

**LECTURERS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON ETHICS IN ACADEMIA  
AND LECTURER-STUDENT INTERACTION**

**MAISARAH MOHAMED SAAT  
NORIZA MOHD. JAMAL  
ANIZA OTHMAN**

**RESEARCH MANAGEMENT CENTRE  
UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA**

**VOT 71989**

**LECTURERS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON ETHICS IN ACADEMIA  
AND LECTURER-STUDENT INTERACTION**

**MAISARAH MOHAMED SAAT  
NORIZA MOHD. JAMAL  
ANIZA OTHMAN**

**RESEARCH VOTE NO:  
71989**

**JABATAN PENGURUSAN  
FAKULTI PENGURUSAN DAN PEMBANGUNAN SUMBER MANUSIA  
UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA**

**2004**



## **ABSTRACT**

Since faculty can strongly influence the overall ethical climate of the University environment (Schulte et.al 1991), the professional and ethical conducts of faculty are of special concern to the public. In general, the aim of this study is to investigate the perceptions of students and lecturers on ethics in academia and lecturer-student interaction. Lecturers of Fakulti Pengurusan dan Pembangunan Sumber Manusia, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia and final year students of the faculty and three other engineering faculties were randomly selected to answer the questionnaire on the subject. Results of the study reveal that lecturers perceive more actions as unethical than the students. Gender and academic program are found to be factors influencing students' perceptions, but only in several situations. No demographic factors influence lecturers' ethical perceptions. Results of this study disclose that students' expectations on lecturers' actions are higher regarding ethics. Respondents agree that the collective and individual action of a member in a university will affect the overall image of the University. Findings show that unethical actions that most lecturers do are using university equipment for personal activities, teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered and canceling office hours excessively. The study found that the likeliness of respondents committing the unethical behaviour is rather low compared to the likeliness of their colleagues doing it. Among recommendations proposed; the University should develop and communicate ethical values through ethics seminar, training, colloquium, University should focus on the quality of personnel and professional development programs for both students and faculty, setting good example or role modelling by the faculty and University members. In addition, the study suggests that the curriculum should emphasize in integrating ethics in all subjects taught and the staff code of ethics has to be made more aware to all University members.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	i
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	ii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	vi
<b>CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.0 FOREWORD	1
1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	2
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT	3
1.3 OBJECTIVES OF STUDY	5
1.4 SCOPE OF STUDY	5
1.5 LIMITATIONS OF STUDY	5
<b>CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
2.0 INTRODUCTION	6
2.1 DEFINITIONS OF ETHICS	6
2.2 ETHICS FRAMEWORK	7
2.2.1 KOHLBERG’S THEORY OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT	8
2.2.2 CRITICISM’S OF KOHLBERG’S THEORY	11
2.2.3 OTHER ETHICAL FRAMEWORK	12
2.2.3.1 UTILITARIANISM	12
2.2.3.2 KANT’S ETHICAL THEORY	14
2.3 ETHICS IN THE UNIVERSITY	15
2.4 ETHICS IN TEACHING	17
2.4.1 THE ‘SHOULD’S’ AND ‘SHOULD NOT’S’	18
2.4.2 THE ROLE OF LECTURERS IN PROMOTING ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR	19

2.4.3	CASES OF UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR IN TEACHING	21
2.5	PROFESSIONAL CODE OF ETHICS	22
2.5.1	UTM ACADEMIC STAFF CODE OF ETHICS	23
2.5.2	STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS	23
2.5.3	CODE OF ETHICS FOR EDUCATORS	24
2.6	PAST STUDIES ON FACULTY BEHAVIOUR	25
2.6.1	LECTURER-STUDENT PERCEPTIONS ON ETHICS IN TEACHING	25
2.6.2	LECTURERS' ETHICAL BELIEFS AND BEHAVIOUR	29
2.6.3	STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON LECTURERS' ETHICAL STANDARDS	31
2.6.4	STUDENTS' DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE PERCEPTIONS	32
2.7	CONCLUSION	34
 <b>CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY</b>		
3.1	INTRODUCTION	35
3.2	POPULATION AND SAMPLE OF RESEARCH	35
3.3	DATA COLLECTION	36
3.1.1	PRIMARY DATA	36
3.1.2	SECONDARY DATA	36
3.4	DATA ANALYSIS	37
3.4.1	DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS	37
3.4.2	RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY TESTS	37
3.4.3	EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS	37
3.5	CONCLUSION	37

## **CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS OF DATA**

4.1	INTRODUCTION	38
4.2	STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS	38
4.2.1	STUDENTS' DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	38
4.2.2	PERCEPTIONS ON LECTURERS' ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR	40
4.2.3	DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS	56
4.2.4	PERCEPTIONS ON THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY IN EMPHASIZING ETHICAL POSITION	64
4.3	LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS	65
4.3.1	DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS	65
4.3.2	PERCEPTIONS ON LECTURERS' ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR	67
4.3.3	PERCEPTIONS ON THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY IN EMPHASIZING ETHICAL POSITION	78
4.4	COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BETWEEN STUDENTS AND LECTURERS	79
4.5	DIMENSIONS OF FACULTY ETHICS	81
4.5.1	STUDENTS' VIEW	81
4.5.2	LECTURERS' VIEW	84
4.6	LECTURERS' EXPERIENCE IN UNETHICAL SITUATIONS	85
4.6.1	EXPERIENCE IN UNETHICAL SITUATIONS	85
4.6.2	REASONS OF UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR	94
4.6.3	PROPENSITY OF PERFORMING UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR	95
4.7	CONCLUSION	108

## **CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS**

5.1	INTRODUCTION	109
5.2	LECTURER-STUDENT PERCEPTIONS ON LECTURERS' ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR IN ACADEMIA	109
5.2.1	PERCEPTIONS ON LECTURERS' ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR IN ACADEMIA	109
5.2.2	DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LECTURERS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS	112
5.2.3	DEMOGRAPHIC INFLUENCE ON LECTURER-STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS	112
5.2.3.1	STUDENTS' GENDER INFLUENCE	113
5.2.3.2	ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE INFLUENCE	113
5.3	LECTURER-STUDENT PERCEPTIONS ON THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY EMPHASIZING ETHICAL POSITIONS	114
5.4	PRACTICE OF ETHICS AMONG LECTURERS	115
5.5	PROPENSITY OF BEHAVING UNETHICALLY AND PERCEPTIONS ON COLLEAGUES' PROPENSITY OF PERFORMING THE BEHAVIOUR	116
5.6	RECOMMENDATIONS	116
5.7	SUGGESTIONS ON FUTURE RESEARCH	117
5.8	CONCLUSION	118

REFERENCE	119
-----------	-----

### **APPENDICES:**

APPENDIX I:	UTM CODE OF ETHICS
APPENDIX II:	STATEMENT OF AAUP
APPENDIX III:	CODE OF ETHICS FOR EDUCATORS
APPENDIX IV:	QUESTIONNAIRE TO STUDENTS
APPENDIX V:	QUESTIONNAIRE TO LECTURERS
APPENDIX VI:	RELIABILITY TEST



## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>PAGE</b>
Table 4.1: Gender	
Table 4.2: Race	
Table 4.3: Religion	
Table 4.4: Program	
Table 4.5: Enrolment In Ethics Subject	
Table 4.6: GPA	
Table 4.7: Giving Easy Test Or Courses To Ensure Popularity	
Table 4.8: Accepting Publishers' Monetary Rebate For Adopting Publishers' Textbooks	
Table 4.9: Using Profanity In Lectures	
Table 4.10: Having An Intimate Relationship With A Student	
Table 4.11: Failing To Update Notes When Re-Teaching A Course	
Table 4.12: Teaching Material They Have Not Really Mastered	
Table 4.13: Telling Colleagues A Confidential Disclosure Told By A Student	
Table 4.14: Ignoring Strong Evidence Of Cheating	
Table 4.15: Ignoring Unethical Behaviour By Colleagues	
Table 4.16: Doing Other Business During Office Hours	
Table 4.17: Giving Good Grades To Students Based On Their Personality	
Table 4.18: Allowing Students To Drop Courses For Reasons Not Officially Approved.	
Table 4.19: Omitting Significant Information When Writing A Letter Of Recommendation For A Student.	
Table 4.20: Insulting, Ridiculing, Etc. A Student In His/Her Absence	
Table 4.21: Ignoring A Student Signing The Attendance Sheet For A Classmate	
Table 4.22: Punishing Students Unequally (I.E Based On Likeability, Lecturers' Mood, Etc.)	
Table 4.23: Plagiarizing Research	
Table 4.24: Submitting A Manuscript To Two Or More Journals In Violation Of Journal Policy.	
Table 4.25: Falsifying Documentation For Research Grants	

Table 4.26:	Falsifying Research Data
Table 4.27:	Not Giving Graduate Student(S) Co-Authorship On Publications When The Student(s) Contribution Justified Co-Authorship
Table 4.28:	Inappropriately Giving A Colleague A Co-Authorship Status
Table 4.29:	Presenting The Same Research To More Than One Regional Or Annual Meeting (Against Meeting Policy)
Table 4.30:	Padding An Expense Account
Table 4.31:	Attending A Meeting At University Expense And Not Substantively Participating (Most Of The Time Spent Sight-Seeing)
Table 4.32:	Neglecting University Responsibilities Due To Outside Employment.
Table 4.33:	Using Student Assistants For Personal Work
Table 4.34:	Cancelling Office Hours Excessively
Table 4.35:	Accepting Money Or Gifts For Grades
Table 4.36:	Dating A Student In His Or Her Class
Table 4.37:	Dating A Student Not In His Or Her Class Who Is Not Majoring In The Lecturer's Discipline
Table 4.38:	Allowing A Relative Or Friend In Class And Giving Them Preferential Treatment
Table 4.39:	Allowing A Student Assistant To Grade Non-Objective Exams And/Or Written Assignments That Require Significant Judgement
Table 4.40:	Cancelling Classes When The Faculty Member Is Not Ill And Has No Other University Related Commitments
Table 4.41:	Using Outdated Texts To Avoid The Efforts Necessary To Revise Notes, Etc.
Table 4.42:	Falsifying Activity Reports That Are Utilized By His Or Her Institutions For Raises, Promotion Or Tenure Evaluations

Table 4.43:	Using University Equipment For Personal Activities
Table 4.44:	Student's Gender
Table 4.45:	Gender V. Accepting Publishers' Monetary Rebate
Table 4.46:	Gender V. Using Profanity Words In Lectures
Table 4.47:	Gender V. Having An Intimate Relationship With A Student
Table 4.48:	Gender V. Ignore Strong Evidence Of Cheating
Table 4.49:	Gender V. Doing Other Business During Office Hours
Table 4.50:	Gender V. Giving Good Grades To Students Based On Their Personality
Table 4.51:	Gender V. Allow Students To Drop Courses For Reasons Not Officially Approved
Table 4.52:	Gender V. Dating A Student In His Or Her Class
Table 4.53:	Students' Academic Program
Table 4.54:	Program V. Allowing Students To Drop Courses For Reasons Not Officially Approved
Table 4.55:	Program V. Plagiarizing Research
Table 4.56:	Program V. Do Not Give Graduate Student(s) Co-Authorship On Publications
Table 4.57:	Program V. Using Student Assistants For Personal Work
Table 4.58:	Role Of University And Faculty In Emphasizing Ethical Position (Percentage)
Table 4.59:	Role Of University And Faculty In Emphasizing Ethical Position (Mean)
Table 4.60:	Gender
Table 4.61:	Race
Table 4.62:	Education
Table 4.63:	Years Of Teaching Experience
Table 4.64:	Giving Easy Tests Or Course To Ensure Popularity
Table 4.65:	Accepting Publishers' Monetary Rebate For Adopting Publishers' Textbooks.
Table 4.66:	Using Profanity/Offensive Words In Lectures.
Table 4.67:	Having An Intimate Relationship With A Student

Table 4.68:	Teaching Material That The Lecturer Have Not Really Mastered
Table 4.69:	Not Giving Graduate Student(s) Co-Authorship On Publications When The Student(s) Contribution Justified Co-Authorship.
Table 4.70:	Inappropriately Giving A Colleague A Co-Authorship Status.
Table 4.71:	Presenting The Same Research To More Than One Regional Or Annual Seminars/Conferences
Table 4.72:	Padding An Expense Account
Table 4.73:	Attending A Meeting At University Expense And Not Substantively Participating (Most Of The Time Spent Sight-Seeing, Etc).
Table 4.74:	Neglecting University Responsibilities Due To Outside Employment.
Table 4.75:	Using University Equipment For Personal Activities.
Table 4.76:	Using Student Assistants For Personal Work
Table 4.77:	Cancelling Office Hours Excessively
Table 4.78:	Accepting Money Or Gifts For Grades.
Table 4.79:	Dating A Student In His Or Her Class.
Table 4.80:	Dating A Student Not In His Or Her Class Who Is Not Majoring In The Lecturer's Discipline.
Table 4.81:	Allowing A Relative Or Friend In Class And Giving Them Preferential Treatment.
Table 4.82:	Allowing A Student Assistant To Grade Non-Objective Exams And/Or Written Assignments That Require Significant Judgment.
Table 4.83:	Cancelling Classes When The Faculty Member Is Not Ill And Has No Other University Related Commitments.
Table 4.84:	Using Outdated Text To Avoid The Effort Necessary To Revise Notes, Etc.
Table 4.85:	Falsifying Activity Reports That Are Utilized By His Or Her Institution For Raises, Promotion, Or Tenure Evaluations.
Table 4.86:	Role Of University And Faculty In Emphasizing Ethical Position (Percentage)
Table 4.87:	Comparison Of Means (Ethical Perceptions On Lecturers' Behaviour In Academia)
Table 4.88:	Comparison Of Means (Role Of University And Faculty In Promoting Ethical Values)
Table 4.90:	Factor Analysis (Lecturers)

- Table 4.91: Giving Easy Tests Or Courses To Ensure Popularity
- Table 4.92: Accepting Publishers' Monetary Rebate For Adopting Publishers' Text Books
- Table 4.93: Using Profanity/Offensive Words In Lectures
- Table 4.94: Having An Intimate Relationship With A Student
- Table 4.95: Teaching Material That The Lecturers Have Not Really Mastered
- Table 4.96: Not Giving Graduate Student(S) Co-Authorship On Publications When The Student(S) Contribution Justified Co-Authorship.
- Table 4.97: Inappropriately Giving A Colleague A Co-Authorship Status.
- Table 4.98: Presenting The Same Research To More Than One Regional Or Annual Meeting (Against Meeting Policy)
- Table 4.99: Padding An Expense Account
- Table 4.100: Attending A Seminar/Conference At University Expense And Not Substantively Participating
- Table 4.101: Neglecting University Responsibilities Due To Outside Employment.
- Table 4.102: Using University Equipment For Personal Activities.
- Table 4.103: Using Student Assistants For Personal Work (E.G., Running Errands).
- Table 4.104: Cancelling Office Hours Excessively
- Table 4.105: Accepting Money Or Gifts For Grades
- Table 4.106: Dating A Student In His Or Her Class
- Table 4.107: Dating A Student Not In His Or Her Class Who Is Not Majoring In The Lecturer's Discipline
- Table 4.108: Allowing A Relative Or Friend In Class And Giving Them Preferential Treatment.
- Table 4.109: Allowing A Student Assistant To Grade Non-Objective Exams And/Or Written Assignments That Require Significant Judgment.
- Table 4.110: Cancelling Classes When The Faculty Member Is Not Ill And Has No Other University Related Commitments.
- Table 4.111: Using Outdated Text To Avoid The Effort Necessary To Revise Notes, Etc.
- Table 4.112: Falsifying Activity Reports That Are Utilized By His Or Her Institution For Raises, Promotion, Or Tenure Evaluations

- Table 4.113: Giving Easy Tests Or Courses To Ensure Popularity
- Table 4.114: Accepting Publishers' Monetary Rebate For Adopting Publishers' Text Books
- Table 4.115: Using Profanity/Offensive Words In Lectures
- Table 4.116: Having An Intimate Relationship With A Student
- Table 4.117: Teaching Material That The Lecturers Have Not Really Mastered
- Table 4.118: Not Giving Graduate Student(S) Co-Authorship On Publications When The Student(S) Contribution Justified Co-Authorship.
- Table 4.119: Inappropriately Giving A Colleague A Co-Authorship Status.
- Table 4.120: Presenting The Same Research To More Than One Regional Or Annual Conference (Against Policy)
- Table 4.121: Padding An Expense Account
- Table 4.122: Attending A Seminar Or Conference At University Expense And Not Substantively Participating
- Table 4.123: Neglecting University Responsibilities Due To Outside Employment.
- Table 4.124: Using University Equipment For Personal Activities
- Table 4.125: Using Student Assistants For Personal Work
- Table 4.126: Cancelling Office Hours Excessively
- Table 4.127: Accepting Money Or Gifts For Grades
- Table 4.128: Dating A Student In His Or Her Class
- Table 4.129: Dating A Student Not In His Or Her Class Who Is Not Majoring In The Lecturer's Discipline
- Table 4.130: Allowing A Relative Or Friend In Class And Giving Them Preferential Treatment
- Table 4.131: Allowing A Student Assistant To Grade Non-Objective Exams And/Or Written Assignments That Require Significant Judgment.
- Table 4.132: Cancelling Classes When The Faculty Member Is Not Ill And Has No Other University Related Commitments.
- Table 4.133: Using Outdated Text To Avoid The Effort Necessary
- Table 4.134: Falsifying Activity Reports That Are Utilized By His Or Her Institution For Raises, Promotion, Or Tenure Evaluations

# **CHAPTER I**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.0 FOREWORD**

The professional and ethical conducts of faculty are of special concern to the public for a number of reasons. First, faculty can strongly influence the overall ethical climate of the university environment (Schulte et.al., 1991). Second, the conduct of faculty affects the moral development of students (McNeel 1994a; Lismann, 1996). Third, teaching is commonly viewed as a noble profession with special privileges and responsibilities (Goodlad, 1990). Fourth, as faculty produce the nation's future leaders, it shoulders the responsibility to ensure quality and high ethical standards of graduates.

Ethics plays an important role in everyday life. The term ethics commonly refers to the rules and principles that define right and wrong conduct. The university's role is not merely confined to teaching ethics but has to be perceived as an ethical institution as well. With the university focusing more on business generating activities to sustain itself, ethics is of paramount consideration. Ethics should play a central role in a university and not merely a cosmetic role (Curtin University, 2001).

Research indicates that the university environment has a powerful influence on students' attitudes and behaviours (Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991). The faculty, particularly, put forth a strong influence on students because of the faculty's level of maturity and expertise relevant to difficult moral issues facing students (Laney, 1991; Mc Neel, 1994b). Research has also proved that lecturers or academicians are one of the factors that influence the moral standard and ethical behaviour of students. In other words, the quality of academicians must improve to achieve the objective of producing high quality graduates. Quality of academicians can be addressed in various manners. One of them is the awareness of ethical behaviour that these academicians should promote when teaching and interacting with students.

## 1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Academics are committed to the discovery, propagation of ideas and knowledge and dissemination of truth. Truth may vary depending on perspective, gender, culture and other factors, but the ultimate goal of the college or university lecturers is to ascertain the truth and share it with students and peers (Hauptman, 2002). Despite this, academicians often face ethical dilemmas include loyalties to the search for truth vs. loyalties to consulting clients, commitment to teaching vs. research and commitment to remain current in the discipline vs. pressures of other duties. In addition, many dilemmas appear to result from the incongruency of profit motives in industry on one hand and university goals on the other (Marshall, et.al, 1998).

From lecturers to undergraduate students, the university confronts a growing ethical deficit (Hauptman, 2002). Most of us do not give much thought to professional ethics as we carry out our day-to-day duties as teachers, researchers, committee members, and advisers. We may read about a case of plagiarism or hear about scientific fraud at another university, but such serious violations seem to be rare or distant from our daily routines. Faculty who have no problem expressing views on teaching strategies, research methods, or university politics hesitate to question a colleague's conduct in the classroom, the place where each lecturer has total power.

Nevertheless, the most powerful role played by faculty in the transmission of values is the behaviour, attitudes, values, and priorities they model (Bickel 1993; Institute 1980; Thomas et.al 1982). Lecturers and students often make moral judgments and express their values as they perform their academic duties. Because of the influence and strength of the mentor-student relationship, it is unreasonable to expect students to show a higher degree of ethical behaviour than what the lecturers model.

We often hear about ethical violations of students, but less is mentioned about the ethical violations of academicians (Gershaw, 1997). Roworth (2002) claimed that most academicians do not give much thought to professional ethics as they carry out their duties. They do not aware that whatever they do, their actions are observed and imitated by students. In other words, lecturers are being considered as one of the role models.



Students become dishonest because their role models (parents, teachers, lecturers as well as society in general) offer little to stimulate principled action. Consequentialist ethical theories (discussed in Chapter 2) that care more about results than principles take precedence over traditional moral thinking. As a result, unethical activity becomes acceptable when it is convenient or whenever one can get away with it. When university lecturers act unethically, the consequences may appear negligible to the potentially errant students (Hauptman, 2002).

## **1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT**

Society looks to higher institutions to produce knowledgeable graduates who will become responsible and productive in their communities and the nation. Since academicians play a significant role in defining appropriate professional behaviour for students, a close examination of their ethical belief and behaviours is critical if questions of ethics are to be raised and answered with meaningful results (Scales, 2002).

Faculty are often caught between addressing the need to interact more with students in their classes and protecting themselves from claims of student exploitation, claims of discrimination and harassment and other challenges that can arise from increased student interaction (Scales, 2002). These are the types of ethical dilemmas that lecturers have to face and manage while upholding their credibility as professionals.

Many research addressed issues on how ethics should be instilled or stressed the way ethics should be taught. They talked about the need to have ethical standards and the role played by the academicians, parents and society. It is reported that ‘while society entrusts parents with the responsibility of instilling ethical values, in recent years faculty have taken an increasingly larger role in this area’. The question is: if lecturers are to teach ethics and make sure that students are prepared with ethical challenges, do these lecturers really practice what they preach? (Hauptman, 2002). According to Mc Bee (1982), the academic community cannot expect the right conduct and moral development of students unless the institution itself is an example of noble behaviour.

This includes, not only the institution's policies and practices, but also the character of faculty.

Where noble is concerned, the definite demarcation line between ethical and unethical behaviour or action has to be established, but is not an easy task. In this study, unethical actions are actions against the academic rules or code of conduct. The unethical actions may not be in any of the guidelines but if the actions will harm or give a negative impact, either little or enormous to other parties, it is generally understood that the actions are unethical. For example, prohibition of accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' text books may not be in the code of ethics, but when lecturers do this, it is the students who are actually paying for the 'extra income' that lecturers receive. This commonly would not be accepted. In academia, students are the ultimate customers or the main concern while other parties or stakeholders would involve members of the faculty itself, university members as a whole, government, the industry or the future employers of the students, parents and society. Therefore, actions would be considered as unethical when the actions would directly or indirectly concern others.

We often hear about students who cheat. But when lecturers or educators cheat, do they ignore and see cheating as merely trying to resolve dilemmas or react on the unethical behaviour? (Hauptman, 2002). Few studies attempt to describe the ethical behaviour of academicians in academic programs and university classrooms.

The urgency to conduct this research was identified when it is reported that lecturers are being dispelled from the university for various reasons. According to the Registrar Office (Human Resource Management) of Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, five lecturers has been dismissed in the year 2003 mainly due to involvement in prohibited activities and failed to report duty on time. As stated by the Urusetia Tata tertib Staf (Staff Disciplinary Committee), although there were also rumors on other types of unethical conduct among these lecturers (i.e. intimate relationship of lecturers and students, plagiarism, in compliance to the university law), the committee cannot act without a formal complaint or grievance.

Despite the fact that academicians have noted that teaching is rife with ethical dilemma, there is relatively little research on ethical issues in academia especially daily ethical dilemma involved in teaching and lecturer-student interactions. Therefore, the aim of this study is to investigate the perceptions of students and lecturers on ethics in academics and lecturer-student interaction.

### **1.3 OBJECTIVES OF STUDY**

The following objectives have been developed to achieve the aim of the study:

- (i) To identify lecturers' and students' perceptions on the ethics in academics and lecturer-student interaction.
- (ii) To examine the differences between their perceptions.
- (iii) To identify demographic factors that influence their perceptions.
- (iv) To seek the practice of ethics among lecturers.
- (v) To determine the lecturers' propensity of performing unethical actions.
- (vi) To identify lecturers' perceptions on their colleagues' propensity of performing unethical actions.

### **1.4 SCOPE OF STUDY**

This study focuses on ethics in academics and lecturer-student interactions. Academic refers to activities including teaching, conducting research, lecturer-student interaction and participating in conferences or seminars. Perceptions are obtained from existing lecturers and full time final year undergraduate students of Faculty of Management and Human Resource Development (FPPSM), Faculty of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Faculty of Electrical Engineering of UTM Skudai.

