Ethical Issues in University Teaching: Some University Teachers' Perceptions and Practices

NAJNIN JAHAN
Bangladesh Open University, Gazipur, Bangladesh

and

MD. SERAZUL ISLAM
Bangladesh Open University, Gazipur, Bangladesh

Abstract

The present study is aimed at investigating what Bangladeshi university teachers think about and what they practice on ethical issues that arise in the process of teaching. A descriptive survey design was used for this study in which 90 teachers took part and submitted completed questionnaires. In the selection of the sample population, simple random sampling was used. The data were analysed using percentages and a central score median. The results of the study show that almost all selected teachers in Bangladesh had positive or favourable perceptions about ethical issues in teaching but ethics remained by and large absent in some of the teachers' behaviour and practices.

Keywords: Ethics, Perceptions, Practices, University teachers.

Introduction

Ethics is a branch of philosophy which deals with rules of human conduct from a moral point of view. Broadly speaking, ethics address issues of morality such as good and evil, right and wrong, virtue and vice and justice. Therefore, it is also sometimes called moral philosophy. In this study, ethics means a study of the rights and duties of educational stakeholders, teachers and students in particular; the moral rules that they apply in making decisions; and the nature of the relationship between teachers and students. In educational institutions, particularly in universities, it is expected that teachers respect the rights, status and dignity of their colleagues, students, staff and others with whom they interact.

Descriptive ethics is one of the main branches of ethics. A form of empirical research, this branch aims to uncover people's beliefs about what is right and what is

actions a society condemns or punishes by law. The present study reveals teachers' ethical perceptions and practices in Bangladesh. Ethical behaviour also connotes how an individual conducts himself or herself according to what is deemed appropriate by society.

An ethical issue arises in a situation when there is a conflict between two or more parties where one benefits at the expense of the other. It may also arise in a situation where there are moral rules or when at least one rule is violated. In the present study, ethical questions in education were mainly addressed in violating rules or disciplines at two different levels—the teacher (faculty) level and the student (learner) level. The subject matter of this paper is the first level and it focuses on the perceptions, practices and experiences of teachers about their behaviour.

As per statistics from the Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics (BANBEIS), in 2011 there were 31 public universities including the National University and 51 private universities for higher education in Bangladesh. Although these institutions had qualified teachers and mentioned some codes of ethical issues (confidentiality, sexual harassment, discrimination and academic dishonesty) in their policies, it would not be an exaggeration to say that some of the teachers inadvertently or advertently committed unethical activities in teaching and evaluating students, dealing with their colleagues, students and others, and even in doing research.

In Bangladesh and also elsewhere in the world a number of studies have been done on ethics and ethical issues in different areas. However, very few of these focus on ethical issues in education and no specific studies have been done on ethical issues in university teaching, especially in Bangladesh. The present study is an attempt to bridge this gap.

Literature review

This section concentrates on reviewing the issues involved in the teaching process in universities in the backdrop of ethical issues being concerned with the ideas of right / wrong, duties / obligations and rights / responsibilities.

Ethics in a university

In a higher educational institution, especially in a university, ethics can play a vital role in building an ethical environment with morally developed and ethically strong communities. If the stakeholders (teachers, officers, staff members, guardians and others) involved in university education are ethical, the system that they develop and the practices that they follow are also expected to be ethical. Therefore, an ethical university teaches students ethics and values and thereby tries to be a model university. It strives for the all-round development of students (emotional, moral and physical) and it makes students ethical individuals and useful members of the society in which it disseminates knowledge. In other words, a university with ethics can lay the foundation for living ethically.

O'Neil (1983: 38) 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.' Academicians are, therefore, expected to exhibit a higher degree of professionalism and to abide by a strict code of ethics as compared to other professions. From an ethical point of view, as an institution a university provides normative guidance,

standards for behavior and goals for policy and practices at all levels (Saat et al. 2004). In their study on institutional culture and ethics, Smith and Reynolds (1990) direct their attention to the active participation of a university in a community's, and even in a nation's, civic life by fostering ethical behaviour. According to them to meet these expectations, universities themselves should conduct their affairs in the highest ethical manner. With regard to the ethical responsibility of a university, O'Connell (1998: 1617) states, 'Our task in universities is not only to teach ethics and values for the marketplace but to model these values ourselves as we fulfil our own moral responsibility as educators in the universities where our students begin the business ethics journey in the first place.'

