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ABSTRACT

With public criticism of American higher education on the rise, it is prudent for those in the academy to reflect upon their responsibilities to their students. Of particular salience is an examination of what constitutes misconduct within the faculty role. This dissertation reports the results of a study designed to identify what nursing educators believe to be the violation of normative teaching behaviors. A sequential explanatory mixed methods design was utilized to develop an understanding of the actions that constitute academic impropriety. The College Teaching Behaviors Inventory, a survey instrument designed by Braxton and Bayer (1999), was distributed to deans and faculty members of all associate degree nursing programs accredited by the National League for Nursing Accreditation Commission in the United States. Results reveal that nursing educators (n=604) identified nine patterns of normative behavior categorized as either inviolable or admonitory based upon the degree of sanction required if the norm should be violated. A discussion of each of the identified norms with fictional vignettes is provided. This study validates the need for critically reflective teaching that is conscious of the special nature of the teacher-student relationship. The results of this research have implications for higher education relative to issues of student retention, institutional policy regarding ethical faculty conduct, and preparation of graduate students for teaching in the college classroom.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

To teach in a manner that respects and cares for the souls of our students is essential if we are to provide the necessary conditions where learning can most deeply and intimately begin (hooks, 1994).

It is the purpose of this dissertation to present the findings of a study conducted to explore what undergraduate educators in associate degree nursing programs believe are normative teaching behaviors. This chapter will provide a background for the study, specify the research questions, describe the study’s significance, present an overview of the methodology used, identify limitations, and define key terms.

Background for the Study

Millennia ago, Socrates imparted to those he taught the need to critically reflect upon their personal beliefs and practices. He also demonstrated by his words and actions that the responsibility of a teacher is to provide the student with the necessary tools and skills to become a critically reflective person (Baca & Stein, 1983). In so doing, he illustrated what has become a time-honored and special relationship between teacher and student. Often, those who teach enter into this activity with a desire to transmit knowledge to other human beings (Tom, 1984). Yet, effective teaching involves much more than mere transmission of information. It also includes eliciting ideas, imparting attitudes, encouraging imagination, modeling behavior, and caring (Teven & McCroskey, 1997). The context of the teacher-student relationship is value-laden and rich with social implications. Shulman (2002) asserted that there is a “pedagogical imperative” (p. vii) dictating that integrity in education exists only when teachers sincerely consider the impact of their work on students.

American higher education has long basked in the glow of public support and respect for its mission and its productivity in research (Callan & Finney, 2002). However, questions of
integrity in academe are on the rise. Violations of integrity range from student cheating on exams and plagiarizing, faculty engaged in research misconduct and sexual harassment of students, and administrators misappropriating funds and falsifying their vitas (Bruhn, Zajac, Al-Kazemi, & Prescott, 2002; Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). Coupled with this exposure of integrity issues is an increasingly prevalent societal expectation in the United States that a college education is necessary for a higher quality of life, personal empowerment, and the ability of this country to better compete in a global economy (Callan & Finney, 2002). Further compounding this is the reality of a current collegiate environment that is rapidly evolving with advances in technology and increasing student diversity (Austin, 2002). Such changes challenge faculty members to become even more responsive to the needs of the students. Two decades ago, Baca (1983) challenged the academy to consider that a wise and positive course of action for academics would be to raise issues of violation of academic integrity and moral concern “openly and aggressively” in order to “foster and patronize decision making enlightened by ethical reflection” (p. 10).

