress associated with ratcheted performance demands and the threat of sanctions, researchers set out to examine to what degree impactful accountability requirements influence choices and ethical perspectives of teachers concerning academic policy.

Because behaviors of teachers, inside and outside the classroom, are of enormous interest to the public, schools must give full attention to these matters. Otherwise, as some studies suggest (Bruhn et al., 2002; Cummings et al., 2002; Evetts, 2006; Storm & Storm, 2007), public opinion and trust may diminish. In view of prior research, this study explores two areas: (a) teachers' perspectives of their past decisions toward academic policies (i.e., did teachers perceive themselves as breaching the law relevant to academic policies?); and (b) the link between teachers' academic policy choices and their self-reported ethical orientation (i.e., to what particular ethical viewpoint do teachers rationalize their interaction with academic policy?). Implications for leadership and decision-making are discussed.

Background

To more fully grapple with teachers' interactions with academic policies, researchers focused on academic impropriety in the workplace and ethics in education. The academic impropriety literature was useful in contextualizing teachers' responses to items that probed their perceived interaction with policy. Literature on ethics also provided a lens to examine, from a philosophical premise, the ethical rationale for teachers arriving at a decision or choice.

Academic Dishonesty

Generally considered a violation of an academic policy, academic dishonesty has been a topic of research for decades (Cizek, 1999; Cummings et al., 2002; Finn & Frone, 2004; McCabe, 1999; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001). While much research has focused on student cheating, recent reports of teacher engagement in academic dishonesty have emerged (Bruhn et al., 2002; Evetts, 2006; Storm & Storm, 2007). The shift from students to teachers in the academic dishonesty discourse comes as no surprise in view of the tighter coupling between student academic dishonesty and ethical failure in the workplace (Cummings et al., 2002; Davy, Kincaid, Smith, & Trawick, 2007).

Pressure and conflict have been identified as underlying factors linked to increasing ethical lapses (Colgan, 2004; O'Neill, 2003, Son Hing, Bobocel, Zanna, & McBride, 2007; Stefkovich, 2006). Teachers have reported feelings of extreme pressure stemming from expectations associated with the No Child Left Behind Act. Such

pressures are reported to have engendered conflict between the teacher and the educational organization (Booher-Jennings, 2005; Whisnant, 1988). While examining the effect of mounting workplace stress yields insight, the less salient ethical motives impacting individual choice are considered far less.

Ethics and Ethical Framing

Ethics is typically described as the study of right versus wrong. Dewey (1903) underscores the obligation of schools to embed ethics in every function of education. According to Dewey, "the school is fundamentally an institution erected by society to do a certain specific work – to exercise a certain specific function in maintaining the life and advancing the welfare of society. The educational system which does not recognize this fact as entailing upon it an ethical responsibility is derelict and a defaulter" (p. 10).

While definitions vary, the meaning of ethics is oftentimes driven by theory or worldview or as Strike and Ternasky (1993) note "have a strong normative core and provide various ways to appraise the merits and judge the significance of educational policy" (p. 1). For example, social Darwinism (Starratt, 1991), utilitarianism (Sims, 1994; Tenbrunsel & Messick, 1999), community (Furman, 2003), and Judeo-Christian, Hobbesian or Wilsonian (Casmir, 1997) reflect a few pathways of ethical inquiry. The meaning of ethics within the education purview varies to a point as well. Rebore (2001) describes ethics as an "extremely complex enterprise" influencing one's choosing of a course of action in a difficult situation. Ethical outcomes or choices, according to Rebore, are linked to three questions:

(a) What does it mean to be a human being?
(b) How should human beings treat one another?
(c) How should the institutions of society be organized? (p. 5)

Similarly, Beckner (2004) sees ethics as a way to reflect on "dilemmas which have no completely satisfactory answer or they may more happily require a choice between two conflicting goods" (p. 8).