Ethics in teaching

Teaching is an educating or instructing activity that imparts knowledge or a skill. In this activity practitioners are expected to uphold ethical principles as their students are impressionable and constantly learning from their actions and decisions. The fundamental responsibilities of a university teacher include constructing courses and classroom environments that encourage learning, evaluating learning fairly and treating students respectfully. Ethical teaching means engaging in behaviours that meet these responsibilities in ways that are expected by the students, the institution and the discipline (Keith-Spiegel et al. 2002). According to them, ethical teaching includes paying attention so as to avoid actions or inactions that may cause students educational or emotional harm. The responsibilities that they list form the foundational elements of ethical behaviour in teaching and are embedded within the ethical codes and principles for teachers. Unfortunately, like most ethical standards, these codes only provide general guidelines for ethical teaching.

In this regard, Barcena and Gil (1993) emphasize ethical control over teaching and interaction with human beings. The degree of ethicalness of an individual can be found in the complex interaction between his stage of moral development and several moderating variables including his characteristics, the organization's structured design, the organization's culture and the intensity of the ethical issues involved. Murray et al. (1996) provide a set of basic ethical principles in university teaching. These include competence in course content, pedagogical competence, dealing with sensitive or discomforting topics, the intellectual development of students, avoiding dual relationships with students, maintaining confidentiality, respecting colleagues and a valid assessment of students.

With respect to morality and values, teachers should be role models for students. Vargas (2001) in a study on teachers' moral development and professional ethics and points out that teachers' behaviour, attitudes, values and priorities were the most powerful factors in Their being role models for students and also in the transmission of values to them. Many times while performing their academic duties both teachers and students make moral judgments and express their values. Normally students cannot be expected to show a higher degree of ethicalness than their teachers if their relations with their teachers are strong (Saatet al. 2004).

Viewing a teacher as a moral agent, Buzzelli and Johnston (2002: 125) say, 'Teaching is an activity involving a deep awareness of the significance of one's choices and how those choices influence the development and well-being of others. An awareness of

the moral significance of one's work enlarges the understanding of that work.' Teachers can cultivate a degree of awareness by exemplifying moral and ethical values and principles in their own actions.

Campbell (2003) in her famous book *The Ethical Teacher* gives arguments in favour of the significance of applied ethics in the teaching profession. According to her a teacher is considered to be ethical if she makes ethical and moral decisions, possesses more heightened awareness and sensitivity to the decisions, instils ethics and morals in students and colleagues and helps professionalize the field of teaching. She, however, also found that most teachers are not aware of the ethical decisions that they make on a daily basis. She argues that ethical knowledge can provide the basis for a renewed professionalism in teaching. She treats a teacher as a moral agent who is engaged in ethical professional conduct and as a moral educator who teaches students the same core virtues and principles that s/he strives to uphold in practice.

Almost all scholars emphasize teachers' ethical responsibilities but many university teachers are engaging in unethical behaviour in the form of breaking their commitments to their profession and to students. In curriculum development, classroom teaching, conducting examinations and student evaluation, publishing results, student-teacher interaction, research and publications, teachers have traditionally adopted unfair means whether intentionally or unintentionally. The present study is an endeavour to measure the degree of ethicalness of teachers' behaviour in addition to their perceptions.

Objectives of the study

The specific objectives of the study were:

(i) To disclose selected university teachers' profiles;

(ii) To enumerate the key ethical issues involved in the university teaching process;

(iii) To portray what university teachers perceive as ethical issues in the teaching process; and

(iv) To measure the degree of ethics that the selected teachers maintained in their teaching practices.

Materials and methods

This study was designed as a descriptive investigation of teachers' perceptions in three public and three private universities of their activities in the teaching-learning process in Bangladesh. To this end, a survey questionnaire was administered to 90 randomly selected teachers. Questionnaires were distributed and collected via personal contacts.