Indeed, it is argued that the work of the faculty is the heart of an academic institution’s fulfillment of its duty to society (Kennedy, 1997). Professors meet this academic duty through the production of scholarship and the teaching of students (Boyer, 1990; Shulman, 2002). Teaching involves not only development of the intellectual abilities of students, but also an impartation of values such as commitment to truth and objectivity and a respect for the viewpoint of others (Markie, 1994). Bruhn, Zajac, Al-Kazemi, & Prescott (2002) noted that if faculty intend to maintain credibility and public trust, they must themselves be models of responsibility and ethical behavior. College faculty members are held by society to high professional standards and expectations.
The very idea of professionalism connotes a relationship with society built upon trust (Abbott, 1983). Goode (1957) noted that educators are professionals and as such, carry an obligation to the public they serve. This ideal of service pervades to this day. In essence, the service obligation forms an unwritten, social compact where professionals agree to restrain self-interest, promote ideals of public service, and maintain high standards of performance, while society allows professionals autonomous self-regulation through peer review processes (Bruhn et al., 2002; Hamilton, 2002; Kezar, 2004; Sullivan, 2005; Wilensky, 1964). In many professions, such as law and medicine, this sense of obligation has been formalized by the development of a standardized code of conduct. Yet, no such universally accepted, formalized code exists in education. Explanations for this lack have been attributed to such factors as the autonomy of the professor, the presence and practice of academic freedom, and disciplinary differences (Birnbaum, 1988; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995).

Nursing, as one of the applied professional disciplines, is concerned with the integration and application of its content, theory, and practice dimensions in order to prepare graduates to begin professional practice at a basic level of competence (Stark, 1998). During the classroom and clinical experiences that comprise the nursing educational process, students have opportunity to interact daily with their instructors. It is during these interactions that the student of nursing is first exposed to the ethic of care that undergirds the practice of nursing (Gastmans, Dierckx de Casterle, & Schotsmans, 1998). According to Gastmans et al. (1998), how the teacher of nursing models that ethic of care has great potential to impact the students’ understanding of the nursing profession. Thus continues a cycle of professional socialization in which teachers and students pass down the expectations and norms of nursing practice (Austin, 2002; Braxton, 1991; Clark & Corcoran, 1986). In particular, the socialization of a nurse into a college faculty member has its roots in the graduate school experience and continues through engagement with the faculty role.
(Austin, 2002; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Wehrwein, 1996). As one gains experience as a faculty member, this experience has the potential to impact the teacher’s understanding and practice of what constitutes an ethical teacher-student relationship (Braxton & Bayer, 1999).

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

With public mistrust of higher education growing throughout the end of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first (Bruhn et al., 2002) and more frequent reports of professorial misconduct, (Anderson, Louis, & Earle, 1994; Braxton & Bayer, 1999; Fox & Braxton, 1994; Hackett, 1994), it is prudent to examine what constitutes impropriety in the teacher-student relationship, particularly as it relates to the teaching role. A review of research in the last two decades related to ethics and the professorial role reveals an emphasis on the philosophical and anecdotal, rather than empirical data gathering (Baumgarten, 1982; Bruhn et al., 2002; Dill, 1982; Hardy, 2002; Wehrwein, 1996; Wilson, 1982).

In one empirical study, Braxton and Bayer (1999) examined the issue of faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching and developed definitions of behavioral teaching norms accepted within the academy. Surveying professors within the four disciplines of biology, history, mathematics, and psychology, Braxton and Bayer identified seven patterns of inviolable norms and nine clusters of admonitory norms. Inviolable norms are defined as those that when violated, invoke a high degree of moral outrage demanding severe sanctions to be taken against the transgressor. Examples range from belittling students in front of other classmates to making negative comments about colleagues in front of students to sexual harassment. Violation of admonitory norms tends to create a lesser degree of indignation among faculty. Additionally, the faculty response to such infractions is less certain. Examples of admonitory norms include failure to update teaching techniques, unkempt appearance, and introducing personal opinion outside the realm of topics being discussed in class.
Suggesting that the academic discipline exerts a more powerful effect on deterring unethical teaching behavior than individual norm internalization, Braxton and Bayer called for additional research to examine other academic disciplines, particularly those that emphasize the application of knowledge to professional practice. The higher education literature provides validation for the differences in disciplinary cultures. Braxton and Hargens (1996) noted that there are profound and extensive differences among academic disciplines. Stark (1998) noted that each disciplinary field demonstrates variations in inquiry, teaching, assessment of student learning, and organizational structure. Corroborating such assertions, Braxton and Bayer found in their 1999 study that there were differences in the view of normative teaching behaviors among the four disciplines they studied. Of the sixteen normative behavior clusters identified, there was only consensus for three core norms among the four disciplines of biology, psychology, mathematics, and history. These norms were inattentive course planning, moral turpitude, and authoritarian classroom. Otherwise, there were variations in identification of norms among the disciplines with biologists expressing greater levels of disapproval for various behaviors than did psychologists, mathematicians, and historians.