Ethical framing provides a promising approach to better understanding teachers' partiality to particular responses when confronted with an academic policy decision. Shapiro & Stefkovich (2005) offer a multidimensional model allowing for analysis of choice and decisions across four distinct ethical frames: a) the ethic of justice, (b) the ethic of care, (c) the ethic of critique, and (d) the ethic of profession. These ethical frames, while characteristically unique but not entirely distinct, are highly applicable to teachers' ethical practices.

Under the *ethic of justice*, laws and rules are considered universal and applied and interpreted in a consistent and or fair manner. A guiding principle of the ethic of justice is utilitarianism. In utilitarianism (Locke, 1960), decisions maximize goodness or pleasure and minimize evil or pain. For example, teachers' ethical decisions using utilitarianism or maximization are intended to benefit the greater good (Mill, 1957; Stefkovich, 2006). Libertarianism is another key dimension within the ethic of justice. Within libertarianism, the equality for all individuals is pursued. As it pertains to school leaders, Enomoto (1997) suggests educational administrators are more apt to rely on the ethic of justice because of its top down orientation, emphasis on universal principles, and maintenance of the status quo.

In response to male oriented moral development theories of Freud, Piaget and Kohlberg, Gilligan's work in the *ethic of care* (1982) placed emphasis on the humanistic "voice" of morality. Addressing Kohlberg's position on moral development specifically, Gilligan challenged the notion of the individual's ability to reflect on "morality rights" as the pinnacle of moral awareness. Rather, "moral responsibility," according to Gilligan, reflected an alternative moral understanding, emphasizing care and relationships. According to Gilligan (1982), "the moral problem arises from conflicting responsibilities rather than from competing rights and requires for its resolution a mode of thinking that is contextual and narrative rather than formal and abstract" (p. 19). Gilligan believed women observed and made sense of the world differently from men. The ethic of care for that reason has largely been treated as a gender construct (Enomoto, 1997; Noddings, 1984). In the late 1970s, Nel Noddings broadened the care ethic to describe the relationship as "one caring" and the "cared for" (Blumenfeld-Jones, 2004; Noddings, 1984). In seeking to promote the wellbeing of others, care additionally meant being "oriented toward ethics grounded in empathy rather than dispassionate ethical principles" (McCray & Beachum, 2006, p.5). In a similar vein, Torres (2004, p. 252) notes "Caring [as an ethic] reflects a profound responsibility to ensure that needs are met with the purpose of helping the individual realize and achieve self-liberation." Through emphasis on relationships, collaboration and sense of belonging, the ethic of care focuses on the welfare of individuals (Begley, 2006; Furman, 2003; Shapiro & Gross, 2008).

In contract to justice and care, the *ethic of critique* more closely examines the question of fairness for whom. At the core of the ethic of critique is the pretext of privileged, European-American males establishing traditional rules and laws to reinforce social stratification. According to this frame, traditional rules are in and of themselves unfair to all parties. The ethic of critique serves as a counter response to the justice ethic primarily to "ensure equity and equal opportunity" (Normore, 2004, p. 5) or as Shapiro & Gross (2008) maintain, to achieve the "concept of democracy" (p. 6). Through critique, injustices are revealed and action is taken to correct the injustices or oppression (Arononwitz & Giroux, 1985; Freire, 1970; Furman, 2003; Giroux, 1988; McCray & Beachum, 2006).

Increasing injustice arising from the current policy environment of high-stakes assessments and accountability (Furman, 2003) is usually paraded under the banner of social justice and has acquired a new intensity and urgency in education (McDonald, 2007). Starratt (1991) suggests society has always consisted of different groups struggling for some form of control, and philosophers since the Frankfurt School have examined social arrangements through critical theory, a dominant lens under this ethic. According to Starratt (1991), "the point of critical theory was to uncover which group had the advantage over the others, how things got to be the way they were, and to expose how situations were studied and language disused so as to maintain the legitimacy of social arrangements" (p.189). To this end, more and more teacher education programs are emphasizing social justice as a basis and central concern of teacher education programs (McDonald, 2007).