Before the final collection of data, the questionnaire was validated by taking comments and criticisms from senior colleagues, conducting a pilot survey with 10 teachers who had not been included in the sample and reviewing relevant literature (Marshall et al. 1998; Morgan and Korschgen 2001; Scales 2002; Tabachnick et al. 1991; Vargas 2001). The survey instrument used for the respondents consisted of two sections. While the first section of the instrument dealt with the teachers' background information, the second section was meant for identifying the university teachers' perceptions on and practices of ethical issues (53 items). The questions in the second section were 5-point Likert-style questions. The

reliability of the items in the questionnaire was measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient which at 0.8751 was within the acceptable limit as per Nunnally (1978). For collection of secondary data books, journals, unpublished research reports, websites and other publications were consulted. The data were analysed and described with frequency distributions, percentages and a central score or median.

Results and discussion

Sample teachers' profiles

Table 1 shows that more than one half (58.8 per cent) of the sample teachers were comparatively young as they were not more than 35 years old. The average age of the teachers was 36.28 years. The reasons for this might be the dominance of groups of young and middle aged teachers in private universities; 74.4 per cent of the randomly selected teachers were male. This shows that the teacher community is male dominated. With regard to the educational levels of the sample teachers as shown in Table 1, the study found that more than half of the teachers (55.6 per cent) did not have degrees above the masters' level. The distribution of years of teaching among the respondent teachers shows that around 72 per cent of them had been teaching for not more than 10 years (the average experience was nine years). Nearly 50 per cent of the sample teachers were lecturers. These figures indicate that the selected private universities were young in age and did not have enough senior teachers requiring freedom for decision making, relaxation, job security and other non-financial facilities which don't exist at the selected private universities.

Table 1: Profiles of sample university teachers

Profiles of sample teachers	No. of teachers	Percentage
Age (in years)		
Up to 30	31	34.4
31-35	22	24.4
36-40	13	14.4
41 and above	24	26.7
Total	90	100.0
Mean age	36.28 years	
Sex		
Male	67	74.4
Female	23	25.6
Total	90	100.0
Educational qualifications		
Masters	50	55.6
M.Phil / MS	18	20.0
Ph.D.	21	23.3

Post-Doc	1	1.1
Total	90	100.0
Teaching position		
Lecturer	44	48.9
Assistant Professor	21	23.3
Associate Professor	7	7.8
Professor	18	20.0
Total	90	100.0
Previous teaching experience		
Up to 5 years	40	44.4
6 to 10 years	24	26.7
11 years or more	26	28.9
Total	90	100.0
Mean experience	9 years	

Source: Field survey.

University teachers' ethical perceptions and practices

The present study was undertaken to examine what the selected teachers believed and what they actually did about the 53 behaviours (see Table 2). The study had questions relating to 10 distinct areas of the teaching process—course content (syllabus), preparation of lecture notes, taking classes in the classroom, question setting, student evaluation, education environment, research and publication issues, financial and material transactions, social relationships with students and sexual relationships with students and colleagues.

Respondents were asked to respond to the items using a scale from 1 to 5 where I was completely ethical, 2 was slightly ethical, 3 was not sure, 4 was slightly unethical and 5 was completely unethical. The study found that the participants reported only three actions as ethical—encouraging competition among students, suspending offending students from the class and always insisting on rules, discipline and good behaviour. Among these behaviours, teachers claimed that they spent the most time in creating competition among their students. Out of the 53 selected behaviours, 38 were perceived as completely unethical and were found to be rare among university teachers' practices. The top ranked (see percentages in Table 2) five unethical behaviours (as perceived by more than 90 per cent of the teachers) were: (i) accepting money or gifts from students for grades; (ii) deliberate or repeated teasing of female students; (iii) ignoring strong evidence of cheating; (iv) beating or affronting junior colleagues / falsifying research data (same central score); and (v) engaging in sexual relationships with another faculty member / making negative comments in the classroom about other teachers.

Interestingly the study also found that failure at maintaining scheduled class time, using the same lecture notes while re-teaching a course, receiving mobile phone calls during teaching hours and having intimate relationships with students were perceived by teachers as unethical behaviours (median score of ≥4) but they had engaged in these at least once in their

teaching tenures.