Today, enrollment in colleges and universities is not increasing in the pure disciplines of the arts and sciences, but rather in programs designed to prepare students for either professional or occupational careers (Stark, 1998). This is especially true for nursing. With a current shortage of registered nurses that is expected to grow to 340,000 by the year 2021, efforts to recruit students to this field are being strenuously employed (AACN, 2007). Yet, research geared toward developing a clearer understanding of the dynamics of teaching and learning in the field of nursing is still limited.
Therefore, it is the purpose of this study to address the following questions:

1. To what extent do data obtained from associate degree nursing educators in the current study match the original findings of Braxton and Bayer (1999)?

2. What behaviors do undergraduate nursing faculty from associate degree programs identify as inviolable norms of teaching behavior?

3. What behaviors do undergraduate nursing faculty from associate degree programs identify as admonitory norms of teaching behavior?

4. How do educators from associate degree nursing programs describe the transgression of normative teaching behaviors?

Significance of the Study

Following the precedent set by Braxton and Bayer (1999), this study operationally replicated the original research conducted with the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory with a different population. Braxton and Bayer based their sampling of educators upon the widely accepted Biglan classification scheme of applied/pure, hard/soft, life/nonlife dimensions (Biglan, 1973a). Research conducted since the development of Biglan’s typology questions whether this model adequately describes the differences among the wide range of academic disciplines (Braxton & Hargens, 1996; Rhoades, 1991; Stark, 1998). Nursing is unique among the applied disciplines, not only for the predominance of females in the discipline, but also for the variety of educational paths it provides for students to enter the nursing profession. To become a registered nurse, students may choose between the hospital-based diploma program, the Associate of Science in nursing program, and the Bachelor of Science in nursing program. Of the three educational routes available to students pursuing nursing as a career, the associate degree is the most popular with over 137,000 students enrolled nationwide during 2006 (NLNAC, 2006). Because academic disciplinary differences abound and college enrollment in applied disciplines
continues to increase, it is salient to explore what educators within the applied discipline of nursing identify as the behavioral norms of the teacher-student relationship as they relate to the teaching role.

Overview of Methodology

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed methods design (Creswell, 2008). In the first phase of the research, a cross-sectional survey design utilizing the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI), developed by Braxton and Bayer (1999), was used. The survey was distributed to associate degree nursing educators in the United States in order to elicit an understanding of the attitudes and practices of these educators as related to behavioral norms. Data were analyzed with both descriptive statistics and confirmatory factor analysis, resulting in a list of inviolable and admonitory norms as identified by this sample of study participants.

In the second and qualitative phase of this study, participants were contacted to provide narratives of actual events they had experienced or observed involving transgression of normative teaching behaviors. Data obtained during this phase were synthesized into fictional vignettes in order to more richly illustrate the aspects of both inviolable and admonitory norms.

Limitations of the Study

A few methodological limitations should be noted. This study is based predominantly upon results of survey data which are self-reported and therefore prone to bias (Creswell, 2003; Rea & Parker, 2005). Because this study is an explanatory design, threats to internal validity do not pose as great a concern as if the design had been experimental; however, some threat does exist related to external validity and must be addressed. The construction of a list of all deans/directors of the NLNAC-accredited ASN program in the United States, rather than a complete list of all 7800 ASN educators in the U. S., contributes to a limitation in generalizing the results of this study to the entire population under study (Creswell, 2008).
Another limitation to this study relates to the limited reliability and validity data for the CTBI. Braxton and Bayer (1999) acknowledged that the CTBI is not “exhaustive of the universe of behaviors subject to normative criteria” (p. 156). The research conducted with the CTBI did not include applied disciplines; therefore, no normative preferences have previously been established for such fields.