The fourth and final frame, the *ethic of profession* offers a more holistic approach to the distinct ethics of justice, care, and critique (Stefkovich, 2006). Under profession, teachers and leaders struggle with the alternative concepts of justice, care, and critique, which may spark tensions between professional ethical codes and the ethical beliefs of

the individual. Decisions under the ethic of profession are made in the best interests of the students (Faircloth, 2004; Stefkovich, 2006). Teachers and leaders reflect on choices and decisions from a multi-ethical perspective despite their personal orientation toward particular ethical beliefs (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005). Similarly, Begley suggests administrators move beyond the use of a single ethical frame as a "moral rubric" (Begley, 2006, p. 583) and to consciously adopt a multi-ethical perspective as a guide for problem solving in the educational arena.

Minimal research has captured the link between ethics and teacher perspectives regarding their conduct toward academic policy. This inquiry relies on teacher perspectives to more fully understand these ethical constructs and why teachers choose to interact with academic policies in particular ways. By probing perspectives on professional interaction with academic policy, educational leaders may be better able to comprehend the complexity of decisions and choices and develop strategies at minimizing or deterring fraudulent behaviors.

Methodology

Research Questions

Q1: Do teachers engage in some type of academic misconduct?
Q2: To what extent do teachers' perceived ethical beliefs explain their perceived conduct toward academic policy?

Data Source

Texas was noted by Storm and Storm (2007) as one of a handful of states where academic dishonesty was prevalent on a standardized assessment and where a test security company was hired to monitor irregularities. Specifically, the data source for this study included elementary teachers from a school district with more than 20,000 students located in a large metropolitan suburb in Southeast Texas. The student profile for the school district participating district reflected the following percentages: 5% Asian, 20% African Americans, 45% Latino, and 30% White. Over 40% of the students were designated economically disadvantaged and over 10% were identified as English Language Learners.

Invitations to participate in the study were sent to campus principals. Ten schools chose to participate. Using a random number generator, the campuses were assigned an identification number. Teachers from the self-selected campuses were invited to participate by email from the school principal. Two hundred and thirteen elementary teachers responded to the self-administered questionnaire, providing a return rate of approximately 50%. After selecting out respondents who were teachers of record and indicated complete familiarity with academic policies, 73% (N=155) remained in the data set. Fifty-one percent of the teachers described themselves as persons of color. The majority, 84%, reported their having a bachelor's degree; the remaining 16% held a master's degree. Most (75%) obtained their teaching certification through a traditional manner as opposed to an alternative certification program (ACP). Just under half, 48%,

taught in self-contained classrooms; they taught English, reading, math, science, and social studies to their assigned group of students.

Survey Development and Data Collection

Based on well established principles for developing self-administered questionnaires (Creswell, 2003 & Fowler, 1993), a survey instrument was created using well known surveys as models including the Assessment of Academic Misconduct (Ferrell & Daniel, 1995), Attitude Toward Cheating Scale (Roig & Ballew, 1994), Rokeach's Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973) and the List of Values Test (Homer & Kahle, 1988). Selected questions were modified to gauge knowledge of grading policies and procedures. A focus group of 30 master teachers and 15 doctoral students assisted in refining items dealing with realistic grading and testing situations for the survey. The focus group was asked to list violations of grading or testing policies they had witnessed. The reported violations were then consolidated into a single list. A subset of teachers was asked to review a list of common grading or testing situations for authenticity and to provide any other situations that were not addressed on the list. The instrument was administered to the focus group on two separate occasions. It asked respondents to indicate an action related to a grading or testing policy and to provide a reason for the action.

Respondents were then asked to identify which ethical frame (i.e., justice, care, critique, and the profession) most accurately reflected their responses. Respondents were later interviewed to determine if the various items of the instrument were easily understood. While respondents indicated minimal difficulty in identifying an action or reason, connection to the ethical categories caused moderate confusion for teachers. A subsequent iteration of the instrument addressed item problems and was reviewed again for construct and content validity by researchers in the field. Reliability was established using a test-retest method. A convenience sample of 30 teachers was asked on two occasions to complete the survey. Using SPSS, reliability of the test-retest data was calculated at a Cronbach's α of 0.85.