### **1.5 LIMITATIONS OF STUDY**

When doing the survey, researchers faced the challenge of collecting questionnaires distributed to the lecturers. Additionally, answers provided are assumed to be of honest and true.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

In general, the study has been carried out to determine the perceptions of lecturers and students on the ethics in academics and lecturer-student interaction. It also tries to seek the lecturers' experience in performing unethical behaviours in academics. The initial stage of the study was to gather, as much as possible, information and past studies on the topic in order to design the research instrument. Questionnaires were designed and distributed to respondents. Data from the instrument was subsequently analysed to obtain primary data. The first hand data was then interpreted and conclusions were made from the results. They are supported with past results as presented in the next two chapters.

#### **3.2 POPULATION AND SAMPLE OF RESEARCH**

The population of the study are lecturers and students of Fakulti Pengurusan Dan Pembangunan Sumber Manusia (FPPSM), Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. No sampling was made to the population of lecturers, questionnaires were sent to all of them. There are 180 active lecturers of FPPSM, who are not undergoing study leave or sabbatical leave. However, the study was able to obtain only 44 responses after two follow-ups. There are approximately 240 final year students in the faculty during the data collection period. The study managed to obtain responses from 225 of them.

The final year Engineering students were also selected to be the respondents of the study in order to achieve the third objective. The 263 respondents were selected randomly using convenience sampling.

### **3.3 DATA COLLECTION**

The research data was obtained using primary and secondary data.

#### **3.3.1 PRIMARY DATA**

Data were gathered through questionnaires distributed to two group respondents, students and lecturers. Questionnaires were used in the study in obtaining the research data. Questionnaires distributed to the students consist of a three-part questionnaire, the data on respondents' demographics, 37 items/statements on ethical behaviour in academics and lecturer-student interaction, and statements on the university and faculty being the role model in ethics (Appendix IV). The 37 items were adapted from Morgan and Korschgen (2001) and Marshall et.al. (1998).

Questionnaires distributed to the lecturers are slightly different from students (refer Appendix V). Besides demographic data and the statements on the ethical positions of the university and faculty (Section A and B), lecturers were asked to perceive the ethicalness of the behaviours, whether they have done such actions before, the likeliness of doing the actions, their perceptions on how their colleagues would act on the actions and reasons of doing the unethical actions (Section C). However, the items/statements in Section C consists of only 22 items as used by Marshall et.al (1998). Lesser items were listed compared to students' to avoid respondents from reluctance to answer them since lecturers have to actually response to 88 questions that come from the four parts in that particular section.

This study also gathered primary data from the statistics obtained from the UTM Registrar office.

#### **3.3.2 SECONDARY DATA**

The secondary data was attained through articles, past studies from journals and proceedings, newspapers, on-line references and code of ethics.

### **3.4 DATA ANALYSIS**

Data gathered were analysed mainly using descriptive analysis and Exploratory Factor Analysis.

#### **3.4.1 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS**

A descriptive analysis was performed on the data set, calculating the mean, standard deviation and frequencies for all variables.

#### **3.4.2 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY TESTS**

The reliability test was conducted using Cronbach Alpha method to determine the internal consistency of the agreement made by these respondents.

#### **3.4.3 EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS (EFA)**

The technique is used to factor or group a number of variables into smaller groups. EFA is used in the research to identify the dimension (factors) of faculty behaviour in the items listed in the questionnaire. EFA will load on the resulting factors within the 0.50 cut-off, items which have lower loadings ( $<0.50$ ) will be dropped from further analysis. It is important to highlight that the study tries to extract factors from the items asked to lecturers even though the number of respondents are insufficient to perform the analysis. However, it is not impossible to extract the items, the loadings will probably not “fit” or good.

### **3.5 CONCLUSION**

This chapter discusses on the methodology adopted to achieve the objectives of the study. Findings in the next chapter will be presented using the analysis described above.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.0 INTRODUCTION**

Interest in the professional and ethical conduct of faculty is also stimulated by the impact of recent generations of lecturers. Higher education is undergoing a shift from the traditional paradigm in academic life to a “new academic culture” (Kerr, 1994). According to Kerr, the old academic ethics of teaching, advancing knowledge and citizenship responsibilities within the campus community is being neglected in favor of new off-campus interest. When this happen, faculty is less committed to the academic community, to serve on committees and to participate in campus governance. They have stronger commitment to individual economic opportunities off-campus and to promoting personal political concerns on campus. For many faculties, the academic environment has become a means to non-academic ends.

According to Smith (1996), faculty in universities proclaim their commitment to being effective teachers and scholars, to searching for truth, and to working as effective problem solvers. Yet, there are gaps between what lecturers say and what they actually do, as well as their awareness of these gaps.

#### **2.1 DEFINITIONS OF ETHICS**

Ethics refers to standards of conduct that indicate how one ought to behave based on specific values and moral duties and virtues arising from principles about right and wrong. For example, many people value certain rights such as the right to be treated equally regardless of one's race or religion. It would be wrong to discriminate against another person based on these or any other factors. We have a moral duty to treat others fairly and equitably, and it is the virtue of justice that enables us to do so. Ethical behaviour explains conducts of an individual who deemed appropriate by

society. Ethical behaviour is used interchangeably with moral behaviour (Curtin University, 2001).

Values are basic and fundamental beliefs that guide or motivate attitudes or actions (Mintz, 1995). Values are concerned with how a person will behave in certain situations whereas ethics is concerned with how a moral person should behave. Some values concern ethics because they pertain to beliefs about what is right and proper or which motivate a sense of moral duty or virtue. For example, the most important value of the academic profession is its commitment to serve the public interest. It is the duty of academicians to produce highly educated graduates with strong ethical value; those who would be the future leaders of the nation. The duty involves expectations from the public, parents, future employers and government. Therefore, this entails placing the public good ahead of all other interests especially self-interest. These academicians are expected to act according to the moral point of view in fulfilling their responsibilities to society. Other values of the academic profession, as evidenced by their inclusion in the University professional codes of ethics are: to perform services competently and with excellence; to enhance students' character development in order to fulfill national aspirations of producing future generations, to be objective in carrying out professional responsibilities; to maintain integrity; and most importantly to guarding the honor of our academic profession (Professional Code of Ethics For Staffs, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 2001).

## **2.2 ETHICS FRAMEWORK**

The theory of ethics has been a subject of interest to many philosophers. Some philosophers argued that truth, ethical conduct and moral principles are not innate, but they are only acquired through perception and conception (Locke, 1975). The following sections explain the well known moral development theory developed by Lawrence Kohlberg and other philosophical point of view based on Kant's ethical theory as well as Utilitarian theories.



### **2.2.1 KOHLBERG'S THEORY OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT**

Lawrence Kohlberg was particularly well known for his theory of moral development, which he popularised through research studies conducted at Harvard's Centre for Moral Education. His cognitive theory of moral development was dependent on the thinking of the Swiss psychologist, Jean Piaget and the American philosopher, John Dewey. They agreed that human beings develop philosophically and psychologically in a progressive fashion (Wright, 1995).

Kohlberg developed a model of ethical cognition which states that the psychology of ethical reasoning provides a theory that explains the human decision making process prior to ethical behaviour (Ponemon, 1990). His ideas of moral development are based on the premise that at birth, all humans are void of morals, ethics and honesty. He identified the family as the first source values and moral development for an individual. He believed that as one's intelligence and ability to interact with others matures, so does one's patterns of moral behaviour (Wright, 1995).

According to Ponemon (1990), Kohlberg believed and was able to demonstrate through studies that people progressed in their moral reasoning (i.e. in their bases for ethical behaviour) through a series of stages. He believed that there were six identifiable stages, which could be more generally classified into three levels. Kohlberg's model implies that all individuals move upwardly through developmental levels beginning at what is termed "pre-conventional level" to the second level termed "conventional" and to the final and highest level called "post-conventional" morality. In each level, he further divided it into two different stages. According to him, individuals proceed through a sequence of six distinct stages of moral reasoning (Ponemon, 1990).

Kohlberg's classification can be outlined in the following manner:

LEVEL	STAGE	SOCIAL ORIENTATION
Pre-conventional	1	Obedience and punishment
	2	Individualism, instrumentalism, and exchange (personal reward)
Conventional	3	"Good boy / nice girl" orientation
	4	Law and order
Post-conventional	5	Social contract
	6	Universal ethical principle

**Table 2.1: Kohlberg's stages of moral development (Ponemon, 1990)**

According to Kohlberg, the first level of moral thinking is generally found at the elementary school level (Wright, 1995). In the first stage of this level, people behave accordingly to socially acceptable norms because they are told to do so by some authority figure for instance parents or teachers. This obedience is compelled by the threat or application or punishment. Persons in this stage obey rules to avoid punishment. A good or bad action is determined by its physical consequences. The second stage of this level is characterized by a view that right behaviour means acting in one's own best interests.

The second level of moral thinking is generally found in society, hence it is named "conventional". The first stage of this level (stage 3) is characterized by an attitude, which seeks to do what will gain the approval of others. To a person in stage 3, good means "nice", that is, one's behaviour is determined by what pleases and is approved by others. This is a point in Kohlberg's theories that has received criticism regarding its bias against women.

The second stage is one oriented to abiding by the law and responding to the obligations of duty. At this level, one takes into account society's norms and laws by not doing things against the law.

The third level of moral thinking is one that Kohlberg felt is not reached by the majority of adults. Its first stage (stage 5) is an understanding of social mutuality and a genuine interest in the welfare of others. Under this stage, good is determined by socially agreed upon standard of individual rights. Persons operating in this moral stage believe that different societies have different views of what is right and wrong.

The last stage (stage 6) is based on respect for universal principle and the demands of individual conscience. It involves abstract concepts of justice, human dignity and equality. In this stage, persons believe that there are universal points of view on which all societies should agree. While Kohlberg always believed in the existence of Stage 6 and had some nominees for it, he could never get enough subjects to define it.

The case of resolving conflicts of interest may be looked into in order to illustrate the model (Ponemon, 1990). The pre-conventional person acted in a manner that resolution is simple based upon cost and benefit of ethical action. For conventional person, resolution is based upon the avoidance of harm to others belonging to one's social institution. On the other hand, the post conventional person would judge based upon self-chosen set of principles. In essence, the theory states that post conventional stages of moral development can solve conflicts that lower level stages cannot because critical moral thinking is more developed in higher stages.

In relation to following ethical codes of conduct, a professional at stage two for example, would choose to comply with professional standards, ethical codes or law only if he or she deemed that ethical behaviour was less harmful or costly than unethical behaviour. The conventional individual is aware of shared feelings and expectations, which take primacy over individual interests. At stage four, the individual feels obligated to keep the system of rules going and seek ways to avoid breakdown in the system. The post conventional individual would follow self-chosen ethical principles in which case particular laws or social agreements are usually valid because they rest on such principles (Ponemon, 1990).

Kohlberg believed that individuals could only progress through these stages, one stage at a time, that is, they could not ‘jump’ stages. They could not, for example, move from an orientation of selfishness to the law and order stage without passing through the good boy/ girl stage. They could only come to a comprehension of moral rationale one stage above their own. Thus, according to Kohlberg, it was important to present them with moral dilemmas for discussion, which would help them to see the reasonableness of a “higher stage” morality and encourage their development in that direction. The last comment refers to Kohlberg’s moral discussions approach. He saw this as one of the ways in which moral development can be promoted through formal education. Kohlberg believed that most moral development occurs through social interaction, which is based on the insight that individuals develop as a result of cognitive conflicts at their current stage (Wright, 1995).

In conclusion, Kohlberg’s model could be used to understand the level of ethical development of any members in any organization. This is essential in order to improve members’ ethics because without knowledge of the individual specific levels of ethical development, it is difficult to identify how to help them improve.

### **2.2.2 CRITICISM’S OF KOHLBERG’S THEORY**

Many people disagree with Kohlberg for various reasons (<http://facultyweb.cortland.edu/andersmd/KOHL/kidmoral.HTML>). Moral development may not occur automatically in stages. This development may be more related to the rewarding or punishing of a child for certain behaviour. The home environment, according to some psychologists, may be more closely related to moral development than a natural progression of stages.

Critics also question the fact that whatever solution a person picks is all right, as long as the person can base his or her solution on reasons. Basically, critics wonder if the

reasoning a person uses should be enough. The answer of the solution does not have anything to do with the stage of development, instead of just the reasoning.

Kohlberg is also biased against women. This challenge is due to the fact that Kohlberg does not take into account the differences between men and women. For instance, women are more likely to base their explanations for moral dilemmas on concepts such as caring and personal relationships. These concepts are likely to be scored at the stage-three level. Men, on the other hand, are more likely to base their decisions for moral dilemmas on justice and equity. Those concepts are likely to be scored at stage five or six.

### **2.2.3 OTHER ETHICAL FRAMEWORK**

While moral reasoning developed by Kohlberg is concerned with the process that individual follow in making decisions with ethical implications, it is not concerned with the ethics of right or wrong. Besides understanding the theoretical bases for ethical decision-making, it is also essential to understand the underlying theory of ethics itself. Ross (1978) viewed ethics from the philosophical point of view based on Kant's ethical theory where self imposed action conforming to one's sense of duty is the prime source of morality. Utilitarian theories, on the other hand, hold that the moral worth of actions or practice is determined solely by their consequences.

#### **2.2.3.1 UTILITARIANISM**

Utilitarian is an example of consequentialist theory where it looks to consequences of acts for moral justifications. It is derived from the word "utility" to denote the capacity in actions to have good results (Cottell and Perlin, 1990). An action or practice is right if it leads to the best possible balance of good consequences over bad consequences. This theory is also known as the analysis of cost over its benefits. Therefore in utilitarian terms, the more good, which results from an action, the more utility it has, the worse the result, the more disutility.

According to Beauchamp and Bowie (1993), the first developed utilitarian philosophical writings were those of David Hume (1711-1776), followed by Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). In fact, Mill's utilitarianism is still considered the major theoretical base in today's ethical practice. His most widely discussed foundation is his normative foundation in the principle of utility. The principle states that the greatest happiness as the foundation of normative ethical theory, which aims at determining what ought to be done from what is in fact, practised. Mill said, "actions are right in proportion to their tendency to promote happiness or absence of pain and wrong insofar as they tend to produce pain or displeasure" (Etzioni, 1988).

Since the theory is committed to the maximization of the good and the minimization of harm, the concept of efficiency arises as the means to maximization (Beauchamp and Bowie, 1993). The utilitarian commitment to the principle of optimal productivity through efficiency is an essential part of the traditional business concept and part of business practice.

Another feature of utilitarianism is the concept of intrinsic value where utilitarians regard that happiness and pleasure possess the most intrinsic worth where people wish to have them for their sake and not as a means to something else. To maximize a person's utility is to provide that he or she has chosen or would choose from among the available alternatives.

Utilitarianism, however, has also got its criticisms. Measuring happiness as an intrinsic worth, proposed by Mill, has been a major problem because happiness is a very subjective element. Furthermore, the action that produces the greatest balance of value for the greatest number of people may bring about unjustified treatment for minorities (Beauchamp and Bowie, 1993). Utilitarianism has also been criticized on the grounds that it ignores non-utilitarian factors, which are needed to make moral decisions. There are other types of thing, which is right to set us to produce without a view to general pleasure or good.

### **2.2.3.2 KANT'S ETHICAL THEORY**

The third major system of ethics found in modern society is deontology, from the Greek word for duty. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) was the premier deontologist and Kantianism was actually founded by him. In contrast to the utilitarian ethical system discussed earlier, Kant holds the idea that right action is independent of consequences. In other words, Kantianism is the non-consequentialist theory.

Kant prescribed that a moral person has a duty to take right action regardless of consequences. He emphasized that the highest motive for a morally right action comes from a sense of duty, which is derived from reason. An action done from the sense of duty is not based on purpose it is meant to serve but to the principle on which it is done. Kantian ethics requires that the doer respect the rights, status and dignity of the people with whom she or he interacts, that is, there is a necessity of acting from respect for law (Ross, 1978).

To Kant, once one imposes the law on himself, he needs no pressure from outside. His own “will” becomes the supreme source of good. Kant provides two rational principles to discipline and control the will. The principles are:

- (i) One should act so as to treat persons as an end and never as a means only.
- (ii) Act only on maxims, which you can at the same time, will that they would become universal laws.

As mentioned earlier, Kantianism is distinguished from Utilitarianism by the absence of the direct appeal to consequences in determining right or wrong action. To give an example of the difference between the two in our daily life is to look at the case of promise keeping. Utilitarianism says that we should set ourselves to fulfil promises only because when doing so, it is likely to give good overall outcome. In contrast, Kantianism says that the fact that a promise has been made constitutes in itself a

reason why it should be fulfilled, since if everybody broke promises the institution of promise keeping would collapse.

Kant's contribution to moral philosophy, however, has been criticized as narrow and inadequate to handle various problems in the moral life. For instance, the theory does not take into account moral emotions or sentiments such as caring and sympathy (Beauchamp and Bowie, 1993). Kant's emphasis on universal law, some argued, is at the expense of specific obligations, for example, obligations that fall only on those who have certain roles such as business manager.

## **2.3 ETHICS IN UNIVERSITY**

It is essential to approach the question of ethics in a university by recognizing that ethics is fundamental to the underlying principles of a university as a total institution, or living moral community. The objective of the university is not only to teach ethics but also to be an ethical institution. An unethical university or a university without ethics in the way it operates as a moral community or business would be a contradiction terms. In other words, in a university, like a good business organization, ethics must play more than a cosmetic role. Ethics should play a central role in a university. Dehardt (1988) suggests that university is an institution that provides normative guidance, standards for behaviour, and goals for policy and practice at all levels.

This is true because colleges and universities are custodian of knowledge. When the possession of knowledge is the source of power, and has the ability to influence decisions in today's society, these institutions significantly affect the quality of economic and social life throughout the world. Thus, as colleges and universities create and disseminate knowledge within a particular society, they are institutions with moral responsibilities to maintain the well being of that society. Universities are said to be the cornerstones in building ethical organizations and has the vital role to lay the foundation on how to make tough choices and live ethically.



Universities have a duty of care to their staff, to enable and empower them to do their job and to improve their performance, by promoting the university as an environment of mutual teaching and learning. Rigorous scientific evaluation procedures should be applied to the teaching and learning activities, not based on rumours and hearsay.

The issues of economic disparity, access to knowledge and education, and the moral use of specialized skills are not only directly addressed by ethicists but also by other scholars concerned with the state of higher education in general. At an international gathering of scholars discussing service-learning, educator Mithra Augustine of India noted, “The role and function of the universities and colleges were earlier seen as integral to the processes of social engineering, developing in students critical faculties, creative potential and initiative towards applying these to the tasks of freeing people from material want and intellectual deprivation. Amidst current trends of modernisation and globalisation the culture of self-interest is growing dominant in centres of higher education. The interest is in training for lucrative careers at the expense of all else once supportive of social concerns of justice, peace, and integrity of creation” (Berry and Chisholm, 1999).

These and other voices acknowledge that educational institutions, either religious or secular, that provide students with opportunities for ethical formation in the classroom, outside of the classroom and through an environment suffused with concern for high ethical standards, produce employers/employees who will create ethical cultures at their businesses.

O’Connell (1998) stated that: “Our task in universities is not only to teach ethics and values for the marketplace but to model these values ourselves as we fulfill our own moral responsibility as educators in the universities where our students begin the business ethics journey in the first place.” Many business courses address ethical foundations. This provides some assurance that students are exposed to ethical theories and issues but sometimes this exposure can often be a stale and perfunctory

introduction to the student, and its impact is uncertain. Students, on the other hand, are keenly aware of and sensitive to the ethical behavior of the course instructor. The questions are whether teaching faculty (1) treat students equally and fairly, (2) give tests that are representative of the materials covered and the importance placed on them, (3) make themselves available for extra help and actually keep office hours, (4) return assignments promptly, etc. Teaching faculty are exemplars for students and it is essential that they reflect and personify the values of the institution.

Smith and Reynolds (1990) have pointed out that there is a broad public consensus that universities should be prepared for active participation in the civic life of our communities and nation, a task with implications for nurturing ethical behaviour. They emphasize that universities cannot meet these expectations unless its own affairs are conducted in the highest ethical manner.

It could be argued that academicians should exhibit a higher degree of professionalism and adhere to a more strict code of ethics than other professions. O'Neil (1983) states "a university that teaches and preaches ethical responsibility to others must itself be a model of that very responsibility if it is to maintain credibility and public trust and continue to be regarded as an essential contributor to society's well-being. Institutions of higher education that live the ethics and values contained in their mission statements produce the graduates who are highly valued and sought by ethical organizations.

## **2.4 ETHICS IN TEACHING**

Teaching is a human activity. Due to the fact that teaching and education involve interaction with human beings, everything in these activities must be subjected to ethical controls (Barcena and Gil, 1993). Whether an individual acts ethically or unethically is the result of a complex interaction between the individual's stage of moral development and several moderating variables including individual's

characteristics, organization's structured design, the organization culture and intensity of the ethical issues.

A report revealed that faculty now spends less time with students (Milem et.al, 2000). Gone are the days when lecturers and students interact frequently and devote themselves towards teaching excellence. Changes in academia has set great challenges to lecturers, for one, lecturers are now expected to not only perform the teaching and academic advice, but doing research, consultancies, publications as well as doing social services. Stakeholders of education institutions value teaching, as they perceive that lecturers or academicians should play the role as a shaper of minds and values. However, we reward research and scholarly publication. Teaching seems to be secondary in the eyes of University top management and lecturers themselves. Thus, students may come to be disappointed when their mentors do not live up to expectations.

#### **2.4.1 THE 'SHOULD'S' AND 'SHOULD NOT'S'**

Educators and academicians should be the role model to students especially in the aspects of moral and values. Vargas (2001) dictated from several researchers that the most powerful role played by faculty in the transmission of values is the behaviour, attitudes, values and priorities they model. Lecturers and students often make moral judgments and express their values as they perform their academic duties. Because of the influence and strength of the mentor-student relationship, it is unreasonable to expect students to show a higher degree of ethical behaviour than what the lecturer model.

In addition, lecturers and educators influence their students in one way or another in the normal course of their activities. Thus, moral education in some sense or another is unavoidable. Even if educators or lecturers do not talk to students specifically about ethical behavior, it does not mean they are not learning through observations of the lecturers' actions and how lecturers relate to students.

There is a “culture of copying” in China – plagiarism among professors and cheating among students – according to an article in the *Chronicle* by Jiang Xueqin. This situation has been highlighted in recent weeks as a renowned professor at Peking University has been demoted, accused of plagiarizing the work of an American academic. China’s academic community is reportedly divided on the issue of what is appropriate. Peking has added a new clause to its academic handbook: “Anyone who plagiarizes a published or unpublished work or idea will be warned, reprimanded, or demoted depending on the severity of the offense”. This is the first time a Chinese university has adopted a written rule in this area, and many academics hope that other universities will follow.

The same goes with plagiarism cases in Indonesia. Jakarta Post (2003) reported that the world of education and learning needs to have a sense of respect for originality of thought and the contribution to knowledge. Additionally, there should exist, within all educators, an unwritten but fully recognized and upheld honor code that holds plagiarism in contempt. This kind of code and its accompanying higher standard of ethics should make plagiarism an alien and disgusting thought for all educators.

Presently though, as the above examples have illustrated, this does not seem to be fully the case. Of course, economic realities may have to be factored into the equation here, in the sense that it might be economically expedient for some educators to be able to “sell themselves” through seminars and speeches whilst in fact plagiarizing and essentially selling someone else’s ideas and thoughts. But expediency should not be placed above principle and responsibility and educators, in particular, have to have high principles and are by definition in positions of responsibility.

#### **2.4.2 THE ROLE OF LECTURERS IN PROMOTING ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR**

Ideally, lecturers or professors should promote good ethical conduct and be the role model to students. However, a poll conducted by National Association of Scholars

(2002) reported that a large majority of college graduates testified that their professors tell them there are no clear and uniform standards of right and wrong. A similarly large majority reports that they have been taught that corporate policies furthering “progressive” social and political goals are more important than those ensuring that stockholders and creditors receive accurate accounts of a firm’s finances.

The poll concluded that it seems reasonable to believe that when students leave college, they are convinced that ethical standards are simply a matter of individual choice. They are likely to be reliably ethical in their subsequent careers. Unfortunately, three quarters of the respondents report that this was the relativistic view of ethics they received from their professors.

However, faculty should take responsibility for their own behaviours. According to Stevens et. al. (1994):

*‘A good case could be built for the premise that students cannot be expected to be more ethical than the faculty who teach them. If there is true concern on the part of colleges of business to improve the ethical sensitivity of students and not just have to have course content requirements met, then perhaps ethics education should begin with the faculty.’*

Mintz (1995) studied virtue ethics of accountants and made some remarks on integrity, trustworthiness and loyalty. Like any other professions, lecturers have the responsibility to pose integrity, trustworthiness and loyalty in their career. They must not only possess the ability to act ethically and must have the intent to do so. Integrity provides the intent. Integrity means acting according to ethical principles and placing those principles above expedience or self-interest even when such an action imposes bad reputation.