Definition of Key Terms

In regard to the current study and for the purpose of clarification, the following terms are defined:

**Norms** – a set of informal rules that serve to regulate the behavior of a group of people bound by a common purpose (Feldman, 2001).

**Inviolable norm** – norm that when violated invokes a high degree of moral outrage demanding administrative sanctions to be taken against the transgressor (Braxton & Bayer, 1999).

**Admonitory norm** – norm that when violated evokes less indignation, but sanctioning action in such cases should be handled between professorial peers (Braxton & Bayer, 1999).

To properly contextualize this study, the major concepts of social norms of behavior, the teacher-student relationship, and the professional socialization of registered nurses and nurse educators as found in the literature are reviewed in the next chapter. Chapter 3 is a detailed description of the methodology used in the study, including the participants and the instrument used to collect the data. Results of the data analysis, together with a discussion of those results are reported in Chapter 4. The final chapter provides a summary of the study and implications for future research.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

It is the purpose of this study to examine the dynamic relationship between teacher and student, particularly as it relates to normative teaching behaviors in undergraduate nursing education. The major concepts to be addressed in this literature review are 1) social norms of behavior, 2) the teacher-student relationship, and 3) the professional socialization of registered nurses and nurse educators.

Social Norms of Behavior

What exactly constitutes ethical behavior is a long debated topic (Abbott, 1983; Campbell, 2000; Roworth, 2002). The impact of moral relativism has led people to believe that it is simply not possible to define what is and is not ethical because such matters are intensely personal and belong to an individual’s belief system (Campbell, 2000). Indeed, academicians often chafe at the questioning of morality or ethics within the academy, instead believing that such questions should not be raised outside the parameters of organized religion (Baca, 1983).

Yet, sociological studies support the idea that people convene into groups with common goals and communicate expected norms of behavior to members of the group (Feldman, 1984; Rossi & Berk, 1985).

In the mid twentieth century, French sociologist Emile Durkheim asserted that “it is not possible for a social function to exist without moral discipline (Durkheim, 1957), pp. 10-11). Within any society there are individuals who share the same ideas and interests apart from the rest of the population. Through mutual attraction and common purposes, these persons form a group that distinguishes them from the remainder of society. Durkheim posited that it is not possible for people to have constant dealings with one another without maintaining a sense of the whole that brought them together in the first place. It is this sense of the whole that causes the
individuals in the group to adhere to the interests of the group rather than just individual interests. This sense of the whole becomes the source of moral activity. From this, the group regulates its activities and is able to socialize its members into its expectations. Whether written explicitly or tacitly understood in an implicit fashion, the norms under which the group functions are established by the group via consensus.

The academy on a macro level is one such social group. “Colleges and universities are built on moral obligations, ethical responsibilities, and principles and codes of behavior” (Baca, 1983), p. 7). If one questions that this is indeed a true statement, consider that colleges have very clear guidelines against such practices as plagiarism, falsification of research data, and other forms of academic dishonesty. Other areas of moral concern over which there are specifically written sanctions in the academy are those related to sexual harassment, selling of grades, and the protection of academic freedom. If anything, the academy is usually such a moral and safe place to work with freedom that it is a relatively pleasant and rewarding place to dwell (Baca, 1983).

Feldman (2001) examined the development of group norms and discovered that norms exist as a set of informal rules used to regulate the behavior of a group of people bound by a common purpose. Within the context of this common purpose, members of a group decide what behaviors have particular significance and deserve enforcement. Similarly, Rossi and Berk (1985) asserted that norms are not merely attitudinal and personal, but they are inherently “statements of obligatory actions” (p. 333) usually determined by group consensus. Once a group begins to agree upon what constitutes normative behavior, it is possible to develop more formalized codes of conduct; this is particularly true for the professions.

A long accepted hallmark of the professions is the establishment of a code of ethical conduct (Abbott, 1983; Moore, 1970). Indeed, it is argued that the very act of becoming a
professional commits one to ethical standards (Campbell, 2000; Soltis, 1986). Because society endows professionals with a high level of autonomy and self-regulation, it behooves professionals to reflect upon their obligations to the society they serve (Abbott, 1983; Bruhn et al., 2002; Freitas, 1990). The occupation of teaching bears professional status because not only does teaching afford its members a high level of autonomy, but also because it meets other parameters that define a profession, such as a requirement for specialized knowledge and a service orientation, rather than a profit orientation (Bruhn, et al., 2002; (Callahan, 1982; Counelis, 1993).