As for policy knowledge, participants were asked to indicate their familiarity with grading and testing policies at the campus, district, and state level. Participants were also asked to indicate if identified policies were reviewed on a continuous basis by their campus and academic team. If respondents lacked knowledge of basic policies, they were removed from the analysis to avoid confounding the results.

Items capturing policy interaction were used to gather participants' responses to common grading situations (see Table 1). An interaction score was determined by assigning one point for each time a teacher indicated that his/her action would violate the district's or state's policy. On a second coding, teachers were categorically coded as a violator if a violation was indicated on any question. Items in the final section pertaining to the ethical frames explored participants' responses to common situations when placed in an educational context or scenario and reasons (premised on the ethical frames) guiding the response.

Identifying respondents' dominant ethical frame called for criteria when subjects identified differing frames depending on the question (see Table 2). The respondents' dominant ethical frame was identified when the respondent referred to a single ethical frame three or more times. If a respondent chose the ethic of profession twice and another

paradigm twice, the paradigm other than profession was coded as dominant. If a dominant paradigm could not be identified, a code of *none* was assigned to the respondent. Researchers acknowledge the limitations in employing rigid criteria as it may oversimplify or distort respondents' ethical identity. Be that as it may, the exploratory nature of this research is intended to generate thought and discussion about ethics and choice as well as encourage future inquiry.

Table 1
Policy and Misconduct Constructs

Data	Conditions	Definition	Category Levels
Policies	Individuals must be familiar with policies before they can be held accountable for policy violation	Familiar with both district and state academic policies	0=No* 1=Yes
Academic misconduct- Direct questions	Responses indicating violation were based on written policies and validation by district administrator	Violation of a written policy	0=Policy not violated 1=Policy violated
Academic misconduct- Scenarios	Responses indicating violation were based on written policies and validation by district administrator	Violation of a written policy	0=Policy not violated 1=Policy violated

Table 2
Ethical Frames

Data	Conditions	Definition	Category Levels
Ethical paradigm	Respondents selected an ethical rationale for each grading decision	Justice: uphold traditional rules, policy or procedures; strives to apply rules equally to all students Care: develop and maintain caring relationship with student; show respect for the student as an individual Critique: level the field for students from different political or social situations Profession: act in the best interest of the child while abiding by parameters of the professional code	1=Justice 2=Care 3=Critique 4=Profession

Data Analysis

This study explored the relationship between ethical frames and teacher's self-reported behavior with respect to academic policy. Logistic regression was used to explore the influence of categorical or interval-ratio variables on a dichotomous dependent variables (Agresti, 2002). The flexible and robust logistic regression did not assume normality, linearity or equal variances. Logistic regression utilized probabilities to determine into which bi-variant category a subject would fall. The linear regression equation (*u)* is then the natural log of the probability of being in one group divided by the probability of being in the other group. The linear regression equation creates the logit or log of the odds:

$$\ln(\tfrac{\hat{Y}}{1-\hat{Y}}) = B_0 + B_1 X_1 + B_2 X_2 + ... + B_k X_k \text{ ''}$$

The model fit was analyzed using a *-2Log Likelihood of 0* and the *Goodness of Fit* statistic; each compared predicted values to observed values. Since the investigation was exploratory in nature, a forward stepping method was utilized; thus only IVs that significantly predicted the DV were included in the model. Data were screened for missing data and outliers (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005).

Results

Overall, 90% of the eligible sample (i.e., among those expressing familiarity with the policies) reported violating at least one policy. The percentage of the reported violation exceeded the upper limit of 75% reported in similar studies of academic dishonesty. Fifty-eight percent of teachers reported violating at least one academic policy (e.g., do you add points, curve grades?). The percentage increased to 72% when the policy was presented using a scenario (e.g., a student struggles academically and comes from a very difficult home life has an average of 67 at the end of the grading period…do you record a passing grade on the report card?).