On the other hand, trustworthiness is a trait of character that inspires confidence for those who rely on the good intentions of others to perform services competently and in their best interests. For example, a lecturer who is honest can be expected (trusted) to disseminate knowledge with accurate and complete facts.

Loyalty entails a special moral responsibility to promote and protect the interests of others. While a lecturer is expected to be loyal to the University, it is the students' interest to which the lecturer owes ultimate allegiance. The duty of loyalty requires that lecturers should protect the confidentiality of information and to be faithful to the University and students' interests by performing academic services competently.

### **2.4.3 CASES OF UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR IN TEACHING**

In the international scenario, reports show that it has been a trend going where teachers/educators who are helping their students cheat on tests in the United States (Labi et. al., 1999). Probe into New York City's public school system that exposed a number of educators helping students cheat on standardized tests. Some hinted broadly at correct answers while students were taking the test; others used the scrap-paper method to avoid the multiple erasures that often indicate cheating; a few even changed answers after their students turned in the exams. The motive is not hard to discern. Educators/teachers, particularly in the early grades, are increasingly being measured by the test scores of their students and can lose their jobs if student performance is too low and shows no sign of improvement.

Educators who help their students cheat are a tiny minority. Teachers' union leaders disputed the cheating charges in New York City, claiming they were based on the unproved allegations of children and, in any event, do not constitute a "sweeping indictment of the entire system." Still, the temptation to cheat seems to be growing among teachers, who are being held accountable if their students don't measure up (Kantrowitz et.al., 2000).

Indonesian educators plagued by lack of ethics, plagiarism is said to be a common 'disease'. What is most sad is that so many of the people who so willingly plagiarize are engaged in the world of education. The need to have ethical standards has been stressed by both business and academicians. While society entrusts parents with the responsibility of instilling ethical values, in recent years business schools have taken an increasingly larger role in this area.

## **2.5 PROFESSIONAL CODE OF ETHICS**

Presently, the issuance of code of ethics in guiding a member of an organization is considered essential. Many organizations have a formal code of ethics in place. Codes of ethics are perceived as one of the most important tools organizations possess to increase their employees' ethical decision behavior (Molander, 1987) but they are just one way of communicating an ethical culture to employees and not powerful enough to affect ethical decision making behavior (Cleek and Leonard, 1998). It is said that the ethical philosophies and values of management have significant influences on the ethical choices and behavior of employees and their example is a critical component in creating ethical/unethical behavior by employees.

Organizational values give direction to the many decisions made at all levels of the organization every day (Schmidt and Posner, 1983). The organization's value system functions as a sense-making device for organizational members, and management should be obsessive in ensuring that it is understood and accurately interpreted (Dobni et al., 2000). Research strongly supports the conclusion that the ethical philosophies and values of management have a great influence on the ethical choice and behaviors of other organizational members (Stead et al., 1990; Soutar et al., 1994; Wimbush and Shephard, 1994).

In higher education institutions, codes of ethics are placed to ensure that principles are ingrained in the academic staff routine to achieve the organizations' objectives. Codes are hoped to be a guide in combating fraud and carrying out the duties and responsibilities as academicians. As one of the premier higher learning institutions in the country, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) has issued The Professional Staff Code of Ethics to improve the quality of academic programmes as its main objective. Subsequently, it aims to produce graduates who are competitive and with high moral standard.

### **2.5.1 UTM ACADEMIC STAFF CODE OF ETHICS**

The UTM staff code of ethics (refer to Appendix I) was issued in the year 2001, in response to cases and unethical conduct performed by its staff. All academic staffs are entrusted with teaching, conducting research, writing and publishing, community services, student-development and academic management. Therefore, according to the code, academics are to devote their efforts to these core responsibilities through activities that would give added value to academic standing.

As stated by the code, academicians should not only comprehend, adopt, practice and transmit knowledge for the benefit of mankind, but must also abide by a set of high moral values, consistent with the standing of an educationist, which could inspire and be emulated by their personal conducts, attitudes and principles. The code has underlined rules in conducting the core responsibilities for the academicians to refer to. It highlights the importance of maintaining integrity and ethics while carrying out the duties.

It is important to highlight that the code has even exert the rules that academic staff should contribute towards shaping students' character and personal development, aside from ensuring students' academic excellence. Students character building program should be comprehensive and integrated, encompassing the physical, emotional, spiritual and intellectual aspects. As students' mentor and academic advisor, academic staffs, according to the code, have the responsibility to instill and nurture good leadership quality, positive thinking outlook, sound mental health and the development of an honorable character.

### **2.5.2 STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS (AAUP)**

It is important to look at other ethical guidelines for academicians to abide with. The AAUP Statement of Professional Ethics (refer to Appendix II) states that faculty



should practice intellectual honesty and "accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge."

In addition, the code put emphasis on the lecturers' responsibility to hold before students the best scholarly and ethical standards of their disciplines and to demonstrate respect for students as individuals by adhering to their "proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors." Remarkably, this code emphasized on the need of every lecturer to make reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. Lecturers are also expected to respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student, and they must avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students.

### **2.5.3 CODE OF ETHICS FOR EDUCATORS**

The code issued by Georgia Professional Standard Commission (refer to Appendix III) focuses to responsibilities of educators and is more serious in underlining the ethical principles that they must comply to.

Two major principles identified in the code of ethics established internationally are commitment to the student and commitment to the profession. In the former, educators are expected to strive to help each student realize his or her potential as a worthy and effective member of society. In the latter, the education profession is vested by the public with a trust and responsibility requiring the highest ideals of professional services. The code also emphasized on the magnitude of the responsibilities inherent in the teaching process. The desire for the respect and confidence of one's colleagues, of students, of parents, and of members of community provides the incentive to attain and maintain the highest possible degree of ethical conduct.

Remarkably, the code has called attention to the goals educators need to achieve. The professional goals of educators are to provide knowledge, develop skills and nurture many aspects of students' personality in order to facilitate students' development, help them fulfill their potential, and to assist them in becoming both involved citizens and

contributors to society and as humans expanding and forming their personality. Educators have to constantly strive to use updated scientific knowledge, educational concepts and teaching methods, emphasizing the usefulness of what is being taught, with intellectual integrity, fairness, and in an atmosphere of openness.

Additionally, the code has underlined that educators must treat students equally, avoiding any discrimination based on nationality, race, gender, sexual orientation, or any other reason, and maintain a relationship based on sensitivity and respect for students' needs, bodies, property and opinions. Educators should also preserve confidentiality of information about students and act to build relationship based on mutual trust and respect.

## **2.6 PAST STUDIES ON FACULTY BEHAVIOUR**

The following past studies will elaborate more on the perception of lecturers and students on faculty behaviour.

### **2.6.1 LECTURER-STUDENT PERCEPTIONS ON ETHICS IN TEACHING**

Morgan and Korschgen (2001) investigated differences in professors' and undergraduate students' perceptions of the ethicalness of faculty behaviour. Both groups responded to sixteen items regarding faculty behaviour. Respondents consist of 115 faculty professors and 157 student respondents. They rated the ethicalness of 16 faculty behaviours on a 5-point scale that ranged from 1 (unquestionably not ethical) to 5 (unquestionably ethical).

The results of the study showed that faculty and students differed significantly on four of the sixteen behaviours and indicated a strong trend on another three. Faculty saw ensuring popularity with an easy test, accepting a textbook rebate and using profanity in lectures as more unethical than did the undergraduates. While the students viewed failing to update notes as more unethical than did the faculty. The findings revealed that students' understandable self-interest is evident in their concern over course issues such as outdated lecture notes. On the other hand, faculty are more aware of factors

that refocus the moral principles that may underlie unwanted behaviours such as teaching material lectures have not really mastered (Morgan and Korschgen, 2001).

The study by Morgan and Korschgen (2001) also found that students appear less disturbed by some of the ‘political’ issues in academia for instance allowing likeability to influence grading, giving easy tests for popularity sake, or sexual relations between faculty and students. However, although there was a difference of degree, both faculty and students viewed most of the behaviours as unethical. For example, both faculty and students perceive ignoring evidence of cheating and insulting a student in his or her absence as strongly unethical. The results of the study can be summarised as follows:

No	Item	Lecturers’ mean	Students’ mean
	<b>Behaviours that faculty viewed as more unethical.</b>		
1.	Giving easy courses / tests to ensure popularity.	1.33	1.85
2.	Accepting a publisher’s monetary rebate for adopting their textbooks.	1.57	2.24
3.	Using profanity in lectures.	2.29	3.25
4.	Becoming sexually involved with a student.	1.41	1.72
	<b>Behaviours that students viewed as more unethical.</b>		
5.	Failing to update lecture notes when re-teaching a course.	2.58	2.10
6.	Telling colleagues a confidential disclosure told by a student.	1.56	1.32
7.	Teaching material lecturers have not really mastered.	2.62	2.26
	<b>Behaviours that did not yield significant differences</b>		
8.	Ignoring strong evidence of cheating.	1.20	1.39
9.	Teaching full time while ‘moonlighting’ at least 20 hours per week.	2.66	2.94
10.	Selling unwanted complimentary textbooks to used book vendors.	2.46	2.48
11.	Allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved.	2.56	2.79
12.	Omitting significant information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student.	2.11	2.00
13.	Insulting, ridiculing, etc a student in his or her absence.	1.36	1.35

14.	Ignoring unethical behaviour by colleagues.	1.93	1.77
15.	Allowing a student's 'likability' to influence grading.	1.51	1.77
16.	Grading on a strict curve regardless of class performance level.	2.42	2.13

A slightly similar study by Marshall et al. (1998) analysed business students' perceptions of ethical dilemmas that often confront faculties of business schools. Their study extends the work of Engle and Smith (1990, 1992) by focusing on the role of professors as perceived by business students, as opposed to the views of fellow faculty members in accounting departments. Student responses to 29 potential ethical dilemmas are compared to faculty responses to determine whether faculty and students hold faculty to the same standards. The individual issues are then combined to develop a framework of overall dimensions of business faculty ethical dilemmas. The second objective is accomplished by using the students' responses to the 29 ethical issues in exploratory factor analysis. Respondents were asked to respond to the 29 items using the scale from 1 to 5 namely: 1 – totally ethical, 2 – slightly unethical, 3 – moderately unethical, 4 – moderately to extremely unethical and 5 – extremely unethical.

The 29 ethical issues are grouped under certain headings as follows:

			Faculty mean	Students mean	Faculty > Students
Research Activities	1.	Plagiarizing research.	4.63	4.20	+
	2.	Submitting a manuscript to two or more journals in violation of journal policy.	2.88	3.76	-
	3.	Falsifying documentation for research grants.	4.48	4.51	-
	4.	Falsifying research data	4.68	4.43	+
	5.	Not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.	3.65	4.30	-
	6.	Inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status.	3.06	3.99	-
	7.	Presenting the same research to more than one regional or annual meeting.	2.87	3.59	-
Travel Activities	8.	Padding an expense account.	3.82	4.07	-
	9.	Attending a meeting at university expense and not substantively participating.	3.16	3.84	-
Outside Employ	10.	Neglecting university responsibilities due to outside employment.	3.57	3.69	-

ment	11.	Using university equipment for personal activities	3.31	3.40	-
Relation ships with publisher	12.	Selling complimentary textbooks to a used book salesperson.	2.32	3.48	-
	13.	Accepting a bribe from a publisher for a textbook adoption.	4.48	4.37	+
	14.	Adoption of a textbook in return for assets donated to the accounting department by the publisher.	3.59	3.72	-
Student- Related Activities	15.	Favouring a particular firm(s) in employment advice to students because grants, employment, etc., have been accepted from the firm by the faculty member.	3.03	3.34	-
	16.	Using student assistants for personal work.	3.05	3.45	-
	17.	Cancelling office hours excessively.	3.08	3.65	-
	18.	Accepting sex for grades.	4.90	4.82	+
	19.	Accepting money or gifts for grades.	4.90	4.82	+
	20.	Dating a student in his or her class.	3.55	3.48	+
	21.	Dating a student not in his or her class who is majoring in the professor's discipline.	2.64	3.01	-
	22.	Dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the professor's discipline.	1.98	2.39	-
	23.	Allowing lecture notes to become outdated.	2.92	3.40	-
	24.	Allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment.	3.66	4.02	-
	25.	Allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgement.	2.99	3.86	-
	26.	Cancelling classes when the faculty member is not ill or has no other university related commitments.	3.44	3.12	+
	27.	Conducting university responsibilities under the influence of drugs or alcohol.	4.24	4.66	-
	28.	Using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, etc.	3.27	3.99	-
Other Activities	29.	Falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations.	4.16	4.48	-

Students' average scores on each item, as shown in the above table, indicate the seriousness with which students view the ethical dilemmas. A majority of the items (20 out of 29) received average scores of at least 3.50. Twenty-eight out of 29 items received average scores above 3.0 (moderately unethical).

The study found that 92 percent of these business graduates believe that one of the most important influences of students' ethical values development is business professors' actions. It therefore implies that faculty need to display ethical behaviour if higher ethical standards from students are desired. The study reveals that students' viewed 29 potential ethical issues as more serious than did the faculty.

Based on students perceptions, four factors of ethical dilemmas were isolated namely, 'regulations', 'academic job performance', 'dating' and 'personal benefits'. The first factor includes 10 violations of university policy, including items such as presenting the same research to more than one meeting against meeting policy and using university equipment for personal activities. The second factor contains seven items, all of which include some aspect of doing less work, for example using an outdated text to avoid revising notes, allowing student assistants to grade non-objective tests or assignments and cancelling office hours excessively. The third factor consists of statements related to dating students while the final factor contains items that appear to represent personal benefits. Items within the last factor include falsifying documentation for grants and accepting sex, money, or gifts for grades. The results of the study also indicate that students place the highest value on personal benefits with mean 4.72. Regulations and academic job performance received mid-range scores, 3.75 and 3.79 respectively. Dating appears to be of least concern to students.

### **2.6.2 LECTURERS' ETHICAL BELIEFS AND BEHAVIOUR**

In a more recent study, Scales (2002) examines the ethical beliefs and behaviours of full-time community college faculty in United States. Respondents report to what degree they practice sixty-two behaviours as teachers and whether they believe the behaviours to be ethical. Scales used questionnaire developed by Tabachnik et. al (1991) which contained sixty two questions relating to eight distinct areas relating to teaching namely course content, evaluation of students, education environment, conduct related to fitness for duty, research and publication issues, financial and

material transactions, social relationships with students and sexual relationships with students and co-workers.

The study found that survey participants engaged in few of the behaviours and only reported two actions as ethical namely, accepting inexpensive gifts from students and teaching values or ethics. The college faculty holds the belief that it is ethical to teach values to students, to hug them and accept inexpensive gift items from their students. Using school resources to publish research or to work a second job is also not seen as unethical. Scales reported that faculty are less likely to believe that behaviours of a sexual nature, inappropriate or ill-prepared course content nor that unfair treatment or taking advantage of students financially or otherwise should be tolerated as ethical. Additionally, engaging in the use of alcohol, drugs or other illegal substances should not be tolerated as ethical according to the college faculty.

The study also reported diverse responses to questions about behaviour of a sexual nature, but most agreed that sexual relationship with students or colleagues at the same, higher or lower rank were unethical. Additional findings relate to the presence of diversity among the faculty, using school resources to publish textbooks and external publications, selling goods to students and an expansive list of other behaviours.

Scales (2002) reported that faculty members show congruence between what respondents report as ethical beliefs and report as teaching practice (81% of the items). Behaviours of the majority of faculty at the institutions represented in his study are likely to be consistent with their beliefs about ethical and unethical behaviour. In other words, if they believe the behaviour to be unethical, most of the faculty in this situation will not practice such behaviour. If they, on the other hand, believe a behaviour is ethical, they will more often than not, have engaged in the behaviour. Beliefs and behaviours that are not correlated are teaching that certain races are inferior, accepting undeserved authorship of a student's paper, teaching under the influence of alcohol, sexual relationships with both same rank and higher or lower

ranked faculty. Another study by Vargas (2001) on lecturers' perceptions indicates that using profanity/offensive words in lectures as ethical since 75% of the respondents perceive as so.

### 2.6.3 STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON LECTURERS' ETHICAL STANDARDS

An unpublished study of Keith-Spiegel et. al. (1997) about students' perceptions on their professors' ethical standards have asked 282 degree students to rank 107 behaviours of professors. The students rated the following as unethical:

Action	Percentage of response
Making deliberate or repeated sexual comments, gestures or physical contact toward a student that are unwanted by the student.	99%
Including false or misleading information that hurt the students' chances when writing a letter of recommendation for a student.	95%
Ignoring strong evidence of student's cheating.	93%
Including material on the test that was not covered in the lecture or assigned reading.	93%
Allowing how much a student is liked to influence what grade the student gets.	90%
Insulting or ridiculing the student in the student's presence.	90%
Giving every student an "A" regardless of the quality of their work.	89%
Telling the student during a class discussion, "That was a stupid comment."	87%
Choosing a particular textbook for a class primarily because the publisher would pay them a " <i>bonus</i> " to do it.	86%
Intentionally leaving out something very important that would help a student when writing a letter of recommendation.	84.8%
Announcing exam grades of each student, by name, in front of the class.	83%
Becoming sexually involved with a student	81%
Telling a student " <i>I'm sexually attracted to you.</i> "	77.7%
Ignoring unethical behavior committed by their colleagues.	77.6%
Giving a very difficult exam during the third week of school in an attempt to encourage some students to drop the course.	77%



On the other hand, students in the study perceived these actions by their professors as ethical:

Action	Percentage of response
Giving points off for assignments handed in late.	83.8%
Teaching in jeans and a sweatshirt.	74%
Giving "pop" (unannounced) quizzes.	71%
Teaching full-time and holding down another job for at least 20 hours a week.	65%
Selling goods (such as cars or books) to a student.	59%
Giving only essay exams and assigning written projects (that is, no multiple choice exams).	58%
Talking to students (in private) about the student's personal problems.	57%
Accepting a student's inexpensive gift (that is, worth less than \$5).	56%
Engaging in sexual relationships with other faculty members in the same department.	54%

#### **2.6.4 STUDENTS' DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE PERCEPTIONS**

Gender and academic programmes are among factors that generally influence students' ethical perceptions. Most research indicates that females exhibit a higher degree of concern over ethics than males. About half of the studies on gender and ethical attitudes suggest that women are more prone to ethical behavior than men, the other half show no relationship. Giligan (1982) suggest that men and women differ in their moral perspectives and moral reasoning. Prior ethics research has followed Giligan's position, Betz et al. (1989) for example, discovered that men are at least twice as likely to participate in unfair practices, as are women. This is consistent with Marshall et.al (1998), who cited from many studies, indicate female appear to be more concerned or aware of ethical dilemmas, or more ethically oriented toward ethical situations than their male counterparts.

Similarly, Malinowski and Berger (1996) found that undergraduate women responded more ethically than men when faced with ethical dilemmas. An empirical study of ethical attitudes of university students towards software piracy indicate that gender was significantly related to moral intensity, with female students had better moral attitudes than male students.

Nevertheless, Geiger and O'Connell (1999) referred to several researchers and concluded that research findings regarding gender effects on ethical perceptions have been mixed. Many studies found evidence of gender differences in some but not all of the research analysis. Some argued that gender influence exist where ethical decisions, particularly regarding social and personal relationship, have to be made. Based on the gender socialization theory, men place more value on money, advancement, power and tangible measures of personal performance, while women are more concerned with harmonious relationships and helping people (Bertz, et.al 1989). Among business school students, the male students reported that career advancement was more important than relationships or helping others.

Many studies reveal that academic discipline does influence ethical perceptions (Vargas, 2001). Studies by Baird (1980) and McCabe and Trevino (1995) as cited by Crown and Spiller (1997) demonstrated that business students have lower level of ethical reasoning than the non-business students. The findings of this study, however, found an inconsistent result.

Research on business ethics and education major suggest that business students are relatively more tolerant of less ethical behaviours. (Merritt 1991). In other words, previous research has reported that the ethical values of business students are lower than those of their peers in other majors. A study by O'Clock and Okleshen (1993) compare ethical perceptions of business and engineering majors in a university. They found that engineering students are more sensitive to the type of violations that may impact others. They also view themselves as significantly more ethical than their peers in other majors with respect to the ethical issues. Other studies found that study

programs have important influence on students' moral development. Law students education are said to have a positive influence on moral development.

## **2.7 CONCLUSIONS**

Ethics continues to be a major concern for organizations and a frequent topic in academic discussions as well as publications. Organizations appear motivated and concerned with the creation and support of ethical cultures within their institutions. Organizations including Universities are also very conscious about presenting a positive image to their myriad stakeholders (Curtin University, 2001). Academicians or lecturers must be unwaveringly honest and uphold the highest ethical standards of their disciplines, free inquiry, academic freedom, equity, and fairness. They must avoid exploitation, harassment, and conflicts of interest where students are concerned, while striving to ensure that the students also treat each other with equal respect. The theory of ethics presents with lofty ideals; the practice of ethics provides a foundation for the freedom the academicians enjoy as faculty (Roworth, 2002).

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **ANALYSIS OF DATA**

#### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter reports on the primary data gathered from two populations, students and lecturers. A total of 488 students of UTM and 44 lecturers of Fakulti Pengurusan dan Pembangunan Sumber Manusia, UTM answered the questionnaires. The study is conducted to look at the perceptions of these populations on lecturers' ethical behaviour. It attempts to compare the perceptions and determine the factors that influence their perceptions. This study also tries to examine students' and lecturers' perceptions on the role of university and faculty in emphasizing ethical position. Then, based on their perceptions, individual issues are combined to develop a framework of overall dimensions of faculty ethical dilemmas using the exploratory factor analysis. In addition, it observes lecturers' experience in unethical situations.

#### **4.2 STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS**

This section discusses the analysis of students' perceptions on lecturers' behaviour and demographic factors that influence their views using descriptive statistics and cross tabulations.

##### **4.2.1 STUDENTS' DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE**

Six demographic characteristics of students were collected in this study. Descriptive statistics of gender, race, religion, academic program, enrolment in ethics course and academic performance based on their cumulative grade point average (CGPA) are presented in the next six tables.

**Table 4.1: GENDER**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Male	234	48.0	48.0
Female	254	52.0	52.0
Total	488	100.0	100.0

The ratio of male and female students is almost 1:1.

**Table 4.2: RACE**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Malay	283	58.0	58.2
Chinese	151	30.9	31.1
Indian	30	6.1	6.2
Others	22	4.5	4.5
Total	486	99.6	100.0
	488	100.0	

The majority of students are Malay, followed by Chinese and a very small percentage of Indian and other races.

**Table 4.3: RELIGION**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Islam	289	59.2	59.2
Buddhism	123	25.2	25.2
Christianity	48	9.8	9.8
Hindu	22	4.5	4.5
Others	6	1.2	1.2
Total	488	100.0	100.0

The students are mainly Muslims who compose 60% of respondents, one quarter of them are Buddhists and the rest are Christians, Hindus and other religions.

**Table 4.4: PROGRAM**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Management	225	46.1	46.1
Engineering	263	53.9	53.9
Total	488	100.0	100.0

Although the number of engineering students is slightly more than the management students, the split between the disciplines is quite balanced.

**Table 4.5: ENROLMENT IN ETHICS SUBJECT**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	248	50.8	50.8
No	237	48.6	48.6
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
Total	488	100.0	100.0

The proportion of students who have enrolled in ethics courses and those who have not is almost similar

**Table 4.6: GPA**

CGPA Point	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
2.00 – 2.50	41	8.4	10.3
2.51 – 3.00	133	27.3	33.3
3.01 – 3.50	132	27.0	33.0
3.51 – 4.00	94	19.3	23.5
Total	400	82.0	100.0
Missing	88	18.0	
	488	100.0	

Students' academic performance is divided into four categories. About 18% of the respondents do not reveal their CGPA as requested. However, in this study, a small percentage of respondent represents low achievers, one fifth of the sample are high achievers while the rest perform moderately in their studies.

#### **4.2.2 PERCEPTIONS ON LECTURERS' ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR**

The reliability test was conducted using Cronbach Alpha method to determine the internal consistency of the agreement made by these students on the 37 items. Results

of the test show that the items internal reliability is high at Alpha value of 0.9072 (Appendix VI).

The highest percentage of responses in each item is observed. Slightly more than half (19 out of 37 items) of the highest percentage is ‘extremely unethical’ responses (shown by the \* symbol). Eleven items have the highest percentage of ‘unethical’ responses (represented by the # symbol). On the other hand, only six items have the highest percentage of ‘moderately unethical’ (indicated by the @ symbol). Only one item has the highest percentage of ‘slightly unethical’ (shown by the ∞ symbol).