In 1966, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) developed a Statement on Professional Ethics in an attempt to define the special responsibilities of the professoriate. While the 1966 statement addressed the obligations of professors to their disciplines, colleagues, students, institutions, and communities, it was completely silent on the issue of professorial misconduct. Thirty years ago, the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education was created by the AAUP and the American Association of Colleges. This commission charged faculties within their disciplines to develop their own codes of ethical conduct specific to their disciplinary customs and practices. Yet, a formal, widely-accepted code for academia has yet to be developed (Bruhn et al., 2002). If higher education does not actively seek to regulate its own internal practices and mind its ethics, then it is likely that eventually some external agency will (Farago, 1983).

Codes of ethics created from a fear of external regulation tend to be reactive instead of creative. They often deal with immediate circumstances and existing abuses instead of seeking to promote reflective practice and ethical behavior in a constructive manner. Attempts to codify ethical behavior are best based upon an emphasis on reflective practice (Farago, 1983).
However, the academy’s long entrenchment in a positivist framework of technical rationality is at odds with this more reflective mode (Schon, 1987).

A review of the literature not only reveals the lack of a specified ethical code for the professoriate, but also a growing concern that the professoriate needs to examine itself and ask whether its practitioners are fulfilling their service role to their students. For most of its history, the professoriate has enjoyed a state of privileged autonomy imbued with the public’s trust, but public criticism of the higher education enterprise has been on the rise for the past two decades (Bruhn et al., 2002; Davis et al., 1992; McCabe et al., 2001). Reasons cited for this criticism include the escalating costs of higher education (Cotten & Wilson, 2006), research improprieties (Braxton, 1991; Roworth, 2002), concerns over the integrity of accreditation processes (Bollag, 2006), and perceptions that professors are less available than ever as they pursue research interests over teaching (Delucchi & Korgen, 2002; Frankel & Swanson, 2002). In the last 10-15 years, recognition of this growing public concern motivated scholars within the professoriate to reflect upon the academy’s obligation to society and whether the academy is succeeding or failing in its service to the public, particularly in regard to the faculty-student relationship in the classroom.

In one hallmark study conducted over five years, Boice (1996) initiated his study with the intention of examining the presence of student incivility in college classrooms, but concluded with an understanding of the prevalence of teaching improprieties and their negative impact on student classroom behavior. Boice startlingly asserted that teaching improprieties are “more common than uncommon” (p. 479). Such improprieties centered upon two kinds of teacher behaviors: whether a teacher motivated students in a prosocial (i.e., encouraging or facilitating) or antisocial (threatening and guilt-inducing) manner and whether the teacher conveyed a sense of immediacy. Immediacy, defined as “the extent to which the teacher gives off verbal and
nonverbal signals of warmth, friendliness, and liking” (p. 458), played a significant role in
determining the tenor of teacher-student relationships. Student perceptions of coldness or lack of
caring on the part of the teacher, along with incidents of faculty misbehavior resulted in
deterioration of the teacher-student relationship and subsequent poor evaluations of teacher
performance by students (Boice, 1996).