When dominant ethical frames were regressed on violation of high-stakes testing policies (see Table 3), significance was found (Wald (4) =29.86, p < .01). The ethic of profession was designated as the baseline for the regression. The findings suggest teachers orienting to a frame other than profession had higher odds of violating high-stakes testing policies. The range for the odds ratio factor, Exp (β), ranged from almost 12 for those having no identifiable ethical paradigm to a low of approximately 3 for those guided by an ethic of justice.

Table 3

Regression Statistics for Violation of a Standardized Testing Policy with Ethical Frames

Source	Variable	β (logit)	SE	Wald	Exp(β)
Step 1	Dominant Ethical Frame			29.86^	
	No Dominant Frame	2.47	.50	24.35^	11.78
	Justice	1.08	.38	7.82**	2.94
	Care	1.72	.57	9.06***	5.60

		β (logit)	SE	Wald	Exp(β)
Critique		2.03	.88	5.37*	7.63
Constant		-1.12	.26	17.83^	.33

		Goodness of Fit			Nagelkerke	Percent
Source	-2LL	X^2	*df*	Sig.	R^2	Correct
Model	221.75	.00	3	1.0	.23	68.3
Constant	257.08					53.2

Note: *p<.05, **p = .005; ***p<.005, ^p=.0001

As for responses to policy scenarios (see Table 4), teachers with no dominant ethical paradigm had the highest odds ratio for violating policy, followed by those guided by an ethic of critique, then ethic of care, and finally by those reporting an ethic of justice.

Table 4
Regression Statistics for Violation of Multiple Testing[a] Policies with Ethical Frames

Source	Variable	β (logit)	SE	Wald	Exp(β)
Step 1	Dominant Ethical Frame			26.39^	
	No Dominant Frame	2.62	.58	20.65^	13.79
	Justice	1.09	.44	6.24**	2.98
	Care	1.84	.62	8.68***	6.27
	Critique	2.53	1.16	4.78*	12.53
	Constant	-1.14	.30	14.83^	.32

		Goodness of Fit			Nagelkerke	Percent
Source	-2LL	X^2	*df*	Sig.	R^2	Correct
Model	172.62	.00	3	1.0	.26	69.6
Constant	204.74					52.7

Note: Note: *p<.05, **p = .01; ***p<.005, ^p=.0001

Discussion and Conclusions

Due to increasing stress associated with accountability, this study sought to explore the role of ethics in teachers' decisions to engage in academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty has been well documented in the literature (Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992; Ferrell & Daniel, 1995; Whitely, 1998) across diverse participant realms (Bruhn et al., 2002; Cummings et al., 2002; Ferrell & Daniel, 1995; Hamilton, 2006). Despite the paucity of academic dishonesty research involving teachers, studies by Davy et al. (2007) and Lovett- Hooper, Komarraju, Weston, & Dollinger (2007) provided a rationale for pursuing this investigation.

This study first looked at whether teachers reported to have engaged in some form of academic dishonesty. The findings point to teachers reporting violations of grading and testing policies, a finding consistent with prior studies. Teachers reported violating both local and state academic policies; 78% reported violating a local grading policy,

47% reported violating standardized testing policies, and 90% reported violating one or the other. The findings are consistent with previous studies on academic misconduct in other academic realms involving students (Cizek, 1999; Cummings et al., 2002; Ferrell & Daniel, 1995) and professors (Bruhn et al., 2002; Cummings et al., 2002; Hamilton, 2006). Both logistic regression analyses revealed significant associations between specific ethical frames and teachers' self-reported engagement in some form of academic conduct. High odds ratios for both the ethics of critique and care suggest teachers' motives to violate policy may be guided by rationales not strictly legal. As the ethic of care places the human needs foremost and ethic of critique challenges the inherent bias of law and policy, this finding appears to underscore teachers' antipathy toward high impact policy.