Teachers often engaged in behaviours which they were somewhat indifferent to when it came to judging their ethicalness (these behaviours included teaching topics significantly different from the syllabus, always giving lots of assignments and providing students with notes directly from reference books).

Conclusion

From the preceding discussion it can be concluded that though there are no prescribed ethical codes of conduct, university teachers in Bangladesh are aware of or are able to distinguish between ethical and unethical behaviour. Because of an outdated university ordinance, long tradition, no or low penalty, the existing educational environment, teacher-student relationships, etc. teachers sometimes adopt unfair means in teaching and in interacting with students and colleagues. The only areas of agreement among a majority of the teachers who formed a part of the survey was that behaviours that guide students like motivating them about rules, discipline and good behaviours are ethical. Almost all the teachers were less likely to believe that taking advantage of students financially or otherwise, sparing students because of misconduct or any other offences and the act of plagiarizing should be tolerated as ethical.

The practices of a majority of the university teachers represented in the study are consistent with their perceptions about ethical and unethical behaviour. In other words, if they believe a behaviour to be unethical, most of them will not practice it. On the other hand, if they believe that a particular behaviour is ethical they will more often than not engage in it. Some teaching practices (cutting class hours short by being late or leaving early, receiving phone calls during class time, using the same lecture notes without updating them) followed by most of the teachers in the selected universities, particularly public universities were the opposite of their perceptions. In a university, members (of the Board of Governors or the Syndicate, administrators, staff, faculty and students) are expected to honour the principles of integrity, natural justice and due process in their handling of all issues. Unfortunately, the selected universities did not have handbooks to guide teachers on appropriate behaviour in relation to the university. Though the university ordinance, service rules, university acts, etc. act as a guide for ethical behaviour, these are not enough. Hence, although the results cannot be generalized for all university teachers, there is evidence that punitive measures are desirable where professionals have failed to honour written or unwritten ethical standards. A further study covering other ethical issues and other universities may be conducted to explore the scenario as a whole.

Teachers' Behaviors	Teachers' Perceptions					Central Score	Teachers' Practices					Central Score
	Number of teachers						Number of teachers					
	Completely Ethical	Slightly Ethical	Not Sure	Slightly Unethical	Completely Unethical		Forgotten	Never	Once or twice	More than twice	Always	
Taking a class without adequate preparation in subject matter.	1 (1.1)	7 (7.8)	2 (2.2)	28 (31.1)	52 (57.8)	5	3 (3.3)	46 (51.1)	40 (44.4)	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	2
Not maintaining scheduled class time.	0 (0.0)	2 (2.2)	2 (2.2)	39 (43.3)	47 (52.2)	5	1 (1.1)	34 (37.8)	51 (56.7)	4 (4.4)	0 (0.0)	3
Using the same lecture notes when re-teaching a course.	1 (1.1)	32 (35.6)	7 (7.8)	31 (34.4)	19 (21.1)	4	4 (4.4)	29 (32.2)	33 (36.7)	18 (20.0)	6 (6.7)	3
Ignoring a student signing the attendance sheet for a classmate.	2 (2.2)	5 (5.6)	2 (2.2)	18 (20.0)	63 (70.0)	5	7 (7.8)	67 (74.4)	13 (14.4)	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	2
Dating a student.	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (5.6)	3 (3.3)	82 (91.1)	5	4 (4.4)	85 (94.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	2
Cancelling classes without proper reasons.	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	12 (31.3)	76 (84.4)	5	7 (7.8)	74 (82.2)	9 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2
Teaching on topics significantly different from the syllabus.	18 (20.0)	25 (27.8)	10 (11.1)	15 (16.7)	22 (24.4)	3	3 (3.3)	35 (38.9)	40 (44.4)	8 (8.9)	4 (4.4)	3
Discussing personal problems with students.	5 (5.6)	24 (26.7)	14 (15.6)	14 (15.6)	33 (36.7)	4	3 (3.3)	51 (56.7)	31 (34.4)	4 (4.4)	1 (1.1)	2
Receiving mobile phone calls during teaching hours.	2 (2.2)	13 (14.4)	4 (4.4)	35 (38.9)	36 (40.0)	4	2 (2.2)	31 (34.4)	51 (56.7)	4 (4.4)	2 (2.2)	3
Always insisting on rules, discipline and good behaviour.	35 (38.9)	39 (43.3)	6 (6.7)	7 (7.8)	3 (3.3)	2	0 (0.0)	14 (15.6)	26 (28.9)	9 (10.0)	41 (45.6)	4
Always giving lots of assignments.	13 (14.4)	31 (34.4)	11 (12.2)	24 (26.7)	11 (12.2)	3	0 (0.0)	30 (33.3)	32 (35.6)	15 (16.7)	13 (14.4)	3