From the 19 ‘extremely unethical’ behaviours viewed by the students, seven items with more than 60% responses are; using profanity in lectures (73.4%), telling colleagues a confidential disclosure told by a student (65.3%), falsifying research data (64.2%), punishing students unequally (i.e. based on likeability, lecturers’ mood, etc.) (63.7%), insulting or ridiculing a student in his/her absence (63.6%), falsifying documentation for research grants (63.0%) and not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship (60.8%).

All 37 items in the questionnaire are unethical behaviours in academia. Respondents are expected to view these behaviours as unethical. However, this study found responses for ‘totally ethical’ in all items with the percentage from 0.8% to 20.2%. Out of the 37 items asked on lecturers’ behaviours, the highest five items viewed by students as totally ethical are; dating a student in his or her class (20.2%), dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer’s discipline (19.6%), having an intimate relationship with a student (18.3%), allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved (11.1%) and giving easy test or courses to ensure popularity (10.4%).

The following tables indicate the perceptions of students regarding 37 behaviours of lecturers:

**Table 4.7: @Giving easy test or courses to ensure popularity**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	50	10.2	10.4
Slightly unethical	138	28.3	28.6
Moderately unethical	141	28.9	29.3
Unethical	104	21.3	21.6
Extremely unethical	49	10.0	10.2
Total	482	98.8	100.0
Missing	6	1.2	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.8: # Accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' textbooks**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	28	5.7	5.8
Slightly unethical	88	18.0	18.2
Moderately unethical	108	22.1	22.3
Unethical	141	28.9	29.1
Extremely unethical	119	24.4	24.6
Total	484	99.2	100.0
Missing	4	.8	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.9: \*Using profanity in lectures**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	10	2.0	2.1
Slightly unethical	13	2.7	2.7
Moderately unethical	32	6.6	6.6
Unethical	74	15.2	15.3
Extremely unethical	356	73.0	73.4
Total	485	99.4	100.0



Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.10: \*Having an intimate relationship with a student**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	89	18.2	18.3
Slightly unethical	45	9.2	9.3
Moderately unethical	58	11.9	11.9
Unethical	103	21.1	21.2
Extremely unethical	191	39.1	39.3
Total	486	99.6	100.0
Missing	2	.4	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.11: # Failing to update notes when re-teaching a course**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	8	1.6	1.6
Slightly unethical	83	17.0	17.0
Moderately unethical	132	27.0	27.1
Unethical	168	34.4	34.5
Extremely unethical	96	19.7	19.7
Total	487	99.8	100.0
Missing	1	.2	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.12: # Teaching material they have not really mastered**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	7	1.4	1.4
Slightly unethical	77	15.8	15.8
Moderately unethical	128	26.2	26.3
Unethical	165	33.8	33.9

Extremely unethical	110	22.5	22.6
Total	487	99.8	100.0
Missing	1	.2	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.13: \*Telling colleagues a confidential disclosure told by a student**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	10	2.0	2.1
Slightly unethical	16	3.3	3.3
Moderately unethical	39	8.0	8.0
Unethical	104	21.3	21.4
Extremely unethical	318	65.2	65.3
Total	487	99.8	100.0
Missing	1	.2	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.14: \*Ignoring strong evidence of cheating**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	19	3.9	3.9
Slightly unethical	42	8.6	8.6
Moderately unethical	72	14.8	14.8
Unethical	166	34.0	34.2
Extremely unethical	187	38.3	38.5
Total	486	99.6	100.0
Missing	2	.4	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.15: # Ignoring unethical behaviour by colleagues**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	12	2.5	2.5
Slightly unethical	26	5.3	5.3
Moderately unethical	113	23.2	23.2
Unethical	171	35.0	35.0
Extremely unethical	166	34.0	34.0
Total	488	100.0	100.0

**Table 4.16: # Doing other business during office hours**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	16	3.3	3.3
Slightly unethical	68	13.9	13.9
Moderately unethical	136	27.9	27.9
Unethical	148	30.3	30.3
Extremely unethical	120	24.6	24.6
Total	488	100.0	100.0

**Table 4.17: \*Giving good grades to students based on their personality**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	36	7.4	7.4
Slightly unethical	77	15.8	15.8
Moderately unethical	99	20.3	20.3
Unethical	133	27.3	27.3
Extremely unethical	143	29.3	29.3
Total	488	100.0	100.0

**Table 4.18: @Allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	54	11.1	11.1
Slightly unethical	115	23.6	23.7
Moderately unethical	157	32.2	32.3
Unethical	117	24.0	24.1
Extremely unethical	43	8.8	8.8
Total	486	99.6	100.0
Missing	2	.4	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.19: @Omitting significant information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	7	1.4	1.4
Slightly unethical	67	13.7	13.8
Moderately unethical	159	32.6	32.8
Unethical	151	30.9	31.1
Extremely unethical	101	20.7	20.8
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.20: \*Insulting, ridiculing, etc. a student in his/her absence**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	10	2.0	2.1
Slightly unethical	13	2.7	2.7
Moderately unethical	26	5.3	5.3
Unethical	128	26.2	26.3
Extremely unethical	309	63.3	63.6

Total	486	99.6	100.0
Missing	2	.4	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.21: # Ignoring a student signing the attendance sheet for a classmate**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	23	4.7	4.7
Slightly unethical	83	17.0	17.0
Moderately unethical	145	29.7	29.8
Unethical	145	29.7	29.8
Extremely unethical	91	18.6	18.7
Total	487	99.8	100.0
Missing	1	.2	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.22: \*Punishing students unequally (i.e based on likeability, lecturers' mood, etc.)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	6	1.2	1.2
Slightly unethical	12	2.5	2.5
Moderately unethical	37	7.6	7.6
Unethical	121	24.8	24.9
Extremely unethical	309	63.3	63.7
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.23: \*Plagiarizing research**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	22	4.5	4.6
Slightly unethical	31	6.4	6.5
Moderately unethical	109	22.3	22.7
Unethical	134	27.5	27.9
Extremely unethical	184	37.7	38.3
Total	480	98.4	100.0
Missing	8	1.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.24: # Submitting a manuscript to two or more journals in violation of journal policy.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	8	1.6	1.6
Slightly unethical	29	5.9	6.0
Moderately unethical	100	20.5	20.6
Unethical	178	36.5	36.7
Extremely unethical	170	34.8	35.1
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.25: \*Falsifying documentation for research grants**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	6	1.2	1.2
Slightly unethical	12	2.5	2.5
Moderately unethical	35	7.2	7.2
Unethical	127	26.0	26.1
Extremely unethical	307	62.9	63.0
Total	487	99.8	100.0

Missing	1	.2	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.26: \*Falsifying research data**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	6	1.2	1.2
Slightly unethical	9	1.8	1.9
Moderately unethical	42	8.6	8.6
Unethical	117	24.0	24.1
Extremely unethical	312	63.9	64.2
Total	486	99.6	100.0
Missing	2	.4	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.27: \*Not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	8	1.6	1.6
Slightly unethical	8	1.6	1.6
Moderately unethical	42	8.6	8.6
Unethical	133	27.3	27.3
Extremely unethical	296	60.7	60.8
Total	487	99.8	100.0
Missing	1	.2	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.28: \*Inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	11	2.3	2.3
Slightly unethical	18	3.7	3.7

Moderately unethical	64	13.1	13.2
Unethical	139	28.5	28.7
Extremely unethical	253	51.8	52.2
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.29: @Presenting the same research to more than one regional or annual meeting (against meeting policy)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	23	4.7	4.8
Slightly unethical	72	14.8	14.9
Moderately unethical	183	37.5	37.9
Unethical	148	30.3	30.6
Extremely unethical	57	11.7	11.8
Total	483	99.0	100.0
Missing	5	1.0	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.30: # Padding an expense account**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	11	2.3	2.3
Slightly unethical	37	7.6	7.6
Moderately unethical	103	21.1	21.1
Unethical	172	35.2	35.3
Extremely unethical	164	33.6	33.7
Total	487	99.8	100.0
Missing	1	.2	
	488	100.0	



**Table 4.31: # Attending a meeting at university expense and not substantively participating (most of the time spent sight-seeing)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	10	2.0	2.1
Slightly unethical	48	9.8	9.9
Moderately unethical	126	25.8	26.0
Unethical	165	33.8	34.0
Extremely unethical	136	27.9	28.0
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.32: \*Neglecting university responsibilities due to outside employment.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	7	1.4	1.4
Slightly unethical	25	5.1	5.2
Moderately unethical	98	20.1	20.2
Unethical	167	34.2	34.4
Extremely unethical	188	38.5	38.8
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.33: \*Using student assistants for personal work**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	11	2.3	2.3
Slightly unethical	46	9.4	9.4
Moderately unethical	121	24.8	24.8
Unethical	141	28.9	29.0
Extremely unethical	168	34.4	34.5

Total	487	99.8	100.0
Missing	1	.2	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.34: # Cancelling office hours excessively**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	8	1.6	1.6
Slightly unethical	39	8.0	8.0
Moderately unethical	121	24.8	24.8
Unethical	159	32.6	32.6
Extremely unethical	160	32.8	32.9
Total	487	99.8	100.0
Missing	1	.2	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.35: \*Accepting money or gifts for grades**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	46	9.4	9.4
Slightly unethical	85	17.4	17.5
Moderately unethical	78	16.0	16.0
Unethical	111	22.7	22.8
Extremely unethical	167	34.2	34.3
Total	487	99.8	100.0
Missing	1	.2	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.36: @Dating a student in his or her class**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	98	20.1	20.2
Slightly unethical	119	24.4	24.5
Moderately unethical	117	24.0	24.1

Unethical	105	21.5	21.6
Extremely unethical	46	9.4	9.5
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.37: “Dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer’s discipline**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	95	19.5	19.6
Slightly unethical	95	19.5	19.6
Moderately unethical	126	25.8	26.0
Unethical	109	22.3	22.5
Extremely unethical	60	12.3	12.4
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.38: # Allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	8	1.6	1.6
Slightly unethical	44	9.0	9.1
Moderately unethical	99	20.3	20.4
Unethical	172	35.2	35.4
Extremely unethical	163	33.4	33.5
Total	486	99.6	100.0
Missing	2	.4	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.39: \*Allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgement**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	21	4.3	4.3
Slightly unethical	51	10.5	10.5
Moderately unethical	85	17.4	17.6
Unethical	151	30.9	31.2
Extremely unethical	176	36.1	36.4
Total	484	99.2	100.0
Missing	4	.8	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.40: \*Cancelling classes when the faculty member is not ill and has no other university related commitments**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	13	2.7	2.7
Slightly unethical	29	5.9	6.0
Moderately unethical	95	19.5	19.5
Unethical	166	34.0	34.2
Extremely unethical	183	37.5	37.7
Total	486	99.6	100.0
Missing	2	.4	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.41: @Using outdated texts to avoid the efforts necessary to revise notes, etc.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	41	8.4	8.5
Slightly unethical	142	29.1	29.3
Moderately unethical	167	34.2	34.4
Unethical	87	17.8	17.9

Extremely unethical	48	9.8	9.9
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.42: \*Falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institutions for raises, promotion or tenure evaluations**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	4	.8	.8
Slightly unethical	30	6.1	6.2
Moderately unethical	71	14.5	14.6
Unethical	168	34.4	34.6
Extremely unethical	213	43.6	43.8
Total	486	99.6	100.0
Missing	2	.4	
	488	100.0	

**Table 4.43: \*Using university equipment for personal activities**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	7	1.4	1.4
Slightly unethical	62	12.7	12.8
Moderately unethical	133	27.3	27.4
Unethical	133	27.3	27.4
Extremely unethical	150	30.7	30.9
Total	485	99.4	100.0
Missing	3	.6	
	488	100.0	

From the above perceptions, the study also investigates the demographic factors that may influence students' perceptions. This is discussed in the next section.

#### 4.2.3 DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS

Using Pearson Chi-Square and cross tabulations analysis, only gender and students' programme are found to be factors influencing their perceptions. However, differences in their responses are found in eight behaviours only.

**Table 4.44: STUDENT'S GENDER**

No.	Item	Pearson Chi-Square Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
2	Accepting publishers' monetary rebates for adopting publishers' textbooks.	0.013
3	Using profanity in lectures.	0.010
4	Having an intimate relationship with a student.	0.001
8	Ignoring strong evidence of cheating.	0.028
10	Doing other business during office hours.	0.002
11	Giving good grades to students based on their personality.	0.001
12	Allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved.	0.005
30	Dating a student in his or her class.	0.039

Gender is found to be one of the demographic factors that influence students' perceptions particularly in the items stated in Table 4.44. The Pearson Chi-square significance values show that these items have p-score less than 0.05.

**Table 4.45: Gender v. Accepting publishers' monetary rebate**

	Item 2							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
GENDER	Male	Count	19	46	55	52	60	232
		% within GENDER	8.2%	19.8%	23.7%	22.4%	25.9%	100.0%
	Female	Count	9	42	53	89	59	252
		% within GENDER	3.6%	16.7%	21.0%	35.3%	23.4%	100.0%

Total		Count	28	88	108	141	119	484
		% within GENDER	5.8%	18.2%	22.3%	29.1%	24.6%	100.0%

More males perceive that accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' text books as ethical.

**Table 4.46: Gender v. Using profanity words in lectures**

	Item 3							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
GENDER	Male	Count	7	7	21	24	172	231
		% within GENDER	3.0%	3.0%	9.1%	10.4%	74.5%	100.0%
	Female	Count	3	6	11	50	184	254
		% within GENDER	1.2%	2.4%	4.3%	19.7%	72.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	10	13	32	74	356	485
		% within GENDER	2.1%	2.7%	6.6%	15.3%	73.4%	100.0%

Compared to females, males are more tolerant when lecturers use profanity words in lectures.

**Table 4.47: Gender v. Having an intimate relationship with a student**

	Item 4							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
GENDER	Male	Count	53	31	24	48	76	232
		% within GENDER	22.8%	13.4%	10.3%	20.7%	32.8%	100.0%

	Female	Count	36	14	34	55	115	254
		% within GENDER	14.2%	5.5%	13.4%	21.7%	45.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	89	45	58	103	191	486
		% within GENDER	18.3%	9.3%	11.9%	21.2%	39.3%	100.0%

Result shows that more males perceive lecturers having an intimate relationship with a student as ethical behaviour. Consistently, more females perceive this action as extremely unethical than the males.

**Table 4.48: Gender v. Ignore strong evidence of cheating**

	Item 8							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
GENDER	Male	Count	15	23	39	74	83	234
		% within GENDER	6.4%	9.8%	16.7%	31.6%	35.5%	100.0%
	Female	Count	4	19	33	92	104	252
		% within GENDER	1.6%	7.5%	13.1%	36.5%	41.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	19	42	72	166	187	486
		% within GENDER	3.9%	8.6%	14.8%	34.2%	38.5%	100.0%

Result indicates that more male students do not see that lecturers who ignore strong evidence of cheating as an unethical behaviour, compared to female students. More female students feel that ignoring evidence of cheating is extremely unethical than the male students.



**Table 4.49: Gender v. Doing other business during office hours**

	Item 10							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
GENDER	Male	Count	12	45	57	65	55	234
		% within GENDER	5.1%	19.2%	24.4%	27.8%	23.5%	100.0%
	Female	Count	4	23	79	83	65	254
		% within GENDER	1.6%	9.1%	31.1%	32.7%	25.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	16	68	136	148	120	488
		% within GENDER	3.3%	13.9%	27.9%	30.3%	24.6%	100.0%

More male students perceive lecturers' doing other business during office hours as totally ethical than the females.

**Table 4.50: Gender v. Giving good grades to students based on their personality**

	Item 11							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
GENDER	Male	Count	23	51	45	53	62	234
		% within GENDER	9.8%	21.8%	19.2%	22.6%	26.5%	100.0%
	Female	Count	13	26	54	80	81	254
		% within GENDER	5.1%	10.2%	21.3%	31.5%	31.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	36	77	99	133	143	488
		% within GENDER	7.4%	15.8%	20.3%	27.3%	29.3%	100.0%

More males do not mind lecturers' giving good grades to students based on their personality compared to the females. Consistently, more females perceived this action as extremely unethical.

**Table 4.51: Gender v. Allow students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved**

	Item 12							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
GENDER	Male	Count	36	60	72	43	22	233
		% within GENDER	15.5%	25.8%	30.9%	18.5%	9.4%	100.0%
	Female	Count	18	55	85	74	21	253
		% within GENDER	7.1%	21.7%	33.6%	29.2%	8.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	54	115	157	117	43	486
		% within GENDER	11.1%	23.7%	32.3%	24.1%	8.8%	100.0%

More male students approve those lecturers who allow students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved and perceive the action as totally ethical.

**Table 4.52: Gender v. Dating a student in his or her class**

	Item 30							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
GENDER	Male	Count	57	59	58	39	19	232
		% within GENDER	24.6%	25.4%	25.0%	16.8%	8.2%	100.0%
	Female	Count	41	60	59	66	27	253
		% within GENDER	16.2%	23.7%	23.3%	26.1%	10.7%	100.0%

Total		Count	98	119	117	105	46	485
		% within GENDER	20.2%	24.5%	24.1%	21.6%	9.5%	100.0%

More males perceive dating a student in his or her class is totally ethical as compared to the females.

Academic discipline is also found to be the second demographic factors that influence students' perceptions particularly in the items stated in Table 4.45. The Pearson Chi-square significance values show that these items have p-score less than 0.05.

**Table 4.53: STUDENTS' ACADEMIC PROGRAM**

No.	Item	Pearson Chi-Square Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
12	Allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved.	0.000
17	Plagiarizing research.	0.019
21	Not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.	0.003
27	Using student assistants for personal work (e.g running errands)	0.014

**Table 4.54: Program v. Allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved**

	Item 12							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
PROGRAM	Management	Count	16	45	69	73	21	224
		% within PROGRAM	7.1%	20.1%	30.8%	32.6%	9.4%	100.0%
	Engineering	Count	38	70	88	44	22	262
		% within PROGRAM	14.5%	26.7%	33.6%	16.8%	8.4%	100.0%

Total		Count	54	115	157	117	43	486
		% within PROGRAM	11.1%	23.7%	32.3%	24.1%	8.8%	100.0%

Results show that the percentage of engineering students, who perceive lecturers allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved as totally ethical, is two times than management students who perceive similarly.

**Table 4.55: Program v. Plagiarizing research**

	Item 17							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
PROGRAM	Management	Count	9	7	58	70	80	224
		% within PROGRAM	4.0%	3.1%	25.9%	31.3%	35.7%	100.0%
	Engineering	Count	13	24	51	64	104	256
		% within PROGRAM	5.1%	9.4%	19.9%	25.0%	40.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	22	31	109	134	184	480
		% within PROGRAM	4.6%	6.5%	22.7%	27.9%	38.3%	100.0%

Although more engineering students perceive plagiarizing research as totally ethical, it is also found that more of them consider the action as extremely unethical.

**Table 4.56: Program v. Do not give graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications**

	Item 21							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
PROGRAM	Management	Count	4	1	28	70	122	225
		% within PROGRAM	1.8%	.4%	12.4%	31.1%	54.2%	100.0%
	Engineering	Count	4	7	14	63	174	262
		% within PROGRAM	1.5%	2.7%	5.3%	24.0%	66.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	8	8	42	133	296	487
		% within PROGRAM	1.6%	1.6%	8.6%	27.3%	60.8%	100.0%

More engineering students perceive lecturers who do not give graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications as extremely unethical when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.

**Table 4.57: Program v. Using student assistants for personal work**

	Item 27							Total
			Totally ethical	Slightly unethical	Moderately unethical	Unethical	Extremely unethical	
PROGRAM	Management	Count	3	21	61	50	90	225
		% within PROGRAM	1.3%	9.3%	27.1%	22.2%	40.0%	100.0%
	Engineering	Count	8	24	61	91	78	262
		% within PROGRAM	3.1%	9.2%	23.3%	34.7%	29.8%	100.0%

Total		Count	11	45	122	141	168	487
		% within PROGRAM	2.3%	9.2%	25.1%	29.0%	34.5%	100.0%

More engineering students perceive using student assistants for personal work (e.g running errands) as totally ethical compared to the management students. Consistently, more management students perceive the action as extremely unethical compared to engineering students.

#### 4.2.4 PERCEPTIONS ON THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY IN EMPHASIZING ETHICAL POSITION

Besides looking at the perceptions on lecturers' ethical behaviours, the study also seeks their perceptions on whether university and faculty influence the respondents' ethical values and the enforcement made by both parties.

**Table 4.58: Role Of University And Faculty In Emphasizing Ethical Position (Percentage)**

Item	Description	Responses (%)				
		Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Slightly agree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly disagree (1)
1	Lecturer's actions can influence the overall perceptions on how ethical the university is.	50.5	40.2	6.0	1.9	1.4
2	The university's ethical practices will influence my personal ethical values.	27	41.9	19.2	8.2	3.7
3	University's leaders frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions.	16.5	36.1	31.1	11.3	4.9
4	The faculty frequently reinforces the organization's ethical positions.	15.1	32.6	33.0	12.8	6.6

Results explain that majority of students (96.7%) believe lecturer's actions can influence the overall perceptions on how ethical the university is. However, the percentage drops to 88.1% when they were asked whether the university's ethical practices would influence the students' personal ethical values. While 83.7% agree that University's leaders frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions, the percentage decrease slightly regarding the enforcement by the faculty.

**Table 4.59: Role Of University And Faculty In Emphasizing Ethical Position  
(Mean)**

Item		1	2	3	4
N	Valid	485	485	485	485
	Missing	3	3	3	3
Mean		4.3649	3.8021	3.4784	3.3670
Mode		5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		.7982	1.0435	1.0514	1.0897

Results indicate that students, on average, agree that the university and faculty play important roles in emphasizing ethical positions. The modes, showing responses that most frequently occur, reveal that most of them agree on the ethics roles played by the institutions.

### **4.3 LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS**

This section analyses lecturers' perceptions on their behaviour and demographic factors that influence their views using descriptive statistics and cross tabulations.

#### **4.3.1 DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS**

Four demographic characteristics of lecturers were obtained in this study. Descriptive statistics of gender, race, level of education and number of years of teaching experience are presented in the next four tables.

**Table 4.60: Gender**

	Frequency	Percent
Male	13	29.5
Female	30	68.2
Total	43	97.7
Missing	1	2.3
	44	100.0

The gender ratio between male and female is almost 1:2.

**Table 4.61: Race**

	Frequency	Percent
Malay	40	90.9
Chinese	1	2.3
Indian	1	2.3
Others	2	4.5
Total	44	100.0

Almost all respondents are Malays and only one respondent in each category of Chinese and Indian.

**Table 4.62: Education**

	Frequency	Percent
Degree	1	2.3
Masters	36	81.8
PhD	7	15.9
Total	44	100.0

Majority of respondents possess a Masters degree.



**Table 4.63: Years of teaching experience**

Years	Frequency	Percent
0 - 3	9	20.5
4 - 7	14	31.8
> 7	20	45.5
Total	43	97.7
Missing	1	2.3
	44	100.0

Almost half of the respondents are experienced lecturers with more than 7 years teaching experience. Those who are considered as junior lecturers (0-3 years) composed 20% and lecturers who have more than 3 years of teaching experience make up 32% of lecturer respondents.

#### **4.3.2 PERCEPTIONS ON LECTURERS' ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR**

The reliability test was conducted using Cronbach Alpha method to determine the internal consistency of the agreement made by these lecturers on the 22 items. Results of the test show that the items internal reliability is high at Alpha value of 0.9613 (Appendix).

The actions that most lecturers perceive as 'extremely unethical' (more than 60%) are accepting money or gifts for grades (86.4%), falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations (74.4%), dating a student in his or her class (69.8%), using profanity/offensive words in lectures (65.1%), padding an expense account (61.5%), allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment (60.5%). On the other hand, the least percentage of respondents who perceive the actions being 'extremely unethical' are using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary (32.6%) and teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered (27.5%).

All 22 items in the questionnaire are unethical behaviours in academia. Respondents are expected to view these behaviours as unethical. However, this study found responses for 'totally ethical' in all items with the percentage from 4.5% to 23.1%. The highest ten items (above 10%) viewed by lecturers as totally ethical are; accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' textbooks (23.1%), having an intimate

relationship with a student (16.7%), allowing a relative or a friend in class and giving them preferential treatment (16.3%), allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and /or written assignment that require significant judgment (16.3%), cancelling classes when the faculty member is not ill and has no other university related commitments (14.3%) and using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, etc.(14.0%), falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations (14.0%), dating a student in his or her class (14.0%), teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered (12.5%) and accepting money or gifts for grades (11.4%).

**Table 4.64: Giving easy tests or course to ensure popularity**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	3	6.8	6.8
Slightly unethical	3	6.8	6.8
Moderately unethical	5	11.4	11.4
Moderately to extremely unethical	9	20.5	20.5
Extremely unethical	24	54.5	54.5
Total	44	100.0	100.0

Result reveals that three lecturers perceive giving easy tests or course to ensure popularity is an ethical action. Although another three respondents think it is slightly unethical, the rest feel differently.