The impact of pressure (Booher-Jennings, 2005; O'Neill, 2003) on actions of misconduct should be noted as well. Previous studies found academic misconduct was possibly motivated by pressures to succeed (Evans & Craig, 1990; Schab, 1991). The increased probability (12%) of policy violations by teachers was closely associated with students evaluated under state testing and NCLB. These results appear consistent with prior research on student academic dishonesty, which found students were more likely to cheat if given the opportunity (McCabe et al., 1999). The findings also reveal a peculiar distinction in teacher interaction with policy but one that may be perceived intuitively. Teachers in the study appeared to violate grading policies to a greater degree than standardized testing policies. Thus, the level of risk was inversely related to the severity of sanctions (McCabe et al., 1999). Violations of a grading policy could result in a reprimand or loss of contract, while violations of a standardized testing policy could result in loss of certification, professional credentials and the specter of criminal charges.

This inquiry also sought to address the research gap linking academic dishonesty and ethics (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005; Stefkovich. 2006). The findings suggest most teachers (83%) made decisions based on a dominant ethical frame. The variation in ethical framing should be a point of consideration for school leaders as academic misconduct is modified and developed. Leaders should consider adopting professional development opportunities that stress a multidimensional approach to complex ethical decision-making. Kahle (1983) in his work in marketing as well as Shapiro & Stefkovich (2005) and Begley (2006) urge leaders to consider multidimensional ethical framing as a context to explore dilemmas.

Governing bodies typically rely on the threat of sanctions to bring about policy implementation (McDonnell and Elmore, 1987). With 30% fewer teachers indicating a violation of a policy carrying severe sanctions, it would appear the policy is modestly successful at deterring undesirable behaviors. On the other hand, if nearly 50% of responding teachers indicate a willingness to violate testing policies, perhaps the results of this study suggest changes are needed to improve policy compliance. The professional code of conduct should be a focal point of discussion for school leaders and a basis for decisions (Kahle, 1983; Sims, 1994). Administrators should be familiar with the various ethical dimensions (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005) that precede a choice or action. School districts should support learning experiences, which introduce teachers and leaders to a variety of complex situations (McIntyre-Mills, 2008; Kahl, 1983; Rokeach, 1973; Simms, 1994). Leaders become the exemplars for recognizing the diversity of ethical perspective as decisions focus largely on students' best interest of (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005). As

Fullan (2001) suggests, "leaders in all organizations, whether they know it or not, contribute for better or worse to moral purpose in their own organizations and in society as a whole" (p. 15).

As Heckman and Peterman (1996) argue, the impetus for improvement should emerge from within through dialogue and inquiry to arrive at critical knowledge for change. Highly effective schools are not monolithic institutions but instead "indigenously invented" (Heckman and Peterman, 1996). Professional development can be powerful in designing activities that reflect the needs of the context (Hatch, 2000). By and large, schools are seemingly less able to deal with the range of complexity with regard to human thought and for efficiency sake opt for a "disciplinization" of practice (Simola, 1998). Rigid and static theories of ethics and other bodies of content have begun to control many aspects of the classroom, largely discouraging policy innovation and creativity at the local level. In the end, policy altruism and complacency prevents the critical reflection and consciousness needed for change and improvement.

In sum, the findings revealed an empirical connection between ethics and teacher's interactions with grading policies and high-stakes testing guidelines. New pressures have emerged for both students and teachers (Colgan, 2004; O'Neill, 2003; Son Hing et al., 2007; Stefkovich, 2006). The birth of consequences and sanctions seem to be resulting in unintended academic misconduct (Bruhn et al., 2002; Cummings et al., 2002; Evetts, 2006; Storm & Storm, 2007). While academic misconduct is not new, the spotlight has been focused mainly on students (Davis et al., 1992; Ferrell & Daniel, 1995; Whitely, 1998). The findings of this research bring teachers into the fold (Bruhn et al., 2002; Evetts, 2006; Storm & Storm, 2007). With greater insight into academic dishonesty, school administrators must engage teachers in dialogue to reduce or prevent academic misconduct and to use ethics as a multidimensional frame to understand decision and choice.