Only paying attention to favourite students.	6 (6.7)	11 (12.2)	2 (2.2)	17 (18.9)	54 (60.0)	5	1 (1.1)	62 (68.9)	19 (21.1)	4 (4.4)	4 (4.4)	2
Punishing students unequally based on political and other backgrounds.	0 (0.0)	4 (4.4)	3 (3.3)	7 (7.8)	76 (84.4)	5	1 (1.1)	84 (93.3)	5 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2
Bringing up certain class-related topics that are sexually or racially charged.	10 (11.1)	25 (27.8)	6 (6.7)	12 (13.3)	37 (41.1)	4	6 (6.7)	48 (53.3)	22 (24.4)	7 (7.8)	7 (7.8)	2
Providing students with copying notes directly from reference books.	8 (8.9)	30 (33.3)	12 (13.3)	20 (22.2)	20 (22.2)	3	0 (0.0)	36 (40.0)	40 (44.4)	9 (10.0)	5 (5.6)	3
Scolding students when they ask for any explanations.	0 (0.0)	4 (4.4)	2 (2.2)	8 (8.9)	76 (84.4)	5	7 (7.8)	76 (84.4)	5 (5.6)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	2
Deliberately or repeatedly teasing students, especially female students.	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	3 (3.3)	86 (95.6)	5	1 (1.1)	87 (96.7)	2 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2
Encouraging competition among students.	80 (88.9)	6 (6.7)	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	1	0 (0.0)	6 (6.7)	1 (1.1)	8 (8.9)	75 (83.3)	5
Using profanity in lectures when teaching.	0 (0.0)	8 (8.9)	4 (4.4)	7 (7.8)	71 (78.9)	5	3 (3.3)	74 (82.2)	9 (10.0)	2 (2.2)	2 (2.2)	2
Suspending offending students from the class.	19 (21.1)	33 (36.7)	6 (6.7)	16 (17.8)	16 (17.8)	2	5 (5.6)	37 (41.1)	30 (33.3)	10 (11.1)	8 (8.9)	3
Making negative comments in the classroom about other teachers.	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	5 (5.6)	83 (92.2)	5	5 (5.6)	79 (87.8)	5 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	2
Discussing personal political views in the classroom.	5 (5.6)	10 (11.1)	4 (4.4)	11 (12.2)	60 (66.7)	5	2 (2.2)	66 (73.3)	18 (20.0)	1 (1.1)	3 (3.3)	2
Not submitting question papers in time.	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.2)	20 (22.2)	68 (75.6)	5	2 (2.2)	73 (81.1)	15 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2
Giving easy tests to ensure popularity.	5 (5.6)	16 (17.8)	3 (3.3)	11 (12.2)	55 (61.1)	5	3 (3.3)	57 (63.3)	22 (24.4)	2 (2.2)	6 (6.7)	2
Ignoring strong evidence of cheating (copying in an exam).	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	4 (4.4)	85 (94.4)	5	2 (2.2)	84 (93.3)	4 (4.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2
Being negligent in the evaluation of answer scripts.	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.2)	7 (7.8)	81 (90.0)	5	1 (1.1)	80 (88.9)	8 (8.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	2