**Table 4.65: Accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' textbooks.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	9	20.5	23.1
Slightly unethical	2	4.5	5.1
Moderately unethical	7	15.9	17.9
Moderately to extremely unethical	5	11.4	12.8
Extremely unethical	16	36.4	41.0

Total	39	88.6	100.0
Missing	5	11.4	
	44	100.0	

Nine lecturers feel that it is all right to accept publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' textbooks. Two perceive the action as slightly unethical and the remaining twenty eight think otherwise. Five respondents refuse to give their views.

**Table 4.66: Using profanity/offensive words in lectures.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	2	4.5	4.7
Slightly unethical	2	4.5	4.7
Moderately unethical	3	6.8	7.0
Moderately to extremely unethical	8	18.2	18.6
Extremely unethical	28	63.6	65.1
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

Results of the study show that majority of respondents (90.6%) perceive using profanity/offensive words in lectures as unethical behaviour. Only two lecturers feel that there is nothing wrong to do so and two perceive the action as a little unethical. The study fails to obtain one response.

**Table 4.67: Having an intimate relationship with a student**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	7	15.9	16.7
Slightly unethical	3	6.8	7.1
Moderately unethical	3	6.8	7.1
Moderately to extremely unethical	6	13.6	14.3
Extremely unethical	23	52.3	54.8

Total	42	95.5	100.0
Missing	2	4.5	
	44	100.0	

Seven respondents perceive having an intimate relationship with a student is totally ethical while three think the action is somewhat ethical. The rest feel that the action is unacceptable and two respondents refuse to response.

**Table 4.68: Teaching material that the lecturer have not really mastered**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	5	11.4	12.5
Slightly unethical	7	15.9	17.5
Moderately unethical	7	15.9	17.5
Moderately to extremely unethical	10	22.7	25.0
Extremely unethical	11	25.0	27.5
Total	40	90.9	100.0
Missing	4	9.1	
	44	100.0	

The outcome of the study shows that five lecturers believe it is totally ethical to teach material that they have not really mastered. Seven respondents perceive the action as slightly unethical and the remaining twenty-eight think otherwise. Four refuse to response.

**Table 4.69: Not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	3	6.8	6.8
Slightly unethical	3	6.8	6.8
Moderately unethical	1	2.3	2.3
Moderately to extremely unethical	11	25.0	25.0

Extremely unethical	26	59.1	59.1
Total	44	100.0	100.0

Although 86.1% of respondents perceive not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship as unethical behaviour, there are three lecturers who think it is fine to do so while another three feel the action is just slightly unethical.

**Table 4.70: Inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	2	4.5	4.5
Slightly unethical	4	9.1	9.1
Moderately unethical	3	6.8	6.8
Moderately to extremely unethical	15	34.1	34.1
Extremely unethical	20	45.5	45.5
Total	44	100.0	100.0

Similarly, majority respondents (86.7%) feel that it is unethical and lecturers should not inappropriately give a colleague a co-authorship status. Two respondents perceive differently and answered that the action is totally ethical while the remaining four perceive it as slightly unethical.

**Table 4.71: Presenting the same research to more than one regional or annual seminars/conferences**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	4	9.1	9.1
Slightly unethical	4	9.1	9.1
Moderately unethical	4	9.1	9.1
Moderately to extremely unethical	17	38.6	38.6
Extremely unethical	15	34.1	34.1
Total	44	100.0	100.0

Majority respondents (81.8%) perceive presenting the same research to more than one regional or annual seminars/conferences, which is against the policy, is unethical. However, four lecturers think the action is totally ethical and the other four perceive it as slightly unethical.

**Table 4.72: Padding an expense account**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	3	6.8	7.7
Slightly unethical	1	2.3	2.6
Moderately unethical	3	6.8	7.7
Moderately to extremely unethical	8	18.2	20.5
Extremely unethical	24	54.5	61.5
Total	39	88.6	100.0
Missing	5	11.4	
	44	100.0	

The study fails to obtain responses from five respondents. Result shows that three lecturers consider padding an expense account ethical while one respondent feels it is just a little unethical. Majority of them think the action is unethical.

**Table 4.73: Attending a meeting at university expense and not substantively participating (most of the time spent sight-seeing, etc).**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	4	9.1	9.1
Slightly unethical	2	4.5	4.5
Moderately unethical	4	9.1	9.1
Moderately to extremely unethical	10	22.7	22.7
Extremely unethical	24	54.5	54.5
Total	44	100.0	100.0

Result reveals that four lecturers perceive attending a seminar or conferences at university expense and not substantively participating is an ethical action. Although another two respondents think it is slightly unethical, the rest feel differently.

**Table 4.74: Neglecting university responsibilities due to outside employment.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	3	6.8	6.8
Slightly unethical	2	4.5	4.5
Moderately unethical	1	2.3	2.3
Moderately to extremely unethical	8	18.2	18.2
Extremely unethical	30	68.2	68.2
Total	44	100.0	100.0

Three lecturers feel that it is all right to neglect university responsibilities due to outside employment. Two perceive the action as slightly unethical and the remaining thirty nine think otherwise.

**Table 4.75: Using university equipment for personal activities.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	2	4.5	4.7
Slightly unethical	3	6.8	7.0
Moderately unethical	3	6.8	7.0
Moderately to extremely unethical	18	40.9	41.9
Extremely unethical	17	38.6	39.5
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

Results of the study show that majority of respondents (88.4%) perceive using university equipment for personal activities as unethical behaviour. Only two lecturers feel that there is nothing wrong to do so and three perceive the action as a little unethical. The study fails to obtain one response.

**Table 4.76: Using student assistants for personal work**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	4	9.1	9.1
Slightly unethical	4	9.1	9.1
Moderately unethical	3	6.8	6.8
Moderately to extremely unethical	12	27.3	27.3
Extremely unethical	21	47.7	47.7
Total	44	100.0	100.0

The outcome of the study shows that four lecturers believe it is totally ethical to student assistants for personal work (e.g., running errands). Another four respondents perceive the action as slightly unethical and the remaining thirty-eight think otherwise.

**Table 4.77: Cancelling office hours excessively**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	4	9.1	9.5
Slightly unethical	3	6.8	7.1
Moderately unethical	2	4.5	4.8
Moderately to extremely unethical	14	31.8	33.3
Extremely unethical	19	43.2	45.2
Total	42	95.5	100.0
Missing	2	4.5	
	44	100.0	

Four respondents perceive cancelling office hours excessively is totally ethical while three think the action is somewhat ethical. The rest feel that the action is unacceptable and two respondents refuse to response.



**Table 4.78: Accepting money or gifts for grades.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	5	11.4	11.4
Moderately unethical	1	2.3	2.3
Extremely unethical	38	86.4	86.4
Total	44	100.0	100.0

Surprisingly, there are five lecturers who perceive accepting money or gifts for grades as totally ethical. However, the remaining thirty nine think differently.

**Table 4.79: Dating a student in his or her class.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	6	13.6	14.0
Moderately unethical	1	2.3	2.3
Moderately to extremely unethical	6	13.6	14.0
Extremely unethical	30	68.2	69.8
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

**Table 4.80: Dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer's discipline.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	4	9.1	9.5
Slightly unethical	4	9.1	9.5
Moderately unethical	4	9.1	9.5
Moderately to extremely unethical	5	11.4	11.9
Extremely unethical	25	56.8	59.5
Total	42	95.5	100.0
Missing	2	4.5	
	44	100.0	

**Table 4.81: Allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	7	15.9	16.3
Slightly unethical	2	4.5	4.7
Moderately to extremely unethical	8	18.2	18.6
Extremely unethical	26	59.1	60.5
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

**Table 4.82: Allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgment.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	7	15.9	16.3
Slightly unethical	1	2.3	2.3
Moderately unethical	2	4.5	4.7
Moderately to extremely unethical	8	18.2	18.6
Extremely unethical	25	56.8	58.1
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

**Table 4.83: Cancelling classes when the faculty member is not ill and has no other University related commitments.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	6	13.6	14.3
Slightly unethical	2	4.5	4.8
Moderately unethical	5	11.4	11.9
Moderately to extremely unethical	9	20.5	21.4
Extremely unethical	20	45.5	47.6

Total	42	95.5	100.0
Missing	2	4.5	
	44	100.0	

**Table 4.84: Using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, etc.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	6	13.6	14.0
Slightly unethical	7	15.9	16.3
Moderately unethical	2	4.5	4.7
Moderately to extremely unethical	14	31.8	32.6
Extremely unethical	14	31.8	32.6
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

**Table 4.85: Falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Totally ethical	6	13.6	14.0
Slightly unethical	1	2.3	2.3
Moderately to extremely unethical	4	9.1	9.3
Extremely unethical	32	72.7	74.4
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

#### 4.3.3 PERCEPTIONS ON THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY IN EMPHASIZING ETHICAL POSITION

The study also examines lecturers' perceptions on whether university and faculty influence the respondents' ethical values and the enforcement made by both parties.

**Table 4.86: Role Of University And Faculty In Emphasizing Ethical Position (Percentage)**

Item	Description	Responses (%)				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	Lecturer's actions can influence the overall perceptions on how ethical the university is.	40.9	29.5	15.9	6.8	6.8
2	The university's ethical practices will influence my personal ethical values.	11.4	31.8	20.5	27.3	9.1
3	University's leaders frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions.	6.8	47.7	20.5	15.9	9.1
4	The faculty frequently reinforces the organization's ethical positions.	6.8	45.5	20.5	20.5	6.8

Results show that about 70% of the lecturers agree that their actions can influence the overall perceptions on how ethical the university is. A small percentage of 13.6% disagree while almost 16% slightly agree with the statement. However, the agreement percentage drops to 43.2% when they are asked whether the university's ethical practices will influence their personal ethical values. Twenty percent slightly agree while 36.4% disagree that the university's ethical practices have any impact on them.

Result of this study regarding the role of university and faculty in emphasizing ethical position indicates that slightly more than half (54.5%) of the lecturers believe the university's leaders (vice chancellors, top management) frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions. Nevertheless, regarding the enforcement of

organization's ethical positions by the university's leaders, the percentages of agreement and disagreement on the enforcement made by the faculty (deans, head of departments, lecturers) do not have much difference.

#### 4.4 COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS BETWEEN STUDENTS AND LECTURERS

Using means of both responses from the faculty and students, this study tries to see whether there are differences in their perceptions on lecturers' ethical behaviour. In other words, the analysis tries to determine whether faculty and students hold faculty to the same standards. The comparison is done on the same 22 items asked to the students and lecturers. Lecturers' and students' average score on each item (22 items) are shown in the following table:

**Table 4.87: Comparison of Means (Ethical Perceptions On Lecturers' Behaviour In Academia)**

Item	Mean (Faculty)	Mean (Students)	Faculty > Students
1	4.0909	2.9253	+
2	3.4359	3.4855	-
3	4.3488	4.5526	-
4	3.8333	3.5391	+
5	3.3750	3.5359	-
6	4.2273	4.4394	-
7	4.0682	4.2474	-
8	3.7955	3.2981	+
9	4.2564	3.9055	+
10	4.0909	3.7608	+
11	4.3636	4.0392	+
12	4.0465	3.8398	+
13	3.9545	3.8706	+
14	3.9762	3.5503	+
15	4.5000	2.7567	+

16	4.2558	2.8845	+
17	4.0238	3.9012	+
18	4.0233	3.8471	+
19	4.0000	3.9815	+
20	3.8333	2.9155	+
21	3.5349	4.1440	-
22	4.2791	3.7361	+

The positive and negative signs in the last column indicate whether the average score of faculty of that particular item is more or less than the students'. The positive sign represent faculty scores more than the students, which also an indication that they perceive an item or statement as more unethical than the students. Results indicates that faculty (lecturers) has more items that they perceive as unethical; the faculty mean score of 16 items are higher than the students. On the other hand, students score higher in 6 items.

Students view accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' text books, using profanity/offensive words in lectures, teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered, not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship, inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status and using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, as more unethical than the lecturers.

**Table 4.88: Comparison of Means (Role of University and faculty in promoting Ethical Values)**

Item	Mean (Faculty)	Mean (Students)	Faculty > Students
1	2.0909	4.3649	-
2	2.9091	3.8021	-
3	2.7273	3.4784	-
4	2.7500	3.3670	-

Results also reveal that students' score higher in all items compared to lecturers regarding the role of university and faculty in emphasizing ethical position. This indicates that students have higher expectation from both the university and faculty in promoting ethical behaviour. In addition, students score higher than the lecturers in perceiving that university and faculty have regularly reinforced ethical positions.

## **4.5 DIMENSIONS OF FACULTY ETHICS**

The individual issues or items analysed above are combined to develop a framework of overall dimensions of management faculty ethical behaviour. This is accomplished by using Exploratory Factor Analysis. The analyses were conducted on the 37 items raised to the students and 22 items to the lecturers. Since the number of items is not similar, the study expects the former would produce more factors than the latter.

### **4.5.1 STUDENTS' VIEW**

Exploratory factor analysis of the 37 ethical items asked to the students produced six factors that represent dimensions of ethical behaviour. Ten items failed to load on the resulting factors within the 0.50 cut-off selected and were dropped from further analysis.

The first factor includes 8 unethical practices, all of which include some aspects of behaviours that benefit the individual and contain the elements of self-centeredness. The factor is identified as "Self-Interest". The second factor contains 4 items that mainly describe the lack of respect and justice to students. This dimension is named "Disrespectful". The third factor consists of statements related to ignoring unethical behaviour of others and is called "Ignorance". The fourth factor reveals the unethical situations regarding research regulations and is labelled after it. The fifth factor comprises actions that will personally benefit the individual and is identified as "Personal Benefit". The last factor shows the indication of irresponsibility of duties and unconcerned towards the job. This factor is named as "Laziness". These factors are shown in Table 4.89.







#### 4.5.2 LECTURERS' VIEW

Exploratory factor analysis of the 22 ethical items asked to the lecturers produced three factors which represent dimensions of ethical behaviour. One item failed to load on the resulting factors within the 0.50 cut-off selected and were dropped from further analysis.

The first factor includes 8 unethical practices, all of which include some aspect of not having serious attention to work and is identified as “Academic Job Performance”. The second factor contains 7 items that mainly describe the violations of faculty rules. This dimension is named “Violations of Regulations”. Lastly the third factor consists of 6 items that generally explains actions showing lack of consideration for others and therefore named “Self-Interest”.

**Table 4.90: Factor Analysis (Lecturers)**

Description	Academic Job Performance	Violations of Regulation	Self-Interest
Padding an expense account.	0.604		
Using university equipment for personal activities	0.595		
Using student assistants for personal work (e.g., running errands).	0.568		
Allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment.	0.889		
Allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgment.	0.897		
Cancelling classes when the faculty member is not ill and has no other University related commitments.	0.905		
Using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, etc	0.890		
Falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations.	0.862		
Presenting the same research to more than one regional or		0.573	

annual meeting (against meeting policy).			
Attending a meeting at university expense and not substantively participating (most of the time spent sight-seeing, etc).		0.684	
Neglecting university responsibilities due to outside employment.		0.554	
Cancelling office hours excessively.		0.759	
Accepting money or gifts for grades.		0.636	
Dating a student in his or her class.		0.902	
Dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer's discipline.		0.775	
Giving easy tests or courses to ensure popularity.			0.889
Accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' text books.			0.856
Using profanity/offensive words in lectures.			0.723
Having an intimate relationship with a student.			0.566
Not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.			0.688

#### **4.6 LECTURERS' EXPERIENCE IN UNETHICAL SITUATIONS**

The study also tries to look into the practice of ethics among lecturers in the academic profession. Given 22 items on ethical behaviours, lecturers were asked whether they have ever committed any of the actions, whether they would perform the actions if they were in the situations and the likeliness of their colleagues in performing the same actions.

##### **4.6.1 EXPERIENCE IN UNETHICAL SITUATIONS**

Lecturers were asked whether they have performed the behaviour. Unethical actions that most lecturers do are using university equipment for personal activities (48.8%) and teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered (50%). The following tables explain the frequency of experience in doing unethical actions.

**Table 4.91: Giving easy tests or courses to ensure popularity**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	42	95.5	95.5
Once or twice	1	2.3	2.3
More than twice	1	2.3	2.3
Total	44	100.0	100.0

Only two respondents admitted that they have given easy tests or courses to ensure their popularity while the rest have never done it before.

**Table 4.92: Accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' text books**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	28	63.6	71.8
Once or twice	11	25.0	28.2
Total	39	88.6	100.0
Missing	5	11.4	
	44	100.0	

Of 39 respondents, 11 have accepted publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' textbooks while the rest have not done it. Five lecturers refused to answer.

**Table 4.93: Using profanity/offensive words in lectures**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	36	81.8	85.7
Once or twice	4	9.1	9.5
More than twice	1	2.3	2.4
Frequently	1	2.3	2.4
Total	42	95.5	100.0
Missing	2	4.5	
	44	100.0	

Of six lecturers who confessed using profanity or offensive words in lectures, one of them does it frequently while two declined to response.

**Table 4.94: Having an intimate relationship with a student**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	35	79.5	87.5
Once or twice	3	6.8	7.5
More than twice	1	2.3	2.5
Frequently	1	2.3	2.5
Total	40	90.9	100.0
Missing	4	9.1	
	44	100.0	

Five respondents revealed that they have an intimate relationship with a student. A total of four lecturers did not give their responses.

**Table 4.95: Teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	20	45.5	50.0
Once or twice	14	31.8	35.0
More than twice	5	11.4	12.5
Frequently	1	2.3	2.5
Total	40	90.9	100.0
Missing	4	9.1	
	44	100.0	

Almost half of the respondents disclosed that they have been teaching material that they have not really mastered. The study failed to obtain four responses.

**Table 4.96: Not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.**

	Frequency	Percent
Never	43	97.7
More than twice	1	2.3
Total	44	100.0

Only one respondent declared that he/she has not given graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.

**Table 4.97: Inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status.**

	Frequency	Percent
Never	36	81.8
Once or twice	7	15.9
More than twice	1	2.3
Total	44	100.0

Result indicates that 18.2% lecturers have inappropriately given a colleague a co-authorship status.

**Table 4.98: Presenting the same research to more than one regional or annual meeting (against meeting policy)**

	Frequency	Percent
Never	39	88.6
Once or twice	4	9.1
More than twice	1	2.3
Total	44	100.0

This study found that there are also lecturers who present the same research to more than one regional or annual meeting.

**Table 4.99: Padding an expense account**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	37	84.1	92.5
Once or twice	3	6.8	7.5
Total	40	90.9	100.0
Missing	4	9.1	
	44	100.0	

Result shows that three lecturers have padded an expense account; four respondents refuse to response and the rest declined that they have done such action.

**Table 4.100: Attending a seminar/conference at university expense and not substantively participating**

	Frequency	Percent
Never	34	77.3
Once or twice	7	15.9
More than twice	2	4.5
Frequently	1	2.3
Total	44	100.0

Almost a quarter of respondents admitted that they have attended a seminar or conference at university expense and not substantively participated (most of the time spent sight-seeing, etc).

**Table 4.101: Neglecting university responsibilities due to outside employment.**

	Frequency	Percent
Never	37	84.1
Once or twice	6	13.6
Frequently	1	2.3
Total	44	100.0

One lecturer confessed that he/she has frequently neglected university responsibilities due to outside employment, while six have once or twice committed such action.

**Table 4.102: Using university equipment for personal activities.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	22	50.0	51.2
Once or twice	18	40.9	41.9
More than twice	2	4.5	4.7
Frequently	1	2.3	2.3
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

Although one respondent refused to response, almost half of respondents admitted that they have used university equipment for personal activities.

**Table 4.103: Using student assistants for personal work (e.g., running errands).**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	39	88.6	90.7
Once or twice	3	6.8	7.0
More than twice	1	2.3	2.3
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

The result shows that four lecturers have used student assistants for personal work while thirty-nine lecturers have never done it before and one was reluctant to answer.



**Table 4.104: Cancelling office hours excessively**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	27	61.4	64.3
Once or twice	14	31.8	33.3
More than twice	1	2.3	2.4
Total	42	95.5	100.0
Missing	2	4.5	
	44	100.0	

Fifteen respondents confessed that they have cancelled office hours excessively while two did not response to the statement.

**Table 4.105: Accepting money or gifts for grades**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	43	97.7	97.7
More than twice	1	2.3	2.3
Total	44	100.0	100.0

Only one lecturer has accepted money or gifts for grades while the remaining respondents claimed they have never done such action.

**Table 4.106: Dating a student in his or her class**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	43	97.7	97.7
Once or twice	1	2.3	2.3
Total	44	100.0	100.0

Surprisingly, there is a lecturer who admitted that he/she has once or twice plagiarised research.

**Table 4.107: Dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer's discipline**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	41	93.2	95.3
Once or twice	2	4.5	4.7
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

Although a respondent did not response, among those who responded, two have dated a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer's discipline.

**Table 4.108: Allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	41	93.2	95.3
Once or twice	2	4.5	4.7
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

Result reveals that two lecturers have actually allowed a relative or friend in class and have given them preferential treatment. Meanwhile, one respondent failed to response and the remaining denied it.

**Table 4.109: Allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgment.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	42	95.5	97.7
Once or twice	1	2.3	2.3
Total	43	97.7	100.0

Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

The outcome of the study shows that one lecturer has once or twice allowed a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgment.

**Table 4.110: Cancelling classes when the faculty member is not ill and has no other university related commitments.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	32	72.7	76.2
Once or twice	9	20.5	21.4
More than twice	1	2.3	2.4
Total	42	95.5	100.0
Missing	2	4.5	
	44	100.0	

Although two respondents refused to response, ten lecturers confessed that they have cancelled classes without good reasons.

**Table 4.111: Using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, etc.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	33	75.0	76.7
Once or twice	10	22.7	23.3
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

Almost a quarter or ten respondents have used outdated text to avoid the efforts necessary to revise notes.

**Table 4.112: Falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	41	93.2	95.3
Once or twice	2	4.5	4.7
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

Only two lecturers have once or twice falsified activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations.

#### **4.6.2 REASONS OF UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR**

The study also seeks the reasons of unethical behaviour admitted by the lecturers. Those who responded that they have the experience of doing at least one of the actions were asked to indicate the reason(s) of doing so. Six respondents stated that they have done the actions because they perceived the actions as ethical. Four performed the unethical behaviours for the reason that they think the action is ethical since everyone is doing it. On the other hand, five lecturers performed the action just because everyone is doing it. Eight respondents admitted that those unethical behaviours were carried out because they were under pressure while fourteen respondents claimed they had no choice. Merely two lecturers said that what motivate them to act unethically is because no penalty has ever been imposed. Other reasons stated by the respondents are:

- (i) Because of other jobs or assignments, they have to cancel office hours or lectures.
- (ii) Lecturers claimed that they own the knowledge or research and merely transfer the knowledge to students.
- (iii) Although the same papers are presented in more than one seminar, the papers are modified.
- (iv) Inappropriately giving a colleague co-authorship because of difficulties in meeting each other and to maintain goodwill.

#### 4.6.3 PROPENSITY OF PERFORMING UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR

The study also attempts to identify the propensity of lecturers in performing unethical behaviours. The analysis describes the likeliness of lecturers in doing the actions (the left hand side table) and at the same time compares how they perceive the likeliness of their colleagues in doing the same action (the right hand side table).

**Table 4.113: Giving easy tests or courses to ensure popularity**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent
Very Unlikely	35	79.5	81.4	Very Unlikely	10	22.7	26.3
Unlikely	6	13.6	14.0	Unlikely	13	29.5	34.2
Likely	2	4.5	4.7	Likely	15	34.1	39.5
Total	43	97.7	100.0	Total	38	86.4	100.0
Missing	1	2.3		Missing	6	13.6	
	44	100.0			44	100.0	
<i>Respondent</i>				<i>Colleague</i>			

Although only two respondents think that they would give easy test or courses to ensure popularity, a larger number perceive that their colleagues would perform the action. Almost 40% of the respondents feel that other lecturers would act unethically. The study fail to obtain responses from one and six respondents regarding their perception on the likeliness of them doing the action and the likeliness of their colleagues', respectively.

**Table 4.114: Accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' text books**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	20	45.5	52.6	Very unlikely	10	22.7	28.6
Unlikely	6	13.6	15.8	Unlikely	8	18.2	22.9
Likely	10	22.7	26.3	Likely	14	31.8	40.0

Very likely	2	4.5	5.3
Total	38	86.4	100.0
Missing	6	13.6	
	44	100.0	

Very likely	3	6.8	8.6
Total	35	79.5	100.0
Missing	9	20.5	
	44	100.0	

Two respondents think that they would very likely to accept publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' textbooks while the number increase to three respondents when they were asked about the likeliness of doing the action by their fellow lecturers. Similarly, these lecturers perceive higher in the likeliness of doing unethical behaviour by their colleagues compared to the likeliness of themselves. Ten respondents think that they would likely perform the action while fourteen respondents feel their colleagues would likely do it.