References

Agresti, A. (2002). Categorical data analysis (2nd ed.), Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Almasy, S. (2015). Atlanta schools cheating scandal: 11 of 12 defendants convicted. *CNN*. Retrieved April 29, 2015, from http://www.cnn.com/2015/04/01/us/atlanta-schools-cheating-scandal/

Arononwitz, S. & Giroux, H. (1985). *Education under siege.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Beckner, W. (2004). *Ethics for educational leader s*. New York: Pearson.

Begley, P. (2006). Self-knowledge, capacity and sensitivity: Prerequisites to authentic leadership by school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(6), 570-589.

Blumenfeld-Jones, D. (2004). The hope of a critical ethics: Teachers and learners. *Educational Theory*, *54*(3)*,* 263-279.

Booher-Jennings, J. (2005). Below the bubble: "Educational triage" and the Texas accountability system. *American Educational Research Journal*, *42*(2), 231-268.

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

Casmir, F. (1997). *Ethics in intercultural and international communication.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cizek, G. J. (1999). *Cheating on tests: How to do it, detect it, and prevent it*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Colgan, C. (2004). The ethical choice: Making tough choices between right and wrong is the heart of school leadership. *American School Board Journal, 5*, 13-16.

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*,(2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.,

Cummings, R., Maddux, C. D., Harlow, S., & Dyas, L. (2002). Academic misconduct in undergraduate teacher education students and its relationship to their principled moral reasoning. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 29*(4), 286-297.

Davis, S., Grover, C., Becker, A., & McGregor, L. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. *Teaching of Psychology, 19*(1), 16-20.

Davy, J., Kincaid, J., Smith, K., & Trawick, M. (2007). An examination of the role of attitudinal characteristics and motivation on the cheating behavior of business students. *Ethics & Behavior, 17*(3), 281-302.

Dewey, J. (1903). *Ethical principles underlying education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Enomoto, E. (1997). Negotiating the ethics of care and justice. *Education Administration Quarterly, 33*(3), 351-370.

Evans, E. & Craig, D. (1990). Teacher and student perceptions of academic cheating in middle and senior high schools. *The Journal of Educational Research, 84*, 44-52.

Evetts, J. (2006). Trust and professionalism: Challenges and occupational changes. *Current Sociology, 54*(4), 515-531.

Faircloth, S. (2004). Turbulent policy demands and ethical dilemmas: The impact of federal education policies on special education programs and services. *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration, 2*(3), 1-8.

Feather, N. (1975). *Values in education and society.* New York: The Free Press.

Ferrell, C. & Daniel, L. (1995). A frame of reference for understanding behaviors related to the academic misconduct of undergraduate teacher education students. *Research in Higher Education, 36*(3), 345- 375.

Finn, K. V., & Frone, M. R. (2004). Academic performance and cheating: Moderating role of school identification and self-efficacy. *The Journal of Educational Research, 97*(3), 115-122.

Fowler, F. (1993). *Survey research methods,* (2nd ed). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. [Electronic Version]. Retrieved April 18, 2008 from http://www.marxists.org/subject/education/freire/pedagogy/indes.htm.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership, 58*(8), 16-20.

Furman, G. (2003). Moral leadership and the ethic of community. *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration, 2*(1), 1-8.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H. (1988). *Schooling and the struggle for public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Hamilton, N. (2006). Faculty professionalism: Failures of socialization and the road to loss of professional autonomy. *Liberal Education, 92*(4), 14-21.

Hatch, T. (2000). What does it take to break the mold? Rhetoric and reality in New American Schools. *Teachers College Record*, *102*(3), 561-589.

Hechman, P.E., & Peterman, F. (1996). Indigenous invention: New promise for school reform. *Teachers College Record*, *98*(2), 307-327.

Held, V. (2006). *The ethics of care: Personal, political, and global.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Homer, P. & Kahle, L. (1988). A structured equation test of the value-attitude-behavior hierarchy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*(4), 638-646.