Item												
Allowing students to receive phone calls during examination.	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	13 (14.4)	75 (83.3)	5	5 (5.6)	76 (84.4)	7 (7.8)	2 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	2
Doing private work (writing a letter, reading a newspaper, etc.) in the examination hall.	0 (0.0)	14 (15.6)	5 (5.6)	14 (15.6)	57 (63.3)	5	4 (4.4)	53 (58.9)	28 (31.1)	4 (4.4)	1 (1.1)	2
Having an intimate relationship with a student.	11 (12.2)	29 (32.2)	4 (4.4)	21 (23.3)	25 (27.8)	4	3 (3.3)	35 (38.9)	23 (25.6)	7 (7.8)	22 (24.4)	3
Sharing a confidential disclosure by a student with colleagues.	4 (4.4)	12 (13.3)	5 (5.6)	9 (10.0)	60 (66.7)	5	5 (5.6)	65 (72.2)	16 (17.8)	3 (3.3)	1 (1.1)	2
Ignoring / supporting unethical behaviour of colleagues.	0 (0.0)	11 (12.2)	2 (2.2)	10 (11.1)	67 (74.4)	5	2 (2.2)	72 (80.0)	13 (14.4)	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	2
Engaging in other institutions or universities during office hours.	1 (1.1)	7 (7.8)	2 (2.2)	14 (15.6)	66 (73.3)	5	1 (1.1)	73 (81.1)	11 (12.2)	3 (3.3)	2 (2.2)	2
Engaging in other institutions or universities after office hours.	55 (61.1)	13 (14.4)	6 (6.7)	8 (8.9)	8 (8.9)	1	1 (1.1)	33 (36.7)	21 (23.3)	15 (16.7)	20 (22.2)	3
Omitting significant negative information when writing a letter of recommendation for a student.	0 (0.0)	13 (14.4)	4 (4.4)	30 (33.3)	43 (47.8)	4	4 (4.4)	60 (66.7)	20 (22.2)	5 (5.6)	1 (1.1)	2
Attending a meeting at the university's expense and not substantively participating (most of the time spent sight-seeing, etc).	0 (0.0)	3 (3.3)	6 (6.7)	14 (15.6)	67 (74.4)	5	1 (1.1)	77 (85.6)	9 (10.0)	1 (1.1)	2 (2.2)	2
Using student assistance for personal work (computer compose, script evaluation of other universities, etc.).	0 (0.0)	22 (24.4)	3 (3.3)	19 (21.1)	46 (51.1)	5	0 (0.0)	52 (57.8)	34 (37.8)	3 (3.3)	1 (1.1)	2
Giving academic credit for student assistance.	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	3 (3.3)	2 (2.2)	84 (93.3)	5	1 (1.1)	83 (92.2)	4 (4.4)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	2
Accepting money or gifts for grades.	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.2)	88 (97.8)	5	2 (2.2)	87 (96.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	2
Using university equipment for personal activities.	0 (0.0)	13 (14.4)	5 (5.6)	18 (20.0)	54 (60.0)	5	0 (0.0)	59 (65.6)	23 (25.6)	3 (3.3)	5 (5.6)	2