**Table 4.115: Using profanity/offensive words in lectures**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	32	72.7	78.0
Unlikely	8	18.2	19.5
Likely	1	2.3	2.4
Total	41	93.2	100.0
Missing	3	6.8	
	44	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	11	25.0	29.7
Unlikely	21	47.7	56.8
Likely	5	11.4	13.5
Total	37	84.1	100.0
Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0	

Although only one lecturer perceive that he/she would likely use profanity or offensive words in lectures, five think that their colleague would do it. Three respondents did not answer whether they would do the unethical behaviour while seven refuse to perceive how their colleague would likely do it.

**Table 4.116: Having an intimate relationship with a student**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	33	75.0	80.5
Unlikely	3	6.8	7.3
Likely	5	11.4	12.2
Very likely	0	0.0	0.0
Total	41	93.2	100.0
Missing	3	6.8	
	44	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	10	22.7	27.0
Unlikely	14	31.8	37.8
Likely	11	25.0	29.7
Very likely	2	4.5	5.4
Total	37	84.1	100.0
Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0	

Although five respondents think that they would likely have an intimate relationship with a student, the number increases to eleven who perceive that their colleagues would perform the action. Almost 30% of the respondents feel that other lecturers would act in such behaviour. The study fails to obtain responses from three and seven respondents regarding their perception on the likeliness of them doing the action and the likeliness of their colleagues', respectively.

**Table 4.117: Teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	14	31.8	35.9
Unlikely	13	29.5	33.3
Likely	11	25.0	28.2
Very likely	1	2.3	2.6
Total	39	88.6	100.0
Missing	5	11.4	
	44	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	5	11.4	14.7
Unlikely	9	20.5	26.5
Likely	19	43.2	55.9
Very likely	1	2.3	2.9
Total	34	77.3	100.0
Missing	10	22.7	
	44	100.0	

One lecturer feels that he/she is very likely to teach material that he/she has not really mastered. Additionally, eleven respondents perceive their likeliness of performing the

act and the number increases to nineteen when they are asked to perceive the likeliness that their colleagues would do the same action. This study fails to obtain responses from five respondents when asked whether they would likely do the action while ten refused to response regarding how they perceive the likeliness of their colleagues.

**Table 4.118: Not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	36	81.8	83.7
Unlikely	6	13.6	14.0
Likely	1	2.3	2.3
Very likely	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	11	25.0	28.9
Unlikely	10	22.7	26.3
Likely	16	36.4	42.1
Very likely	1	2.3	2.6
Total	38	86.4	100.0
Missing	6	13.6	
	44	100.0	

While only one perceives he/she would likely act unethically, sixteen actually think their colleagues would take the action. Although no respondent feels that they would very likely give graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship, one of them thinks their colleague would do it. One respondent did not answer whether he/she would do the unethical behaviour while six refused to perceive how their colleague would likely do it.

**Table 4.119: Inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	27	61.4	62.8
Unlikely	13	29.5	30.2
Likely	3	6.8	7.0

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	10	22.7	26.3
Unlikely	11	25.0	28.9
Likely	15	34.1	39.5



Very Likely	0	0.0	0.0
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

Very Likely	2	4.5	5.3
Total	38	86.4	100.0
Missing	6	13.6	
	44	100.0	

Although no lecturer perceive that they would very likely give a colleague a co-authorship status inappropriately, two respondents feel that their colleagues would have a high likeliness of performing the same action. One respondent refuses to response. In addition, three lecturers perceive that they would likely do it if they were to be in the situation and fifteen of them think that their fellow lecturers will perform the action. However, this study fails to obtain responses from six respondents.

**Table 4.120: Presenting the same research to more than one regional or annual conference (against policy)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	29	65.9	69.0
Unlikely	8	18.2	19.0
Likely	4	9.1	9.5
Very likely	1	2.3	2.4
Total	42	95.5	100.0
Missing	2	4.5	
	44	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	8	18.2	21.1
Unlikely	10	22.7	26.3
Likely	17	38.6	44.7
Very likely	3	6.8	7.9
Total	38	86.4	100.0
Missing	6	13.6	
	44	100.0	

One respondent confessed that he/she would very likely present the same research to more than one regional or annual conference while three think their colleagues would very likely do the same. While four lecturers feel that they would go against the policy, seventeen respondents perceive that other lecturers would perform the unethical behaviour if they were in the situation. Two respondents refused to response when asked whether they would do the unethical action while six refused to perceive about their colleagues' likeliness of performing the behaviour.

**Table 4.121: Padding an expense account**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	29	65.9	72.5	Very Unlikely	7	15.9	20.0
Unlikely	8	18.2	20.0	Unlikely	15	34.1	42.9
Likely	3	6.8	7.5	Likely	12	27.3	34.3
Very likely	0	0.0	0.0	Very likely	1	2.3	2.9
Total	40	90.9	100.0	Total	35	79.5	100.0
Missing	4	9.1		Missing	9	20.5	
	44	100.0			44	100.0	

The study fails to obtain four responses from the lecturers when asked whether they would pad or claim more than they have actually spent. Nine refused to answer when asked whether their colleagues would do it. Nevertheless, three respondents admitted that they would probably perform the unethical action while twelve lecturers think their colleagues would do it if they were to be in that particular situation.

**Table 4.122: Attending a seminar or conference at university expense and not substantively participating**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	27	61.4	62.8	Very Unlikely	9	20.5	23.7
Unlikely	8	18.2	18.6	Unlikely	11	25.0	28.9
Likely	8	18.2	18.6	Likely	16	36.4	42.1
Very likely	0	0.0	0.0	Very likely	2	4.5	5.3
Total	43	97.7	100.0	Total	38	86.4	100.0
Missing	1	2.3		Missing	6	13.6	
	44	100.0			44	100.0	

Eight respondents confessed that they would likely attend a seminar or conference at university expense and not substantively participating while half (47.4%) that answered

perceive that their colleagues would likely do the same. One respondent refused to response when asked whether he/she would do the unethical action while six refused to answer to perceive about their colleagues' likeliness of performing the behaviour.

**Table 4.123: Neglecting university responsibilities due to outside employment.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	31	70.5	72.1	Very unlikely	9	20.5	23.7
Unlikely	11	25.0	25.6	Unlikely	11	25.0	28.9
Likely	1	2.3	2.3	Likely	16	36.4	42.1
Very likely	0	0.0	0.0	Very likely	2	4.5	5.3
Total	43	97.7	100.0	Total	38	86.4	100.0
Missing	1	2.3		Missing	6	13.6	
	44	100.0			44	100.0	

Although only one lecturer feels that he/she would neglect university responsibilities due to outside employment, eighteen respondents, which compose almost 50% of them, perceive that their colleagues would perform the unethical action. One refuse to response on the likeliness he/she would do it while six did not answer whether their colleagues would neglect their responsibilities.

**Table 4.124: Using university equipment for personal activities**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	23	52.3	54.8	Very Unlikely	8	18.2	21.6
Unlikely	10	22.7	23.8	Unlikely	7	15.9	18.9
Likely	9	20.5	21.4	Likely	18	40.9	48.6
Very likely	0	0.0	0.0	Very likely	4	9.1	10.8
Total	42	95.5	100.0	Total	37	84.1	100.0
Missing	2	4.5		Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0			44	100.0	

Results show that nine respondents agreed that they would use university equipment for personal activities, two refused to response while the remaining thirty-three answered that they would unlikely commit to the unethical behaviour. On the other hand, seven respondents did not answer whether they perceive their colleagues would do it and 50% perceive that their fellow lecturers would likely commit the behaviour.

**Table 4.125: Using student assistants for personal work**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	29	65.9	69.0	Very Unlikely	8	18.2	21.6
Unlikely	10	22.7	23.8	Unlikely	14	31.8	37.8
Likely	3	6.8	7.1	Likely	13	29.5	35.1
Very likely	0	0.0	0.0	Very likely	2	4.5	5.4
Total	42	95.5	100.0	Total	37	84.1	100.0
Missing	2	4.5		Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0			44	100.0	

Results seem to indicate that majority of lecturers will not use student assistants for personal work (e.g., running errands), whereby only three agree that they would do it. However, 40.5% perceive that other lecturers would perform the action. The study fails to obtain responses from two and seven respondents regarding their perception on the likeliness of them doing the action and the likeliness of their colleagues', respectively.

**Table 4.126: Cancelling office hours excessively**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	18	40.9	43.9	Very Unlikely	5	11.4	13.5
Unlikely	17	38.6	41.5	Unlikely	17	38.6	45.9
Likely	6	13.6	14.6	Likely	14	31.8	37.8
Very likely	0	0.0		Very likely	1	2.3	2.7
Total	41	93.2	100.0	Total	37	84.1	100.0

Missing	3	6.8	
	44	100.0	

Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0	

Six respondents confessed that he/she would likely cancel office hours excessively while fifteen think their colleagues would likely do the same. Three respondents refused to response when asked whether they would do the unethical action while seven refused to perceive their colleagues' likeliness of performing the behaviour.

**Table 4.127: Accepting money or gifts for grades**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	40	90.9	93.0
Unlikely	2	4.5	4.7
Likely	1	2.3	2.3
Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	21	47.7	56.8
Unlikely	12	27.3	32.4
Likely	4	9.1	10.8
Total	37	84.1	100.0
Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0	

The study fails to obtain one response when asked whether they would accept money or gifts for grades. Seven refused to answer when asked whether their colleagues would do it. Nevertheless, one respondent admitted that they would probably perform the unethical action while only four lecturers think their colleagues would do it if they were to be in that particular situation.

**Table 4.128: Dating a student in his or her class**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	41	93.2	95.3
Unlikely	1	2.3	2.3
Likely	1	2.3	2.3

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very unlikely	20	45.5	52.6
Unlikely	12	27.3	31.6
Likely	6	13.6	15.8

Total	43	97.7	100.0
Missing	1	2.3	
	44	100.0	

Total	38	86.4	100.0
Missing	6	13.6	
	44	100.0	

Results show that only one respondent agreed that they would date a student in his or her class, one refused to response while the remaining forty-two answered that they would unlikely commit the unethical behaviour. On the other hand, six respondents did not answer whether they perceive their colleagues would do it and six perceive that their fellow lecturers would likely commit to the behaviour.

**Table 4.129: Dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer's discipline**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	39	88.6	92.9
Unlikely	3	6.8	7.1
Likely	0	0.0	0.0
Very likely	0	0.0	0.0
Total	42	95.5	100.0
Missing	2	4.5	
	44	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	14	31.8	37.8
Unlikely	14	31.8	37.8
Likely	8	18.2	21.6
Very likely	1	2.3	2.7
Total	37	84.1	100.0
Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0	

Although no lecturer perceive that they would likely date a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer's discipline, nine respondents feel that their colleagues would have the likeliness to perform the same action. Two and seven respondents were reluctant to response regarding their perception on the likeliness of them doing the action and the likeliness of their colleagues', respectively.

**Table 4.130: Allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	31	70.5	75.6
Unlikely	10	22.7	24.4
Likely	0	0.0	0.0
Very likely	0	0.0	0.0
Total	41	93.2	100.0
Missing	3	6.8	
	44	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	10	22.7	27.0
Unlikely	17	38.6	45.9
Likely	9	20.5	24.3
Very likely	1	2.3	2.7
Total	37	84.1	100.0
Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0	

Results seem to indicate that no lecturer would allow a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment if they were given the choice. However, ten respondents perceive that other lecturers would perform the action. The study fails to obtain responses from three and seven respondents regarding their perception on the likeliness of them doing the action and the likeliness of their colleagues', respectively.

**Table 4.131: Allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgment.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	36	81.8	87.8
Unlikely	5	11.4	12.2
Likely	0	0.0	0.0
Very likely	0	0.0	0.0
Total	41	93.2	100.0
Missing	3	6.8	
	44	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	10	22.7	27.0
Unlikely	17	38.6	45.9
Likely	9	20.5	24.3
Very likely	1	2.3	2.7
Total	37	84.1	100.0
Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0	

Similarly, no lecturer would allow a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgment if they were given the option. However, ten respondents perceive that their colleagues would perform the action. The study again fails to obtain responses from three and seven respondents regarding their perception on the likeliness of them doing the action and the likeliness of their colleagues', respectively.

**Table 4.132: Cancelling classes when the faculty member is not ill and has no other university related commitments.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	28	63.6	70.0	Very Unlikely	11	25.0	30.6
Unlikely	9	20.5	22.5	Unlikely	15	34.1	41.7
Likely	3	6.8	7.5	Likely	9	20.5	25.0
Very likely	0	0.0	0.0	Very likely	1	2.3	2.8
Total	40	90.9	100.0	Total	36	81.8	100.0
Missing	4	9.1		Missing	8	18.2	
					44	100.0	

Results show that three respondents agree that they would cancel classes unnecessarily; four refused to response while the remaining thirty-seven answered that they would unlikely commit the unethical behaviour. On the other hand, eight respondents did not answer whether they perceive their colleagues would do it and ten perceived that their fellow lecturers would likely commit to the behaviour.

**Table 4.133: Using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	23	52.3	56.1	Very Unlikely	9	20.5	24.3
Unlikely	15	34.1	36.6	Unlikely	16	36.4	43.2
Likely	3	6.8	7.3	Likely	11	25.0	29.7



Very likely	0	0.0	0.0
Total	41	93.2	100.0
Missing	3	6.8	
	44	100.0	

Very likely	1	2.3	2.7
Total	37	84.1	100.0
Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0	

The study fails to obtain three responses from the lecturers when asked whether they would use outdated text to avoid the effort necessary. Seven refused to answer when asked whether their colleagues would do it. Nevertheless, three respondents admitted that they would probably perform the unethical action while twelve lecturers think their colleagues would do it if they were to be in that particular situation.

**Table 4.134: Falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	36	81.8	87.8
Unlikely	4	9.1	9.8
Likely	1	2.3	2.4
Total	41	93.2	100.0
Missing	3	6.8	
	44	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Unlikely	13	29.5	35.1
Unlikely	15	34.1	40.5
Likely	9	20.5	24.3
Total	37	84.1	100.0
Missing	7	15.9	
	44	100.0	

Results seem to indicate that majority of lecturers would not falsify activity reports for their interests. Although one of them feel that he/she would do it if were in the position, nine respondents perceive that other lecturers would perform the action. The study fails to obtain responses from three and seven respondents regarding their perception on the likeliness of them doing the action and the likeliness of their colleagues', respectively.

#### **4.7 CONCLUSION**

This chapter analysed data that has been collected through the questionnaire distributed to students and lecturers. The next chapter will discuss and interpret the findings as well as make recommendations on the ethical issues and for future research.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS**

#### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter will present the results and conclusions of the study. It will further discuss the recommendations and suggestions for future research. In general, the study has achieved its objectives. Firstly, it has identified perceptions of both lecturers and students in regards to the lecturers' ethical behaviour. The study has also examined and compared the perceptions of both populations. Additionally, analysis of the study has identified differences in the perceptions with demographic influences. This study has also sought the experience of unethical behaviours by the lecturers. Furthermore, it has determined lecturers' propensity as well as their perceptions on other lecturers' propensity in behaving unethically.

#### **5.2 LECTURER-STUDENT PERCEPTIONS ON LECTURERS' ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR IN ACADEMIA**

The study has identified both lecturers' and students' perceptions on ethical behaviours in some academic activities.

##### **5.2.1 PERCEPTIONS ON LECTURERS' ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR IN ACADEMIA**

The study obtained responses from two sets of population, the students and the lecturers, regarding perceptions on lecturers' ethical behaviour in academics.

Out of the 37 items asked on lecturers' behaviours, the highest five items viewed by students as totally ethical are; dating a student in his or her class, dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer's discipline, having an intimate

relationship with a student, allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved and giving easy test or courses to ensure popularity. The behaviour that they are most tolerant is dating a student not in his or her class with one fifth (20.2%) of the respondents feel that it is not wrong. This is an indication that students accept unethical behaviours that will benefit them.

On the other hand, seven behaviours that most (more than 60%) students perceived as extremely unethical are; using profanity in lectures, telling colleagues a confidential disclosure told by a student, falsifying research data, punishing students unequally (i.e. based on likeability, lecturers' mood, etc.), insulting or ridiculing a student in his/her absence, falsifying documentation for research grants and not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship. Almost three quarter of the respondents viewed 'using profanity in lectures' as extremely unethical. This seems to indicate that students cannot tolerate behaviours that will detriment them as an individual and as a student.

The perceptions are then grouped into categories. Using Exploratory Factor Analysis, this study found that students' perceptions on the 37 items can be grouped into six factors; Self-Interest, Disrespectful, Ignorance, Violations of Research Regulations, Personal Benefits and Laziness. Ten items failed to load on the resulting factors.

On the other hand, the actions that most lecturers perceive as 'extremely unethical' (more than 60%) are accepting money or gifts for grades, falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations, dating a student in his or her class, using profanity/offensive words in lectures, padding an expense account, allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment. The results seem to imply that those unethical behaviours are not the normal practice in the academic environment of the respondents. This contrasts with the findings by Scales (2002) which show that accepting gifts from students is viewed as ethical. A study by Marshall (1998) found that dating a student in his or her class, using profanity/offensive words in lectures, padding an expense account, allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment as merely

moderately unethical. In addition, a study by Vargas (2001) indicates that using profanity/offensive words in lectures as ethical since 75% of the respondents perceive as so.

The least percentage of students who perceive the actions being ‘extremely unethical’ are using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary and teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered. Students may see this as a common practice probably due to the perception that it is not unusual for lecturers to use outdated text or teaching materials. On the part of lecturers, however, this may suggest that lecturers do not really concern about this aspect since the actions will not give direct or immediate consequences on their career. In addition, due to the new academic culture, the importance of updating lecture notes and ensuring teaching excellence has no longer a priority. Lecturers are occupied with activities, which would give them better recognition, for example, research and consultancies.

All 22 items in the questionnaire are unethical behaviours in academic. Respondents are expected to view these behaviours as unethical. However, this study found responses for ‘totally ethical’ in all items. The highest ten items (above 10%) viewed by lecturers as totally ethical are; (1) accepting publishers’ monetary rebate for adopting publishers’ textbooks, (2) having an intimate relationship with a student, (3) allowing a relative or a friend in class and giving them preferential treatment, (4) allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and /or written assignment that require significant judgment, (5) cancelling classes when the faculty member is not ill and has no other university related commitments, (6) using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, (7) falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations, (8) dating a student in his or her class, (9) teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered and (10) accepting money or gifts for grades.

However, the findings show a diverse response from the lecturers where 2 items; allowing a relative or a friend in class and giving them preferential treatment and falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises,

promotion, or tenure evaluations; are viewed as extremely unethical by some of the lecturers. The diversity implies that lecturers do not have a clear definition of what is considered ethical or unethical. It also relate to the differences in the ethical beliefs of a faculty.

Subsequently, lecturers' perceptions on the 22 items are grouped into three categories: Academic Job Performance, Regulations and Self-Interest. Only one item failed to load on the resulting factors and was dropped from further analysis.

### **5.2.2 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LECTURERS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS**

Results show that faculty (lecturers) has more items (16 out of 22) that they perceive as unethical as compared to the students. This is expected since lecturers should be more aware of the ethical issues than the students. However, this contradicts with the findings of Marshall et.al. (1998) where interestingly the reverse is the case. This study reveals that students view accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' text books, using profanity/offensive words in lectures, teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered, not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship, inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status and using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, as more unethical than the lecturers. This indicates that students cannot tolerate behaviours that would directly affect their interests.

### **5.2.3 DEMOGRAPHIC INFLUENCE ON LECTURER-STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS**

Gender and academic program are found to be demographic factors that influence students' perceptions. However, for lecturers, results of the study show that there is no demographic influence on their perceptions.

### **5.2.3.1 STUDENTS' GENDER INFLUENCE**

Results seem to indicate that male students are more tolerant with lecturers' unethical behaviours. More males do not mind if lecturers accept publishers' monetary rebates for adopting publishers' textbooks, use profanity in lectures or having an intimate relationship with a student. In addition, more male students perceive ignoring strong evidence of cheating, doing other business during office hours, giving good grades to students based on their personality, allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved and dating a student in his or her class as ethical or appropriate. This is true where, cited by Marshall et.al (1998), many studies indicate female appear to be more concerned or aware of ethical dilemmas, or more ethically oriented toward ethical situations than their male counterparts.

### **5.2.3.2 ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE INFLUENCE**

Many studies reveal that academic discipline does influence ethical perceptions (Vargas, 2001). Studies by Baird (1980) and McCabe and Trevino (1995) as cited by Crown and Spiller (1997) demonstrated that business students have lower level of ethical reasoning than the non-business students. The findings of this study, however, found an inconsistent result.

Academic discipline influences students' perceptions on few aspects. More engineering students accept lecturers who allow students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved. This is probably due to the nature of the program, which is slightly more difficult, technical-oriented and less focus on moral values. However, in terms of lecturers who do not give graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship, engineering students tolerate less where many of them perceive the action as extremely unethical. Similarly, more engineering students perceive plagiarizing research as unethical compared to management students. Surprisingly, more engineering students perceive using student assistants for personal work as ethical. They are more tolerant with this particular

behaviour. In most statements responded by the students, there is no significant difference between the management and engineering students.

### **5.3 LECTURER-STUDENT PERCEPTIONS ON THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY EMPHASIZING ETHICAL POSITIONS**

Since universities create and disseminate knowledge within a particular society, they are institutions with moral responsibilities to maintain the well being of that society. Dehardt (1988) suggests that a university is an institution that provides normative guidance, standards for behaviour and goals for policy and practice at all levels. Consistently, results of this study reveal that majority of lecturers and students agree that the lecturers' actions can influence the overall perceptions on how ethical the university is. However, the students' agreement is higher than the lecturers', which implies that students' expectations on lecturers' actions is higher regarding ethics. The result also suggests that the collective and individual action of a member in a university will affect the overall image of the university. For instance, the university had the experience of expelling a few academic staffs who disseminate negative ideology and subversive agenda which threats public security. This has affected the university's image and reputation (Human Resource Development Unit, UTM, 2004).

However, the agreement percentage drops significantly when lecturers are asked whether the university's ethical practices will influence their personal ethical values. This is probably due to the lack of efforts in promoting ethical positions to the university members. Moreover, ethical values are not emphasized in the vision and mission of the university. Therefore lecturers do not have the 'drive' to live the ethics and values in academia. Students' response regarding the same issue is very much higher than the lecturers' probably because they see the university and the lecturers as their role model.

Result of this study regarding the role of university and faculty in emphasizing ethical position indicates that slightly more than half of the lecturers agree the university's



leaders (vice chancellors, top management) frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions. Nevertheless, regarding the enforcement of organization's ethical positions by the university's leaders, the percentages of agreement and disagreement on the enforcement made by the faculty (deans, head of departments, lecturers) do not have much difference. In general, students agree that leaders of the university and faculty frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions. Perhaps the disciplinary actions and reprimands taken by the faculty and the university are indications of reinforcement. Furthermore, direct (ethical preach) and indirect (attitude and practice) of the lecturers are also viewed as reinforcement of ethical values.

In general students' perceptions are greater than the lecturers' on the role of university and faculty emphasizing ethical positions. This shows that students put high hopes on the responsibility of role modeling by these institutions, as it should be.

#### **5.4 PRACTICE OF ETHICS AMONG LECTURERS**

Lecturers were asked whether they have performed the behaviour. The study found that there are 'once or twice' responses for all behaviours. Unethical actions that most lecturers do are using university equipment for personal activities, teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered and canceling office hours excessively. Using university equipment for personal activities is a common practice in the faculty due to lack of control and enforcement by the faculty and university. Since it is done collectively, everybody perceives it as acceptable. In addition, it is convenient to use equipment that is available because it is time saving as well as cost saving for the individual.

Teaching material that lecturers have not really mastered does occur in the faculty. Respondents feel that it is beyond their control because it is a kind of directive responsibility. Respondents justified that they cancel office hours excessively due to the need of doing some academic and non-academic job outside the office. The study

also seeks the reasons of unethical behaviour admitted by the lecturers. Lecturers behave unethically for the reasons that:

- (1) they perceived the actions as ethical,
- (2) they think the action is ethical since everyone is doing it,
- (3) they were under pressure,
- (4) they had no choice.

Based on the findings of ethical practice of lecturers, it can be generally said that their actions fall under the pre-conventional and conventional level of Kohlberg's stages of moral development. This is because the unethical actions that lecturers practice are actions that are not clearly stated in the code of ethics or guidelines. This indicates that as long as "law and order" are observed by lecturers, other actions are considered acceptable. In addition, the findings of the study also imply that lecturers' behaviour follow the Utilitarianism approach where actions are considered ethical as long as they have good consequences.