Kahle, L. (ed.) (1983). *Social values and social change: Adaptation time in America.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

Kahle, L., Beatty, S. & Homer, P. (1986). Alternative measurement approaches to consumer values: The List of Values (LOV) and Values and Life Style (VALS). *Journal of Consumer Research, 13*(3), 405-409.

Locke, John (1960). *Two treatises of government*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Lovett-Hooper, G, Komarraju, M, Weston, R., & Dollinger, S. (2007). Is plagiarism a forerunner of other deviance? Imagined futures of academically dishonest students. *Ethics & Behavior, 17*(3), 323-336.

McCabe, D. L. (1999). Academic dishonesty among high school students. *Adolescence, 34*(136), 681-68.

McCabe, D., Trevino, L., & Butterfield, K. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics & Behavior, 11*(*3),* 219-232.

McCray, C. & Beachum, F. (2006). A critique of zero tolerance policies: An issue of justice and caring. *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration, 5*(1), 1-8.

McDonald, M. (2007). The joint enterprise of social justice teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 109*(8), 2047-2081.

McDonnell, L., & Elmore, R. (1987). Getting the job done: Alternative policy instruments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9*(2), 133-152.

McIntyre-Mills, J. (2008). Reconsidering relationships across self, others, the environment and technology. *Sytems Research and Behavioral Science, 25*, 193-213.

Mertler, C, & Vannatta, R. (2005). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical applications and interpretation (*3rd ed). Glendale, GA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Mill, John Stuart (1957). *Utilitarianism.* O. Piest (Ed.). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 107 U.S.C. (2001).

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics & moral education.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Normore, A. (2004). Ethics and values in leadership preparation programs: Finding the north star in the dust storm. *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration, 2*(2), 1-8.

O'Neill, P. (2003). High-stakes testing law and litigation. *B. Y. U. Education and Law Journal, 636,* 623-665.

Rebore, R.W. (2001). *The ethics of educational leadership.* Columbus OH: Merrill-Prentice Hall.

Roig, M., & Ballew, C. (1994). Attitudes toward cheating of self and others by college students and professors. *The Psychological Record, 44*(1), 3-13.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: The Free Press.

Schab, F. (1991). Schooling without learning: Thirty years of cheating in high school. *Adolescence, 26*, 839-847.

Shapiro, J. & Gross, S. (2008). *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times: (Re)solving moral dilemmas.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Shapiro, J. & Stefkovich, J. (2005). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas* (2nd ed.) Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Simola, H. (1998). Firmly bolted into the air: Wishful rationalism as a discursive basis for educational reforms. *Teachers College Record*, *99*(4), 731-757.

Sims, R. (1994). *Ethics and organizational decision making: A call for renewal.* Westport, CT: Quorum Books

Son Hing, L., Bobocel, D., Zanna, M., & McBride, M. (2007). Authoritarian dynamics and unethical decision making: High social dominance orientation leaders and high right-wing authoritarianism followers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(1), 67-81.

Spader, D. (2002). The morality of justice and the morality of care: Are there distinct moral orientations for males and females? *Criminal Justice Review*, *27*(1), 66-88.

Starratt, R. (1991). Building an ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *27*(2), 185-202.

Stefkovich, J. (2006). *Best Interests of the student: Appling ethical constructs to legal cases in education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Strike, K.A. & Ternasky, P.L. (Eds.). (1993). Introduction: Ethics in educational settings. *Ethics for professionals in education: Perspectives for preparation and practice.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press

Storm, R. & Storm, P. (2007). Curbing cheating, raising integrity. *The Education Digest, 72*(8), 42-50.

Sunderman, G., Kim, J., & Orfield, G. (2005). *NCLB meets school realities: Lessons from the field.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tenbrunsel, A. & Messick, D. (1999). Sanctioning systems, decision frames, and cooperation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44,* 684-708.

Torres, M. (2004). Best interest of students left behind? Exploring the ethical and legal dimensions of United States federal involvement in public school improvement. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(2), 249-269.

Whitley, B. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(3), 235-274.

Whisnant, W. (1988). Ethics and administration in America's community colleges. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, *12*(3), 243-249.