Making transactions (lending, selling etc.) with students.	2 (2.2)	13 (14.4)	3 (3.3)	24 (26.7)	48 (53.3)	5	3 (3.3)	70 (77.8)	15 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.2)	2
Engaging in a sexual relationship with another faculty member.	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	5 (5.6)	83 (92.2)	5	0 (0.0)	84 (93.3)	4 (4.4)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.2)	2
Smoking or using other drugs in personal life.	4 (4.4)	5 (5.6)	4 (4.4)	14 (15.6)	63 (70.0)	5	2 (2.2)	70 (77.8)	7 (7.8)	3 (3.3)	7 (7.8)	2
Patronizing student politics.	2 (2.2)	7 (7.8)	5 (5.6)	12 (13.3)	64 (71.1)	5	0 (0.0)	80 (88.9)	9 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	2
Giving more marks to avoid negative evaluations from students.	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	7 (7.8)	82 (91.1)	5	3 (3.3)	81 (90.0)	5 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	2
Relaxing rules (late papers, attendance) in a student's favour.	6 (6.7)	21 (23.3)	1 (1.1)	19 (21.1)	43 (47.8)	4	0 (0.0)	52 (57.8)	26 (28.9)	6 (6.7)	6 (6.7)	2
Favouring students belonging to a particular party or group or religion or area.	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	11 (12.2)	77 (85.6)	5	1 (1.1)	77 (85.6)	11 (12.2)	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	2
Beating or affronting junior colleagues.	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	5 (5.6)	84 (93.3)	5	1 (1.1)	87 (96.7)	2 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2
Plagiarizing (copying without referencing from someone else's writing or speech) research.	1 (1.1)	4 (4.4)	2 (2.2)	6 (6.7)	77 (85.6)	5	0 (0.0)	86 (95.6)	3 (3.3)	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	2
Submitting a manuscript to two or more journals in violation of journal policy.	3 (3.3)	20 (22.2)	2 (2.2)	5 (5.6)	60 (66.7)	5	2 (2.2)	70 (77.8)	16 (17.8)	2 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	2
Falsifying research data.	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	4 (4.4)	84 (93.3)	5	1 (1.1)	89 (98.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2
Not giving student(s) co-authorship on publications when the student(s) contribution justifies it.	0 (0.0)	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	13 (14.4)	74 (82.2)	5	2 (2.2)	86 (95.6)	2 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2
Inappropriately giving a colleague a co-authorship status.	0 (0.0)	6 (6.7)	1 (1.1)	19 (21.1)	64 (71.1)	5	0 (0.0)	72 (80.0)	17 (18.9)	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	2
Presenting the same research paper (article) at more than one seminar.	1 (1.1)	15 (16.7)	5 (5.6)	16 (17.8)	53 (58.9)	5	0 (0.0)	71 (78.9)	17 (18.9)	2 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	2

Note: Figures in brackets indicate percentages to total.

Source: Field survey.

Works cited

Barcena, F. and F. Gil (1993), 'The ethical dimension of teaching: A review and a proposal',

> *Journal of Moral Education* 22(3): 241.

Buzzelli, C. A. and B. Johnston (2002), *The moral dimensions of teaching: Language, power, and culture in classroom interaction.* New York and London: Routledge Falmer.

Campbell, E. (2003), *The ethical teacher.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Keith-Spiegel, P., B. E., Whitley Jr., D. W. Balogh, D. V. Perkins and A. F. Wittig (2002),

> *The ethics of teaching: A casebook* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Marshall, L.L., D. Campbell and E.A. Hogan (1998), 'Business students' perceptions of potential ethical dilemmas faced by faculty', *Teaching Business Ethics* (1235–51.

Morgan, B.L. and A.J. Korschgen (2001), 'The ethics of faculty behaviour: Students' and professors' views', *College Student Journal* 35(3): 418–32.

Murray, H. et al. (1996), 'Reflecting on the practice of teaching: Ethical principles in university teaching', in *Teaching at the University of Manitoba: A handbook,* pp. 5.2– 5.8.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978), *Psychometric theory,* 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

O'Connell, D. W. (1998), 'From the universities to the marketplace: The business ethics',

> *Journal of Business Ethics* (17): 1617–22.

O'Neil, R. (1983), 'Ethical responsibility of faculty', in M.C. Baca and R.H. Stein (eds),

> *Ethical principles, practices, and problems in higher education*, pp. 37–44.

Saat, M.M., N.M. Jamal, and A. Othman (2004), Lecturers' and students' perceptions on ethics in academia and lecturer-student interaction, *Research Management Centre*, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, available at: http://eprints.utm.my/2745/1/71989.pdf.

Scales, R.F. (2002), 'Ethics of teaching: Beliefs and behaviours of community college faculty', Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Texas.

Smith, D.C. and C.H. Reynolds (1990), Institutional culture and ethics, in W. W. May (ed.),

Ethics and higher education. New York, NY: American Council on Education and Macmillan, pp. 21–31.

Tabachnick, B.G., P. Keith-Spiegel, and K.S. Pope (1991), 'Ethics of teaching: Beliefs and behaviors of psychologists as educators', *American Psychologist* (46): 506–15.

Vargas, R.A.C. (2001), 'The moral profession: A study of moral development and professional ethics of faculty', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.