## **5.5 PROPENSITY OF BEHAVING UNETHICALLY AND PERCEPTIONS ON COLLEAGUES' PROPENSITY OF PERFORMING THE BEHAVIOUR**

The findings of the study reveal that the likeliness of respondents committing the unethical behaviour is rather low compared to the likeliness of their colleagues doing it. In other words, they perceive that their colleagues would perform the unethical behaviours more than they themselves. Among behaviours that show great disparity are giving easy test or courses to ensure popularity, not giving graduate students co-authorship when the students' contributions justified co-authorship, inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status, presenting the same research to more than one regional or annual conference, neglecting university's responsibilities due to outside employment and using university equipment for personal activities. The disparities occur probably because the ethical awareness of the respondents is higher than their colleagues who may not be among the respondents.

## **5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study has outlined the following recommendations in improving ethical awareness, ethical perceptions and hence, the ethical climate of the University. Both University and faculty have to seriously play the role in promoting ethics, code of ethics is just inadequate.

In the faculty level, there should be more effective monitoring of faculty conduct and appropriate strategies for personal and professional development. A disciplinary committee should be established. In addition, the faculty should set a good example (role model) to students in relation to ethical values and practice. And most importantly, there must be frequent reinforcement including punishment.

On the other hand, the University should develop and communicate ethical values through ethics seminar, training, colloquium. University should also focus on the quality of personnel and professional development programs for both students and faculty. University administrators should set a good example or role modelling to faculty members and students as a whole. The curriculum should emphasize in integrating ethics in all subjects taught. Code of ethics has to be made more aware to all University members. Vague areas in the code must be made clearer so that it does not only serve as a general guidelines but also a specific reference when ethical concerns arise.

## **5.7 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

The current research looked into the behaviour of a faculty. Ethical climate of a faculty or department is probably different within the University. This is because, unethical behaviour is a consequence of an influential subculture within a weak organizational culture. According to Trevino and Nelson (1995), “departmental subcultures are often stronger than the overall university culture and behaviour is quite different within each subculture”. Thus, it is suggested that future research will look

into other discipline of faculty (i.e. Engineering, Law) in the same University and other universities as well.

This study merely investigates the respondents' perceptions on ethical behaviours. Future researchers may go a stage further by looking at their ethical judgement as well as ethical intentions. When ethical judgement and intention are identified, ethical behaviour can be determined.

## **5.8 CONCLUSION**

It is reasonable to hold academics to a high moral standard, as they are in a prime position to influence young minds through their modeling and control information. Faculty also conducts research and through it often influences public opinion and contributes to social constructions of "truth" and morality. Faculty obtains monies from public and private sources to fund research, which may also support the training of future academics. As such, there is a great deal of autonomy afforded faculty, as well as a great deal of responsibility to the public, to academia, to the institution and to students whom they teach and mentor.

The setback in dealing with unethical behaviour is when cases are treated with discretion and with "an eye close to the law". When rules and regulations are not "above" the leaders of an organization, consequences of unethical or unprofessional behaviour vary among members and within the University system.

Though the picture is not pretty, it is important that this professional group to take action now to preserve their credibility. Many have argued that ethics cannot be simplified as right or wrong; this is why ethics should not be taught but lived. In a university, ethics should not only be looking at the theoretical side, those who preach, must practice ethics while those who learn must inculcate and ask themselves whether they have actually prepared to face the challenges of ethics.

**PROFESSIONAL CODE OF ETHICS  
FOR STAFFS**

**UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA**

**PHILOSOPHY**

The divine law of Allah is the foundation for science and technology. As such Universiti Teknologi Malaysia strives with total and unified effort to achieve excellence in science and technology for universal peace and prosperity, in accordance with His will.

**VISION**

To be a world-class center of academic and technological excellence through creativity.

**MISSION**

To be a leader in the development of human resource and creative technology in line with the aspirations of the nation.

**MOTTO**

In the name of God, for mankind

**THEME**

*The Discovery University*

## **OBJECTIVES**

- To lead in the development of science, engineering and technology, which are contributory to national wealth.
- To improve the quality of education in order to produce competitive and relative human resources.
- To spur strengthen the fields of manufacturing technology and technological management in order to meet national requirements.
- To enhance students' character development in order to fulfill national aspirations of producing future generations.
- To improve the University's management performance through the sharing of common of values and vision.

## **FOREWORD**

In any organization, the most valuable asset is the staff. An organization will prosper and progress when all efforts and ideas of the staff are focused towards the attainment of its corporate objectives.

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) is a large organization with more than 1600 academic staff and a student population of more than 29,000. These figures will continue to increase, in tandem with the progress of the University. Our quest for excellence and recognition as a 'World Class University' requires a total commitment and perseverance from our academic front in order to maintain the highest possible standards in teaching, learning and research activities.

In order to achieve these objectives, it is imperative that all staff performs their duties with dedication, and be guided by the basic values of equality, honesty, wisdom, truth, sincerity and gratitude.

Therefore, I hope that this Professional Code of Ethics be taken as guidelines to safeguard against deviations in duties and responsibilities. More importantly, I hope this code would assist in guarding the honor of our academic profession.

Thank You.

**Datuk Prof. Ir. Dr. Mohd. Zulkifli Tan Sri Mohd. Ghazali**  
Vice Chancellor  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia



## **INTRODUCTION**

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia Professional Staff Code of Ethics (henceforth Code of Ethics) should be regarded as a guide by all academic and non-academic staff towards the inculcation of professional excellence in performing their duties and responsibilities. Various documents were referred to in the process of compiling this Code of Ethics such as Etika Profesion Pensyarah UTM (1987), Panduan Menjadikan Tugas Harian Sebagai Ibadah Untuk Kalangan Umat Islam (1987), and other documents relating to professional code of ethics. With this Code of Ethics, it is hoped that UTM could enhance staff's competence and performance towards achieving the goal of becoming a world-class center of academic and technological excellence.

This Code of Ethics is applicable to all levels of staff and for various contexts of duties and responsibilities.

All UTM staff, therefore, should abide by and take into account this Code of Ethics in all their professional undertakings. It should be read and applied alongside existing laws, regulations and procedures of the University.

For UTM to become a progressive institution that is capable of fostering continuous strategies for development, all efforts for inculcating the culture of excellence should be planned according to the following:

- The Philosophy, the mission and vision statement of the University.
- The University's corporate culture,
- Progressive and visionary perspectives.
- The achievement of total quality management (TQM) organization.

The above approaches should form the basis for organizational culture at UTM, while the Code of Ethics shall be the foundation for standards of excellence.

## **2.0 DEFINITION**

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia Professional Staff Code of Ethics is a code of conduct and practices, and a guideline for the adoption of primary ethical values that are directed towards excellence and continuous quality assurance.

## **3.0 OBJECTIVES**

This Code of Ethics is intended to:

- 3.1 Instill positive attitudes towards the execution of one's duties and responsibilities in order to ensure quality services
- 3.2 Create a harmonious and conducive working environment so as to enhance productivity, promote excellence in staff's performance, and foster positive image of the University.
- 3.3 Promote a culture of cooperation, equality and consensus and focused towards successful team building.
- 3.4 Produce quality output through efficient, effective and planned utilization of resources.
- 3.5 Transform UTM into an institution, which is responsive and proactive to constant changes.

#### **4.0 PRINCIPLES**

The use of this Code of Ethics should be based on the five principles of Personnel Integrity, Commitment to Noble Values, Accountability, Culture of Dynamic Organization and Compliance to Rules and Regulations.

##### **4.1 Personal Integrity**

It is the responsibility of the University Staff to consistently and effectively maintain personal integrity, a commitment to excellence, accountability in all undertakings and an exemplary professional identity, which could be effectively and consistently emulated.

##### **4.2 Commitment to Noble Values**

An organization's progress and stability depend very much on the observance of universal noble values by its members. The adherence to these values would strengthen and harmonize interpersonal relationship, *esprit de corps*, and improve the quality of work

Amongst the desirable values in a working environment are;

- Sincerity of intent
- Team spirit
- Mutual respect and courtesy
- Readiness to rectify personal shortcomings
- A determination to excel

##### **4.3 Accountability**

In the execution of one's duties, every University staff is required to abide by the principles of accountability towards the nation, the University, the community, profession, clients and students.

#### **4.4 Culture of a Dynamic Organization**

In accordance with our position as an institution of higher learning, UTM should progress with the characteristics of a knowledge and corporate organization. It is therefore the responsibility of every staff member to practice and propagate this culture.

#### **4.5 Compliance to Rules and Regulations**

In order to ensure its existence as a dynamic organization, all academic staff should:

4.5.1 Comprehend the concept and the safeguarding of confidentiality.

4.5.2 Accept existing and up-dated versions of regulations and circulars

4.5.3 Anticipate and appreciate changes and formulate new policies whenever necessary.

### **5.0 PRIMARY VALUES**

A person's set of values will influence and determine his or her perceptions and thoughts. Common values shared amongst staff members of an organization would naturally encourage the fulfillment of mission and vision of excellence of the institution. UTM adheres to a set of primary values; committed; communicative, creative, consistent and competent.

These values complement the basic standards already adhered to by the public service sector which emphasize honesty, wisdom, sincerity, truth, equality and gratitude.

#### **5.1 Committed**

Being committed means putting a serious effort in one's duties and responsibilities, either individually or as a team, according to specified and agreed assignments and responsibilities. As such, it is imperative that every staff member strives to increase his or her commitment in terms of time, energy and ideas in the course of carrying out his or her duties, based on his or her knowledge and expertise.

#### **5.2 Communicative**

Communication makes man a social being and a member of an organization. The ability and readiness to communicate clearly and ethically are the primary qualities of a professional and successful staff member.

By employing various strategic and effective communication techniques, UTM staff should be ready and able to communicate with all levels of people for purpose of effective channeling and exchanging of ideas, experiences, decision-making and professionalism.

### **5.3 Creative**

Creativity is seen as a prime mover for progress and excellence. Thus, to be competitive and contemporary, UTM staff should be creative in producing new, original, practical and superior quality products within their respective fields.

### **5.4 Consistent**

The process of building the image and reputation of an organization is long-term and consistently planned. Similarly, in order to realize our mission and vision, each staff member should have the conviction and confidence in continuously implementing consistent services, policies and principles, based on stated aims and objectives.

### **5.5 Competent**

Competency gives a sense of confidence and ensures effective and successful implementation of one's assigned duties and responsibilities. Each staff member, either individually or collectively, is expected to possess and exercise professional competency in all conceptual, technical and human aspect of his work.

## **6.0 ACADEMIC RESPONSIBILITIES**

All academic staff are entrusted with teaching, conducting research, writing and publishing, community services, student-development and academic management. Academic are to devote their efforts to these core responsibilities through activities that would give added value to academic standing.

### **6.1 Teaching**

Academic are the mainstay of the scholarship tradition, therefore, it falls on them comprehend, adopt, practice and transmit knowledge for the benefit of mankind. In the course of carrying out these duties, academics are expected to:

6.1.1 Demonstrate a high degree of professional competency, dedication, determination and responsibility, through the employment of the latest technology and by accepted academic criteria such that through their teaching-learning efforts and their academic counsel, UTM would be able to produce scholarly and competent graduates.

- 6.1.2 Abide by a set of high moral values, consistent with the standing of an educationist, which could inspire and be emulated by their personal conducts, attitudes and principles.
- 6.1.3 Posses a high degree of resilience, industry and inquisitiveness toward scholarship and objectivity so as to ensure that academic standards are not compromised.
- 6.1.4 Abide by the efficient use of time in quality teaching and learning process.
- 6.1.5 Strive for continuous personal and professional development.

## **6.2 Research**

As one of the main responsibilities of academics, research activities serve the need to discover to questions, problems and hypotheses. Research plays a vital role toward the advancement of knowledge at the University in line with the thematic slogan of UTM as “The Discovery University”. To fulfill this function, UTM staff should:

- 6.2.1 Undertake research activities continuously during their academic tenure, giving priority to their field of specialization and expertise.
- 6.2.2 Adopt scholarly ethics and academic integrity while adhering to proper research procedures in data gathering, research findings and data interpretations, and report writing.
- 6.2.3 Be honest and responsible in the utilization of research resources

## **6.3 Writing**

Writing represents an activity of documenting scholarship or expert findings derived from a tradition of knowledge in a specialized field. Writing or publishing includes all scholarly output (articles, essays, working papers, book reviews, reports, lecture materials, seminar and conference proceeding, etc.) in printed format such a books, encyclopedia, journals, newspapers, or in electronic or digital recording format. In the process of producing all these documents, UTM staff should:

- 6.3.1 Strive to publish quality works while observing the copy right laws.
- 6.3.2 Ensure that their writings do not contain elements which are contrary to national interests and public sensitivity or which would threaten political or social stability.
- 6.3.3 Ensure that their expertise and experiences be transmitted and inherited through writings and documentations.

6.3.4 Respect intellectual integrity and refrain from any forms of plagiarism

#### **6.4 Consultancy**

The expertise available within the University could be channeled to benefit the society at large through consultancy services. UTM staffs are therefore encouraged to offer their advisory services either individually or collectively to any programmes or projects that may require their specific knowledge and expertise. In this respect, it is essential that the staff:

6.4.1 Undertakes the consultancy specific to their field of specialization

6.4.2 Be honest, trustworthy and efficient at all times and adheres to the terms of the consultancy agreement and avoids any form of deviation.

6.4.3 Be mindful of their primary duties of teaching and other responsibilities assigned by the University whilst engaging in the consultancy business.

#### **6.5 Community Services**

As a social obligation and within the interest of the well-being of the community at large, academic staff are highly encouraged to volunteer their services and expert skills to his or her community. In fulfilling this responsibility, the staff should:

6.5.1 Ensure that their service is rendered with sincerity and that it contributes towards bringing about market community improvement and solutions to social problems.

6.5.2 Undertake the voluntary services with earnest.

#### **6.6 Student Development**

Aside from ensuring students' academic excellence, academic staff should contribute towards shaping students' character and personal development. Students character building program should be comprehensive and integrated, encompassing the physical, emotional, spiritual and intellectual aspects. As students' mentor and academic advisor, academic staffs have the responsibility to instill and nurture good leadership quality, positive thinking outlook, sound mental health and the development of an honorable character. Towards these ends, the academic staff should:

6.6.1 Render advice, counseling and mentoring with sincerity and honesty.

6.6.2 Be sensitive to students' problems and offer the best possible attempt to resolve their problems without compromising social and national sensitivities.

## **6.7 Management**

All academic staff have specific roles in the management of the University that complement and augment their academic duties and responsibilities. Academic staff should therefore:

- 6.7.1 Understand and abide by the University's management policies.
- 6.7.2 Support management programmes geared towards achieving the University's mission and vision.
- 6.7.3 Plan activities based on the principles of effective management.
- 6.7.4 Perform their duties and responsibilities in accordance with the University's integrated strategies in order to achieve the desired aims and objectives.
- 6.7.5 Acculturate quality measurements and encourage colleagues and students alike to improve performance and productivity.
- 6.7.6 Be constantly proactive and responsive to the changing environment and the culture of a dynamic organization.

## **7.0 CUSTOMER RELATIONS**

In establishing customer relations, certain ethical guidelines should be observed in order to safe-guard personal as well as organizational image and integrity.

### **7.1 Academic Staff-Student Relationship**

Academic staff should maintain cordial relationships with students at all times. Academic staff should therefore:

- 7.1.1 Demonstrate and accord fairness and respect to students in all their academic activities.
- 7.1.2 Encourage exchange of ideas freely and objectively with students.
- 7.1.3 Evaluate students' academic efforts with impartiality and honesty.
- 7.1.4 Demonstrate appropriate appreciations and acknowledgements to students' intellectual output and contributions.
- 7.1.5 Be accountable for students' positive intellectual development. Academic staffs are thus prohibited from inciting students' thoughts with negative ideas and subversive activities.

## **7.2 Relationship with Colleagues**

All academic staff, either acting in their academic or administrative capacity, should accord courtesy, respect, and impartiality to one another. They should:

- 7.2.1 Work collectively towards achieving the University's objective of defending the rights to academic freedom.
- 7.2.2 Defend intellectual integrity at all times and be accountable for the dissemination of truth.
- 7.2.3 Be impartial and objective in professional assessment of colleagues
- 7.2.4 Respect the confidentiality of information of colleagues
- 7.2.5 Acknowledge and appreciate knowledge derived from works of colleagues in the course of carrying out their professional and intellectual duties.

## **7.3 Academic Staff and Community Relationship**

- 7.3.1 In the course of carrying out their professional duties, academic staff should refrain from issuing statements that would confound the distinction between their professional standing and functions or their capacity as a member of the community.
- 7.3.2 Academic staff should respect the community in which they serve and should try to fulfill their communal obligations by participating and contributing in community activities.

## **8.0 ENHANCING PROFESSIONAL INTEGRITY**

All members of the academic staff are responsible for safeguarding the integrity of their profession and refrain from any unethical conduct. Those who commit any of the following acts are construed to have violated the professional ethics outlined thus far:

### **8.1 Violations in Teaching**

Academic staffs who commit any of the following acts are construed to have violated the professional ethics in teaching:

- 8.1.1 Fail to complete the assigned academic programme according to course outline within the stipulated time frame without legitimate reason.
- 8.1.2 Gives unfair and partial evaluation to student's academic work and fail to adhere to academic criteria and regulations.



- 8.1.3 Breach the confidentiality of examination questions by leaking them intentionally or otherwise, to students or any unauthorized party.
- 8.1.4 Make decisions on students' academic affairs without adhering to rules and guidelines set by the University.
- 8.1.5 Spread false information or information which could deviate one's faith, erode national allegiance, undermine positive outlook and personal confidence and tarnish the reputation of the University and the country.
- 8.1.6 Use academic platform to subvert students' minds or incite anti-government stance and to erode national allegiance to the country.

## **8.2 Violations in Research**

Academic staffs who commit any of the following acts are construed to have violated the professional ethics in research.

- 8.2.1 Carry out research without adhering to the proper procedures, rules or research agreement determined by the University or any party agreed upon by the University.
- 8.2.2 Assign or insist on their name to be included into the list of researchers where upon they have no direct involvement in the research activity.
- 8.2.3 Claim to be the sole researcher to a group project.
- 8.2.4 Deviate from the scope of the originally agreed research objective while still retaining the original title.
- 8.2.5 Manipulate and falsify data, misuse and falsify reference sources. Manipulate sources or any other forms of improper documentation or fraud connected to the research.
- 8.2.6 Use research allocation improperly such as give dishonest cost estimation, misappropriate financial grants, gifts, assistance and equipments, as well as commit fraud in the process of claims and project auditing.

## **8.3 Violations in Publishing**

Academic staffs who commit any of the following acts are construed to have violated the professional ethics in publishing:

- 8.3.1 Commit plagiarism by taking another person's ideas, views, opinions, data, writings, designs and claim that these ideas, views, opinions, data, writings and designs as their own, either explicitly or in a manner which could be deemed as an intellectual dishonesty.

- 8.3.2 Publish another person's writing such as reports, articles, academic working-papers, books, either in whole or in part, and claim themselves to be the sole author or co-author of the work.
- 8.3.3 Extract any fact or data from another person's published or unpublished academic research or writing and claim that the data or facts are the results of their academic research or writing.
- 8.3.4 Quote facts and academic data for their academic use, writing and publications without references or acknowledgements to the original sources.
- 8.3.5 Publish any form of writing that could jeopardize public interest.
- 8.3.6 Take data, research work, project designs belonging to students under their supervision and claim ownership to these data, research work and project designs.
- 8.3.7 Alter any writing or designs of another party without prior notification to the owner, whilst claiming and giving the impression of ownership to the work.
- 8.3.8 Translate writing or composition of another party in any form, in part or in whole, without authorization from the original writer or publisher.

#### **8.4 Violations in Consultancy**

Academic Staff who commit any of the following acts are deemed to have violated the professional ethics in the area of consultancy.

- 8.4.1 Carry out consultancy work without authorization from the University.
- 8.4.2 Fail to abide by conditions and methods of consultancy specified by the University.
- 8.4.3 Fail to abide by the agreements and conditions agreed upon with the party requiring the consultancy service.
- 8.4.4 Involve in a consultancy project deemed contrary to the interests of the University and the country.

#### **8.5 Violations in General Terms**

Academic Staff who commit any of the following acts are deemed to have violated the professional ethics in general terms:

##### **8.5.1 Implementation of Responsibilities**

Fail to pay attention to quality services so as to deviate from client's expectations or norms of excellence.

#### **8.5.2 Provocation**

Academic staffs who disseminate any negative ideology or subversive agenda which threatens public security, or demonstrate non-allegiance to the government are deemed to have committed the offence of incitement.

#### **8.5.3 Relationships**

8.5.3 (i) Use their professional position for personal gains.

8.5.3 (ii) Engage in a relationship with students or colleagues of the opposite sex which goes against the norms of religion, custom, and decency, and which would damage their professional credibility and the University's integrity.

8.5.3 (iii) Act either physically or verbally, which could mar harmonious relationships with students, colleagues or other members of the University.

### **9.0 PENALTY FOR VIOLATIONS**

Any academic staff who has committed any of the above-mentioned offences is liable for legal action as per the relevant acts and laws of the University.

### **10.0 CONCLUSION**

This Professional Codes of Ethics should be seriously taken into consideration by all staff of UTM in the strive to improve the quality of personal and professional services as well to attain the University's mission and vision.

### **FUNDAMENTAL NOBLE VALUES**

#### **1. HONESTY**

To maintain and execute one's duties and responsibilities in accordance with the religious tenets, prescribed laws and regulations and without taking advantage of his or her position or personal gains.

## **2. WISDOM**

To be diligent and rational in carrying out one's duties and responsibilities and to utilize all available resources in order to derive excellent objectives and results.

## **3. TRUTH**

To state facts either in writing, as they are heard, or seen, without any factual distortion.

## **4. SINCERTY**

To extend and transmit knowledge, etc. (including speech and writing) to the appropriate party with clarity and sincerity

## **5. JUST**

To execute one's duties and decision-making by observing and adhering to all relevant rules and regulations without fear or favour and influence from any party.

## **6. GRATITUDE**

To be gracious and appreciative for all blessings and benefits given, by rendering dedicated and faithful services; a patience for trials and tribulations; a willingness to sacrifice one's time and energy for the benefits of one's office, nation and religion.

**"STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS"**  
**AND**  
**"STATEMENT ON PLAGIARISM"**  
**OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF**  
**UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS**

## INTRODUCTION

*The statement which follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Council, and endorsed by the Seventy- third Annual Meeting in June 1987.*

From its inception, the American Association recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research.(See botton\*\*) The Statement on Professional Ethics that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to ensure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and Committee B, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, or the applicable provisions of the Association's Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

## THE STATEMENT

I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interest, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the

confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

## **STATEMENT ON PLAGIARISM**

*The statement which follows was approved for publication by the Association's Committee B on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Council in June 1990, and endorsed by the Seventy-sixth Annual Meeting.*

The main practical activity of the American Association of University Professors, since its founding, has concerned restraints upon the right of faculty members to inquire, to teach, to speak, and to publish professionally. Yet throughout its existence, the Association has emphasized the responsibilities of faculty members no less than their rights. Both rights and responsibilities support the common good served by institutions of higher education which in the words of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, "depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition."

In its *Statement on Professional Ethics*, the Association has stressed the obligation of professors to their subject and to the truth as they see it, as well as the need for them to "exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge." Defending free inquiry by their associates and respecting the opinion of others,

in the exchange of criticism and ideas, professors must also be rigorously honest in acknowledging their academic debts.

In the light of recent concerns within and outside of the academic profession, it has seemed salutary to restate these general obligations with respect to the offense of plagiarism.

## **DEFINITION**

The offense of plagiarism may seem less self-evident in some circles now than it did formerly. Politicians, business executives, and even university presidents depend on the ideas and literary skills of committees, aides, and speechwriters in the many communications they are called on to make inside and outside their organizations. When ideas are rapidly popularized and spread abroad through the media, when fashion and the quest for publicity are all around us, a concern with protecting the claims of originality may seem to some a quaint survival from the past or even a perverse effort to deter the spread of knowledge.

Nevertheless, with the academic world, where advancing knowledge remains the highest calling, scholars must give full and fair recognition to the contributors to that enterprise, both for the substance and for the formulation of their findings and interpretations. Even within the academic community, however, there are complexities and shades of difference. A writer of textbooks rests on the labors of hundreds of authors of monographs who cannot all be acknowledged; the derivative nature of such work is understood and even, when it is well and skillfully done, applauded. A poet, composer, or painter may "quote" the creation of another artist, deliberately without explanation as a means of deeper exploration of meaning and in the expectation that knowledgeable readers, listeners, or viewers will appreciate the allusion and delight in it. There are even lapses--regrettable but not always avoidable--in which a long-buried memory of something read surfaces as a seemingly new thought.

But none of these situations diminishes the central certainty: taking over the ideas, methods, or written words of another, without acknowledgment and with the intention that they be taken as the work of the deceiver, is plagiarism. It is theft of a special kind, for the true author still retains the original ideas and words, yet they are diminished as that author's property and a fraud is committed upon the audience that believes those ideas and words originated with the deceiver. Plagiarism is not limited to the academic community but has perhaps its most pernicious effect in that setting. It is the antithesis of the honest labor that characterizes true scholarship and without which mutual trust and respect among scholars is impossible.