In a similar vein, Braxton and Bayer (1999) recognized a growing concern among
collegiate educators regarding the prevalence of incivility in the student population and identified
the need of the professoriate to look inward to determine if its own behavior might be a source of
the problem. Utilizing a survey of 126 items, the authors determined identifiable patterns of
teaching behavior eventually labeled as either “inviolable” or “admonitory” norms. The seven
patterns of inviolable proscribed norms are: (a) condescending negativism, (b) inattentive
planning, (c) moral turpitude, (d) particularistic grading, (e) personal disregard, (f)
uncommunicated course details, and (g) uncooperative cynicism. The nine clusters of
admonitory norms were labeled: (a) advisement negligence, (b) authoritarian classroom, (c)
inadequate communication, (d) inadequate course design, (e) inconvenience avoidance, (f)
instructional narrowness, (g) insufficient syllabus, (h) teaching secrecy, and (i) undermining
colleagues. Braxton and Bayer further described these 16 categories with clearly defined and
identifiable actions, using case study examples with each category. Clustering these behaviors
under the inclusive term faculty misconduct, these researchers called attention to the need for
increased formalization and articulation of behavioral standards for collegiate faculty. Table 2.1
lists inviolable normative clusters and provides examples of each. Table 2.2 lists admonitory
normative clusters with examples.
Table 2.1. Inviolable Normative Clusters with Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORMATIVE CLUSTER</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condescending negativism</td>
<td>Making belittling remarks to a student in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commenting negatively about a colleague in front of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive planning</td>
<td>Course syllabus not prepared for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to order required texts in time for first day of class availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral turpitude</td>
<td>Having a sexual relationship with a student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attending class while obviously intoxicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularistic grading</td>
<td>Allowing a personal friendship with a student to impact the grading of his or her work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course policies are not universally applied to all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal disregard</td>
<td>Frequent use of profanity in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pattern of dismissing class early or routinely arriving late for class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommunicated course details</td>
<td>Changing classroom locations without notification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing class meeting times without notification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative cynicism</td>
<td>Refusal to advise students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynical attitude toward teaching verbalized to Students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Braxton & Bayer, 1999)
Table 2.2. Admonitory Normative Clusters with Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORMATIVE CLUSTER</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisement negligence</td>
<td>Failure to read scholarly literature in preparation for teaching a course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to report students with special problems to appropriate campus service units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian classroom</td>
<td>Does not discourage sexist or racist comments in students’ written work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insistence that students take a particular perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate communication</td>
<td>Office hours are not communicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allowing one or two students to dominate class discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate course design</td>
<td>Does not keep required course materials within a reasonable cost limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectures are not regularly updated to reflect new advancements in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconvenience avoidance</td>
<td>Leaving graded papers or exams in a location where all students can search through them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration of final exam during regular class period instead of official exam period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional narrowness</td>
<td>Memorization of course material is stressed over analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoiding professional development that could enhance teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient syllabus</td>
<td>Syllabus does not include due dates for assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course evaluations are not distributed to students at end of course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching secrecy</td>
<td>Refusal to share course syllabi with other faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refusal to allow colleagues to observe classroom teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undermining colleagues</td>
<td>Making negative comments about courses offered by another faculty member during faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting enrollment in own course at the expense of other colleagues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Braxton & Bayer, 1999)
The need to better define standards of normative teaching behavior also extends into the area of nursing education. Historically, nursing education has focused upon the preparation of novices for practice as registered nurses (Bargagliotti, 2003; Benner, 2001). Prior to the mid-twentieth century, nursing education occurred primarily in hospital-based schools of nursing. During the 1960s, nursing education became more firmly placed within the collegiate environment. Research specific to improvement of nursing practice flourished (Bargagliotti, 2003). Today, while not all undergraduate nursing education takes place in a college setting, the vast majority does and the demands on the time of nursing professors clearly mimic those of their academic colleagues in other disciplines (Speziale & Jacobson, 2005).

The profession of nursing has long concerned itself with defining and promulgating ethical practice (Freitas, 1990). In the nineteenth century, applicants to nursing programs were above all else required to be of “good moral character” (Freitas, 1990, p. 198). Throughout the twentieth century, the American Nurses’ Association sought to “(1) elevate the standards of nursing education (2) establish a code of ethics; and (3) promote the interests of nurses” (Freitas, 1990, p. 197). As nursing curricula became standardized, emphasis upon ethical instruction gained prominence. In 1985, the American Nurses’ Association updated its code of ethics to guide the practice of professional nursing. The reciprocal relationship between nursing and society is the overarching principle framing this document. However, while addressing the relationships between nurse-patient, nurse-physician, nurse-employer, and nurse-society, the code does not directly speak to the relationship between the nurse educator and student. Consequently, nurse educators are left in the same position as others in academia when attempting to articulate what norms undergird the teacher-student relationship.
The Teacher-Student Relationship