## **PRECEPTS**

Every professor should be guided by the following:

1. In his or her own work, the professor must scrupulously acknowledge every intellectual debt--for his ideas, methods, and expressions--by means appropriate to the form of communication.



2. Any discovery of suspected plagiarism should be brought at once to the attention of the affected parties and, as appropriate, to the profession at large through proper and effective channels--typically through reviews in or communications to relevant scholarly journals. Committee B of the Association stands ready to provide its good offices in resolving questions of plagiarism, either independently or in collaboration with other professional societies.

3. Professors should work to ensure that their universities and professional societies adopt clear guidelines respecting plagiarism, appropriate to the disciplines involved, and should insist that regular procedures be in place to deal with violations of those guidelines. The gravity of a charge of plagiarism, by whomever it is made, must not diminish the diligence exercised in determining whether the accusation is valid. In all cases the most scrupulous procedural fairness must be observed, and penalties must be appropriate to the degree of offense.\*\*\*

4. Scholars must make clear the respective contributions of colleagues on a collaborative project, and professors who have the guidance of students as their responsibility must exercise the greatest care not to appropriate a student's ideas, research, or presentation to the professor's benefit; to do so is to abuse power and trust.

5. In dealing with graduate students, professors must demonstrate by precept and example the necessity of rigorous honesty in the use of sources and of utter respect for the work of others. The same expectations apply to the guidance of undergraduate students, with a special obligation to acquaint students new to the world of higher education with its standards and the means of ensuring intellectual honesty.

## CONCLUSION

Any intellectual enterprise--by an individual, a group of collaborators, or a profession--is a mosaic, the pieces of which are put in place by many hands. Viewed from a distance, it should appear a meaningful whole, but the long process of its assemblage must not be discounted or misrepresented. Anyone who is guilty of plagiarism not only harms those most directly affected but also diminishes the authority and credibility of all scholarship and all creative arts, and therefore ultimately harms the interests of the broader society. The danger of plagiarism for teaching, learning, and scholarship is manifest, the need vigorously to maintain standards of professional integrity compelling.

### Citations

\*\*

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 1961 | Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members                                    |
| 1964 | Committee A Statement on Extramural Utterances (Clarification of sec 1c. of the 1940 Statement |

- of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure)
- 1965 On Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Government-Sponsored Research at Universities
- 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities
- 1967 Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students
- 1970 Council Statement on Freedom and Responsibility
- 1976 On Discrimination
- 1984 Sexual Harassment: Suggested Policy and Procedures for Handling Complaints

\*\*\*

On the question of due process for a faculty member who is the subject of disciplinary action because of alleged plagiarism, see Regulations 5 and 7 of the Association's Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure in Academe 69 (January-February 1983: 18a-19a)

## **APPENDIX III**

### **CODE OF ETHICS FOR EDUCATORS**

The **Code of Ethics for Educators** defines the professional behavior of educators in Georgia and serves as a guide to ethical conduct. The **Professional Standards Commission (PSC)** has adopted standards which represent the conduct generally accepted by the education profession. The code protects the health, safety and general welfare of students and educators, ensures the citizens of Georgia a degree of accountability within the education profession, and defines unethical conduct justifying disciplinary sanction. The PSC is authorized not only to issue and renew educator certificates, but to suspend, revoke, or deny certificates, licenses, and permits, or to issue written reprimand, for good cause after an investigation is held and notice and a hearing are provided to the certificate, license, or permit holder. To view the official PSC rules on Educator Conduct, visit the PSC website at [www.gapsc.com](http://www.gapsc.com).

The PSC, in collaboration with the Professional Practices Section (PPS), is responsible for taking adverse action against educators' licenses, and generating appropriate notification to the educational community regarding these actions. Notification of any disciplinary action is made to local Georgia school systems, Georgia colleges and universities, and state certification/licensing agencies through a national clearinghouse.

The PPS, at the request of the PSC, conducts investigations associated with educators' standards of conduct. Due process allows an individual under investigation the right to a hearing before a tribunal of PPS Commission members. At the conclusion of the investigation, the PPS makes a recommendation to the PSC as to what action, if any, should be taken against the individual's certificate or application. The PSC is the authority responsible for taking any final action.

The **Code of Ethics**, adopted by the PPS, consists of principles intended to serve educators as a guide to ethical conduct. They provide a sound basis for solution of many problems which arise in educators' relationships with students, with other educators, and with the public.

## **STANDARDS**

**Standard 1: Criminal Acts** - An educator should abide by federal, state, and local laws and statutes. Unethical conduct includes

the commission or conviction of a felony or misdemeanor offense, including DUI/BUI, but excluding minor traffic violations such as speeding, following too closely, improper lane change, etc. As used herein, "conviction" includes a finding or verdict of guilt, a plea of guilty, or a plea of nolo contendere.

**Standard 2: Abuse of Students** - An educator should always maintain a professional relationship with all students, both in and outside the classroom.

**Standard 3: Alcohol or Drugs** - An educator should refrain from the abuse of alcohol or drugs during the course of professional practice.

**Standard 4: Misrepresentation or Falsification** - An educator should exemplify honesty and integrity in the course of professional practice.

**Standard 5: Public Funds and Property** - An educator entrusted with public funds and property should honor that trust with a high level of honesty, accuracy, and responsibility.

**Standard 6: Improper Remunerative Conduct** - An educator should maintain integrity with students, colleagues, parents, patrons, or businesses when accepting gifts, gratuities, favors, and additional compensation.

**Standard 7: Confidential Information** - An educator should comply with state and federal laws and local school board policies relating to the confidentiality of student records, unless disclosure is required or permitted by law.

**Standard 8: Abandonment of Contract** - An educator should fulfill all of the terms and obligations detailed in the contract with the local board of education or education agency for the duration of the contract.

**Standard 9: Failure to Make a Required Report** - An educator should file reports of a breach of one or more of the standards in the Code of Ethics for Educators, child abuse (O.C.G.A. §19-7-5), or any other required report.

**Standard 10: Professional Conduct** - An educator should demonstrate conduct that follows generally recognized professional standards. Unethical conduct is any conduct that seriously impairs the certificate holder's ability to function professionally in his or her employment position or conduct that is detrimental to the health, welfare, discipline, or morals of students (inappropriate language, physical altercations, inadequate supervision, inappropriate discipline, etc.).

A copy of the full text of the **Code of Ethics** is available in the Education Advisement Center.

Authority: O.C.G.A. Section 20-2-795 TAKEN FROM: Georgia Professional Standards Commission Rule 505-2-.03, July, 1999.



**UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**TOPIC:**

**LECTURERS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON ETHICS IN ACADEMIA AND  
LECTURER-STUDENT INTERACTION**

Dear students,

This study attempts to identify the perceptions of lecturers and students on ethics in their interactions in and outside the class. Information given is strictly confidential and will only be used for academic purposes. Your co-operation in providing true information and honest views is very much appreciated.

Thank you.

Researchers:

MAISARAH MOHAMED SAAT  
NORIZA MOHD. JAMAL  
ANIZA OTHMAN

Faculty of Management and Human Resource Development,  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia,  
Skudai, Johor.



**UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**TOPIC:**

**LECTURERS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON ETHICS IN ACADEMIA AND  
LECTURER-STUDENT INTERACTION**

Dear colleagues,

This study attempts to identify the perceptions of lecturers and students on ethics in their interactions in and outside the class. Information given is strictly confidential and will only be used for academic purposes. Your co-operation in providing true information and honest views is very much appreciated.

Thank you.

Researchers:

MAISARAH MOHAMED SAAT  
NORIZA MOHD. JAMAL  
ANIZA OTHMAN

Faculty of Management and Human Resource Development,  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia,  
Skudai, Johor.

## SECTION A

Please tick ( ☐ ) and fill in where appropriate:

1. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. Race : ☐ Malay ☐ Chinese ☐ Indian ☐ Others
3. Religion: ☐ Islam ☐ Buddhism ☐ Christianity ☐ Hindu  
Others: (state) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Degree programme:  
☐ Management ☐ Science ☐ Education ☐ Engineering  
☐ IT ☐ Others: (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
5. Name of faculty: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Have you taken any ethics courses/subjects? ☐ Yes ☐ No
7. Latest CGPA: \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION B

Please circle the degree of **ethicalness of lecturers** on each action based on the scale of:

	1	2	3	4	5
	Totally Ethical	Slightly Unethical	Moderately Unethical	Unethical	Extremely Unethical
1. Giving easy tests or courses to ensure popularity.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' text books.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Using profanity in lectures.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Having an intimate relationship with a student.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Failing to updates notes when re-teaching a course.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Teaching material they have not really mastered.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Telling colleagues a confidential disclosure told by a student.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Ignoring strong evidence of cheating.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Ignoring unethical behaviour by colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Doing other business during office hours.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Giving good grades to students based on their personality.	1	2	3	4	5



12.	Allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Omitting significant information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Insulting, ridiculing, etc. a student in his/her absence.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Ignoring a student signing the attendance sheet for a classmate.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Punishing students unequally (i.e. based on likeability, lecturers' mood, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Plagiarizing research.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Submitting a manuscript to two or more journals in violation of journal policy.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Falsifying documentation for research grants.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Falsifying research data.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Presenting the same research to more than one regional or annual meeting (against meeting policy).	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Padding an expense account.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Attending a meeting at university expense and not substantively participating (most of the time spent sight-seeing, etc).	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Neglecting university responsibilities due to outside employment.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Using student assistants for personal work (e.g., running errands).	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Canceling office hours excessively.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Accepting money or gifts for grades.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Dating a student in his or her class.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer's discipline.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgment.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Canceling classes when the faculty member is not ill and has no other University related commitments.	1	2	3	4	5

35.	Using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Using university equipment for personal activities.	1	2	3	4	5

### SECTION C

		1	2	3	4	5
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
38.	I believe that the lecturers' actions can influence the overall perceptions on how ethical the university is.					
39.	I believe that the university's ethical practices will influence my personal ethical values.					
40.	I believe the university's leaders (vice chancellors, top management) frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions.					
41.	I believe the faculty (deans, head of departments, lecturers) frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions.					

*Thank You For Your Time And Co-Operation.*

## SECTION A

Please tick ( ✓ ) and fill in where appropriate :

1. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. Race : ☐ Malay ☐ Chinese ☐ Indian ☐ Others
3. Religion: ☐ Islam ☐ Buddhism ☐ Christianity ☐ Hindu  
Others: (state) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Degree programme :  
☐ Management ☐ Science ☐ Education ☐ Engineering  
☐ IT ☐ Others: (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
5. Name of faculty: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Have you taken any ethics courses/subjects? ☐ Yes ☐ No
7. Latest CGPA : \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION B

Please circle the degree of **ethicalness of lecturers** on each action based on the scale of:

	1	2	3	4	5
	Totally Ethical	Slightly Unethical	Moderately Unethical	Unethical	Extremely Unethical
1. Giving easy tests or courses to ensure popularity.				1	2 3 4 5
2. Accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' text books.				1	2 3 4 5
3. Using profanity in lectures.				1	2 3 4 5
4. Having an intimate relationship with a student.				1	2 3 4 5
5. Failing to updates notes when re-teaching a course.				1	2 3 4 5
6. Teaching material they have not really mastered.				1	2 3 4 5
7. Telling colleagues a confidential disclosure told by a student.				1	2 3 4 5
8. Ignoring strong evidence of cheating.				1	2 3 4 5
9. Ignoring unethical behaviour by colleagues.				1	2 3 4 5

10.	Doing other business during office hours.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Giving good grades to students based on their personality.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Allowing students to drop courses for reasons not officially approved.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Omitting significant information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Insulting, ridiculing, etc. a student in his/her absence.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Ignoring a student signing the attendance sheet for a classmate.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Punishing students unequally (i.e. based on likeability, lecturers' mood, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Plagiarizing research.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Submitting a manuscript to two or more journals in violation of journal policy.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Falsifying documentation for research grants.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Falsifying research data.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Presenting the same research to more than one regional or annual meeting (against meeting policy).	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Padding an expense account.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Attending a meeting at university expense and not substantively participating (most of the time spent sight-seeing, etc).	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Neglecting university responsibilities due to outside employment.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Using student assistants for personal work (e.g., running errands).	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Canceling office hours excessively.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Accepting money or gifts for grades.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Dating a student in his or her class.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer's discipline.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment.	1	2	3	4	5

33.	Allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgment.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Canceling classes when the faculty member is not ill and has no other University related commitments.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Using university equipment for personal activities.	1	2	3	4	5

### SECTION C

	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
38.	I believe that the lecturers' actions can influence the overall perceptions on how ethical the university is.				12345
39.	I believe that the university's ethical practices will influence my personal ethical values.				12345
40.	I believe the university's leaders (vice chancellors, top management) frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions.				12345
41.	I believe the faculty (deans, head of departments, lecturers) frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions.				12345

*Thank You For Your Time And Co-Operation.*

### **SECTION A**

Please tick and fill in where appropriate :

1. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. Race: ☐ Malay ☐ Chinese ☐ Indian ☐ Others
3. Religion: ☐ Islam ☐ Buddhism ☐ Christianity ☐ Hindu  
☐ Others: (state) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Level of education : 

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

 Degree  
Master  
PhD
5. Name of faculty: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Number of years in teaching and/or lecturing: \_\_\_\_\_

### **SECTION B**

Please circle appropriate answer based on the scale below:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I believe that the lecturers' actions can influence the overall perceptions on how ethical the university is.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I believe that the university's ethical practices will influence my personal ethical values.                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I believe the university's leaders (vice chancellors, top management) frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I believe the faculty (deans, head of departments, lecturers) frequently reinforce the organization's ethical positions.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

### **SECTION C**

Please circle the degree of ethicalness and the propensity of doing on each action based on the scale of:

Part

<b>I</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Totally Ethical</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Slightly Unethical</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Moderately Unethical</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Moderately to Extremely Unethical</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Extremely Unethical</b>
<b>II</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Never</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Once or twice</b>	<b>3</b> <b>More than twice</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Frequent</b>	
<b>III</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Very unlikely</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Unlikely</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Likely</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Very Likely</b>	
<b>IV</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Very unlikely</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Unlikely</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Likely</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Very likely</b>	

	<b>I</b>					<b>II</b>				<b>III</b>				<b>IV</b>			
<b>Actions/situations</b>	<b>Do you think the act is ethical?</b>					<b>Have you done it before?</b>				<b>Would you do it if were to be in the situation?</b>				<b>Would your colleague do it?</b>			
Giving easy tests or courses to ensure popularity.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Accepting publishers' monetary rebate for adopting publishers' text books.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Using profanity/offensive words in lectures.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Having an intimate relationship with a student.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Teaching material that the lecturers have not really mastered.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

<b>Actions/situations</b>	<b>Do you think the act is ethical?</b>	<b>Have you done it before?</b>	<b>Would you do it if were to be in the situation?</b>	<b>Would your colleague do it?</b>
Not giving graduate student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justified co-authorship.	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status.	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Presenting the same research to more than one regional or annual meeting (against meeting policy).	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Padding an expense account.	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Attending a meeting at university expense and not substantively participating (most of the time spent sight-seeing, etc).	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Neglecting university responsibilities due to outside employment.	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Using university equipment for personal activities.	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Using student assistants for personal work (e.g., running errands).	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Cancelling office hours excessively.	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Accepting money or gifts for grades.	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Dating a student in his or her class.	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4
Dating a student not in his or her class who is not majoring in the lecturer's discipline.	1    2    3    4    5	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4	1    2    3    4



<b>Actions/situations</b>	<b>Do you think the act is ethical?</b>	<b>Have you done it before?</b>	<b>Would you do it if were to be in the situation?</b>	<b>Would your colleague do it?</b>
Allowing a relative or friend in class and giving them preferential treatment.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Allowing a student assistant to grade non-objective exams and/or written assignments that require significant judgment.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Cancelling classes when the faculty member is not ill and has no other University related commitments.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Using outdated text to avoid the effort necessary to revise notes, etc.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Falsifying activity reports that are utilized by his or her institution for raises, promotion, or tenure evaluations	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

Reason(s) if any answer(s) in Part II is either 2,3 or 4:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I think the action is ethical.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I think the action is ethical since everyone is doing it.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I did it since everyone is doing it although the action is unethical.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I was under pressure.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I had no choice.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I did it since no penalty has ever been imposed although the action is unethical.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other reason(s): _____

---

*Thank You For Your Time And Co-Operation.*

## **REFERENCES**

1. Barcena, F. and Gil, F. (1993). *The Ethical Dimension Of Teaching: A Review And A Proposal*. Journal of Moral Education. Vol. 22. Issue 3, p. 241.
2. Beauchamp, Tom L., and Bowie, Norman E., (1993). *Ethical Theory and Business*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
3. Berry, H. A. and L. A. Chisholm: 1999, *Service-Learning in Higher Education Around the World: An Initial Look*. The International Partnership for Service-Learning, New York, New York, pp. 10–11, 12, 14, 19.
4. Betz, M., O'Connell, L. and Shepard, M. (1989). *Gender Difference in Proclivity for Unethical Behaviour*. Journal of Business Ethics 8, 321-324.
5. Bickel, J. (1993). *Promoting Medical Students' Ethical Development: A Resource Guide*. Washington D.C. Office Of Educational Research And Improvement.
6. Bowie, Norman E., and Freeman, Edward R., (1993). *Ethics and Agency Theory – An Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
7. Bruhn, J.G., Zajac, G., Ali A. Al-Kazemi, Loren D.P. Jr. (2002). *Moral Positions And Academic Conduct*. The Journal of Higher Education. Columbus. Jul/Aug. 2002. Vol. 73 Issue 4.
8. *Code of Ethics For Educators*. Georgia Professional Standards Commission Rule. July 1999.
9. Cottell, Philip G., Jr and Perlin, T. M. (1990), *A Practical Guide For Professionals – Accounting Ethics*. Quorum Books, USA.
10. Crown, D.F. and Spiller, M.S. (1997). *Faculty Responsibilities In Dealing With Collegiate Cheating: A Student Development Perspective*. Teaching business ethics 1: 117-130.
11. Curtin University. (2001). *Power and Responsibility: Practical Ethics in the life of a University. Ethics, Equity and Social Justice*.
12. Etzioni, A. (1988). *The Moral Dimension – Towards A New Economics*. The Free Press, Macmillan.

13. Geiger, M A. and O'Connell, B.T. (1999). *Accounting Student Ethical Perceptions: An Analysis Of Training And Gender Effects*. Teaching Business Ethics. Vol. 2: 371-388.
14. Gershaw D.A. (1997). *Ethics In Teaching*. A Line of Life.
15. Gilligan, C. (1982). *In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory And Women's Development*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.
16. Goodlad, J.I. (1990). *The Occupation Of Teaching In Schools*. In Vargas, R.A.C. (2001). *The Moral Profession: A Study of Moral Development and professional Ethics of Faculty*. PhD. Dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.
17. Hauptman, R. (2002). *Dishonesty In The Academy*. Academe. Nov./Dec. 2002.
18. <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v48/i36/36a04501.htm> 5 June 2002
19. <http://facultyweb.cortland.edu/andersmd/KOHL/kidmoral.HTML>
20. <http://www.aggelia.com/htdocs/kohlberg.shtml>
21. <http://www.bus.ualberta.ca>
22. <http://www.nd.edu/~rbarger/kohlberg.html>
23. <http://www3.azwestern.edu/psy/dgershaw/loI/EthicsInTeaching.html>
24. Kantrowitz, B., McGinn, D., Pierce, E. and Check, E. (2000). *When Teachers Are Cheaters*. Newsweek. Vol. 135, Issue 135.
25. Kerr, C. (1994). *Higher Education Cannot Escape History: Issues For The Twenty-First Century*. New York: State University of New York Press.
26. Labi, N., Hylton, H., Nordan, D. and Sieger, M. (1999). *When Teachers Cheat*. Time. Vol. 154. Issue 25 p. 86.
27. Laney, J.T. (1991). *Can The Humanities Still Humanize Higher Education?* In. D.L. Thompson (Ed.). *Moral Values and Higher Education*. Albany New York: State University of New York Press.
28. Lisman, C.D. (1996). *The Curricular Intergration of Ethics*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
29. Litwack, L. (2003). *Ethics For Educators*. International Journal of Reality Therapy. Fall 2003. Vol. 23. No. 1.

30. Locke, J. (1975). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited with an introduction, critical apparatus and glossary by Peter H. Widditch, Oxford at The Clarendon Press.
31. Lopez, L. (2002). *Business Ethics Must Be Lived, Not Taught*.
32. Malinowski, C. and K.A. Berger (1996). *Undergraduates Students Attitudes About Hypothetical Marketing Dilemmas*. Journal Of Business Ethics 15.
33. Marshall, L.L., Campbell, D. and Hogan, E.A. (1998). *Business Students' Perceptions Of Potential Ethical Dilemmas Faced By Faculty*. Teaching Business Ethics. Vol: 1.
34. Mc Bee, M.L. (1982). *Moral Development: From Direction To Dialogue*. NASPA Journal. 20(1).
35. McNeel, S.P. (1994). *College Teaching And Student Moral Development*. In Vargas, R.A.C. (2001). *The Moral Profession: A Study of Moral Development and professional Ethics of Faculty*. PhD. Dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.
36. Merritt, S. (1991). *Marketing Ethics And Education: Some Empirical Findings*. Journal Of Business Ethics 10.
37. Milem, J.F., Berger, J.B. and Dey, E.L. (2000). *Faculty Time Allocation: A Study Of Change Over Twenty Years*. Journal of Higher Education, 71.
38. Mintz, Steven M. (1995). *Virtue Ethics And Accounting Education*. Issues in Accounting Education. Fall95, Vol. 10, Issue 2 *Business Source Premier*.
39. Morgan, B.L. and Korschgen, A.J. (2001). *The Ethics Of Faculty Behaviour: Students' And Professors' Views*. College Student Journal, Sept. 2001. Vol. 35 Issue 3.
40. N.A. (2003). *Indonesian Educators Plagued By Lack Of Ethics, Plagiarism*. Jakarta Post (Indonesia). 07/05/2003.
41. O'Clock, P., Okleshen, M. (1993). *A Comparison of Ethical Perceptions of Business and Engineering Majors*. Journal of Business Ethics. Sept. 1993.
42. O'Connell, D. W. (1998). *From the Universities to the Marketplace: The Business Ethics*. Journey. Journal of Business Ethics 17, 1617–1622.

43. O'Neil, R. (1983). *Ethical Responsibility of Faculty*. In M.C. Baca & R.H. Stein (Eds).
44. Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How College Affects Students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
45. Ponemon, L. A. (1990). *Ethical Judgements in Accounting – A Cognitive Developmental Perspective*. Critical Perspectives on Accounting. Vol 1 No.2, June 1990.
46. Ponemon, L.A. (1992). *Ethical Reasoning and Selection*. Accounting, Organizations and Society, Vol 17 No 3/4.
47. *Professional Code of Ethics For Staffs*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. 2001.
48. Ross, W.D. (1978). *Kant's Ethical Theory*. Greenwood Press, USA.
49. Roworth, W.W (2002). *Professional Ethics Day By Day*. Journal of High Education. July – August 2002.
50. Scales, R.F. (2002). *Ethics of Teaching: Beliefs and Behaviours of Community College Faculty*. PhD Dissertation. University of North Texas.
51. Schulte, L.E., Brown, R.D. and Wise, S.L. (1991). *The Development And Validation Of The Ethical Climate Index For Graduate And Professional School Programs*. Research In Higher Education.
52. Smith, R.A. (1996). *Reflecting On The Ethics And Values Of Our Practice*. In Bruhn, J.G., Zajac, G., Ali A. Al-Kazemi, Loren D.P. Jr. (2002). *Moral Positions And Academic Conduct*. The Journal of Higher Education. Columbus. Jul/Aug. 2002. Vol. 73 Issue 4.
53. Keith-Spiegel, P.K., Tabachnik, B. and Allen, M. (1993). *Ethics In Academia: Students' Views of Professors' Actions*. Ethics and Behaviour Journal. Vol. 3 Issue 2.
54. Keith-Spiegel, P.K., Wittig, A. and Tabachnik, B. (1997). *Do Honors Students Hold Professors To Higher Ethical Standards?* (unpublished). California State University, Northridge.
55. Statement of Professional Ethics and Statement On Plagiarism of The American Association of University Professors. 1987.

56. Tabachnick, B.G., Keth-Spiegel, P.C. and Pope, K.S. (1991). *Ethics of Teaching: Beliefs and Behaviours of Psychologists As Educators*. American Psychologist, 46.
57. Vargas, R.A.C. (2001). The Moral Profession: A Study of Moral Development and Professional Ethics of Faculty. PhD Dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.
58. Wright, M. (1995). *Can Moral Judgement And Ethical Behaviour Be Learned?* Management Decision. Vol 33 No 10, 1995, pp 17-28.