“If higher education is to fulfill its ethical obligations to society, a logical starting place is the day-to-day interaction between professors and students” (Brown & Krager, 1985). The literature is replete with studies examining the frequency and quality of interaction between teachers and students, particularly as they impact social, academic, and personal outcomes for students (Clark, Walker, & Keith, 2002; Endo & Harpel, 1982; Kuh, 1995; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1981; Thompson, 2001a, 2001b). The potentially positive impact of faculty involvement with students challenges professors to become increasingly active in not only classroom teaching, but also in advisement and mentorship of students (Rupert & Holmes, 1997). This engagement with students in “multiple professional relationships” (Rupert & Holmes, p. 660) creates an environment ripe with possibilities for both positive and negative outcomes.

Effective teacher-student relationships are multifaceted, complex, and occur both formally in the classroom and informally out of classroom (Anderson & Carta-Falsa, 2002; Cotten & Wilson, 2006; Frankel & Swanson, 2002; Kuh & Hu, 2001; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Feldman (1994) synthesized research conducted from 1920 through the late 1980s that examined teacher and student expectations for the classroom. There were striking similarities between the two groups as to what constituted effective teaching. Teacher enthusiasm, knowledge of subject matter, preparation and organization of the course, understandableness, clarity of expectations, nature and frequency of feedback, encouragement, concern and respect for students, and availability and helpfulness were perceived as important components of effective teaching (Feldman, 1994). Similarly, Cotten and Wilson (2006) found that teachers often cite that effective in-class interactions encompass such teaching activities as appropriate curricular design, timely content selection, and engaging content delivery. The college classroom has even been conceptualized as a workplace in which grades serve as the currency of
exchange in an unwritten contract between teacher and student (Becker, Geer, & Hughes, 1994). In such an environment, students expend significant effort attempting to understand the terms of the contract through interpretation of the teacher’s actions and words. Consequently, students perceive the class as a “connected sequence of events” (Becker, et al., p. 439) that results in the students’ attempts to uphold their end of the bargain in order to receive a good grade.

Anderson and Carta-Falsa (2002), in a thematic analysis of student narratives, discovered that students place less emphasis on actual teaching activities than faculty. Instead, students indicated their desire to have an open, supportive learning environment characterized by respect and mutual trust. A sense of security and feeling “safe” were identified as paramount to student success. In such an environment, students expressed their ability to more easily take risks and engage in collaborative learning. In turn, collaborative learning environments lead to enhanced comprehension of course content and skills and increased awareness of other viewpoints (Anderson & Carta-Falsa, 2002). Such findings support the efficacy of the student-oriented pedagogy proposed by Paulo Freire (1970) who asserted that instruction must begin with a sharing of ideas and experiences between teacher and students via classroom dialogue. Using the term “engaged pedagogy” (p.15), hooks (1994) advocated for teaching practice that displays “interest in one another, in hearing one another’s voices, in recognizing one another’s presence” (p. 8). This approach to teaching compels professors to seek ways to connect with students both inside and outside of classroom walls.

An examination of the educational literature reveals that out of class experiences have the capacity to contribute to a greater sense of connectedness for students (Benor & Leviyof, 1997; Cotten & Wilson, 2006; Gillespie, 2005; Thompson, 2001b). This opportunity to connect is promoted by a perception of faculty availability (Cotten & Wilson, 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Cotten and Wilson (2006) found that faculty classroom behaviors send signals to students
that assist the students in inferring faculty availability outside the classroom. Teachers who
promote an interactive classroom environment convey approachability to their students both in
and out of the classroom (Cotten & Wilson, 2006). In an earlier study, Jaasma and Koper (1999)
discovered that when faculty indicated their immediacy both verbally and nonverbally in the
classroom, more out of class encounters were likely to occur between the faculty and the
students. Examples of verbal immediacy include use of humor, calling students by name, and
using real-life, personal examples in class. Nonverbal immediacy includes smiling, appropriate
gesturing, and vocal tone and inflection. Conveyance of such immediacy was not only highly
correlated with more frequent student-teacher interactions, but also with increased student
motivation (Jaasma & Koper, 1999).

Kuh (1995) found that informal student-faculty encounters demonstrated an impact upon
not only the academic abilities of the students, but also upon their confidence and self-worth.
Pascarella and Terenzini (1980) linked the quality and quantity of faculty-student interaction to
positive effects on first year persistence in college students, as well as cognitive gains. Extra-
class communication (Bippus, Kearney, Plax, & Brooks, 2003) also has a positive influence on
students’ overall satisfaction with the college experience (Kuh & Hu, 2001; Pascarella &
Terenzini, 2005) and satisfaction with quality of the faculty (Astin, 1993).

Yet, when faculty and students interact, it tends to be brief and very focused upon
coursework or other specific classroom issues (Cotten & Wilson, 2006). While these
interactions have the potential to positively impact student learning and socialization, frequent
faculty-student encounters are uncommon (Hagedorn, Maxwell, Rodriguez, Hocevar, & Fillpott,
2000; Kuh, 1995; Nadler & Nadler, 2001). Further, research indicates a growing perception
among students that professors frequently display attitudes of inapproachability, abruptness, and
even hostility (Boice, 1996; Cotten & Wilson, 2006).
Cotten and Wilson (2006) noted some factors that hindered students’ interactions with faculty members. These included student perceptions that faculty appear rushed and unavailable. Students attributed this to lack of interest on the part of faculty in interacting with students, when quite often it was time constraints that prohibited faculty from interacting more. Also, teachers who display a sense of humor or who utilize interactive teaching techniques were seen as more approachable than those who rush through lecture only formats or arrive late to class (Cotten & Wilson, 2006; Feldmann, 2001).

The existence of uncivil faculty behavior can further inhibit effective student-teacher interactions (Boice, 1996; Feldmann, 2001). Boice (1996) reported that faculty incivility occurred in more than two-thirds of the courses in institutions of higher education followed over a five-year period. Other studies have reported incidences of rude faculty interactions that students perceive as belittling, degrading, and unresponsive (Cotten & Wilson, 2006; Rosenthal et al., 2000). Student perceptions of faculty aloofness and indifference lead students to question faculty competence (Anderson & Carta-Falsa, 2002; Frankel & Swanson, 2002). Ultimately, negative faculty behavior is cited as a main reason for students’ desire to be less involved in the classroom. The ultimate result of these types of negative interaction is hampered student learning (Feldmann, 2001). When student learning is compromised due to faculty incivility, Feldmann (2001) asserted that this constitutes an ethical violation of the faculty member’s responsibility and duty.

Within nursing, research confirms that students often perceive faculty behavior as oppressive and abusive (Benor & Leviyof, 1997; Diekelmann, 2001; McGregor, 2005; Poorman, Webb, & Mastorovich, 2002; Thomas, 2003). McGregor (2005) noted that students used phrasing such as “a gang of professors” to refer to their nursing faculty (p. 91). Because of the intense nature of nursing and the life and death responsibility associated with it, the educational
process is highly stressful. While nursing is a profession ultimately concerned with caring, it is not unusual for instructors to behave in harsh, bullying ways (McGregor, 2005). Nursing faculty often teach the way they were taught resulting in a perpetual cycle of verbally abusive behavior (Diekelmann, 2001). This behavior is often justified as necessary “for the student’s own good” or in order to “teach a lesson” (McGregor, 2005, p. 94). A review of the nursing literature indicates that there is a growing concern among educators regarding this type of behavior with a resultant call to examine what constitutes healthy, productive teacher-student relationships (McGregor, 2005; Secrest, Norwood, & Keatley, 2003).

Ultimately, such concerns raise the issue of power in the classroom. Markie (1994) noted that the “teacher-student relationship is a power relationship, and just about all the power is the professor’s” (p. 6). Teachers are endowed with power precisely because of their specialized knowledge and experience (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983). The authority afforded teachers is so taken for granted that teachers are often unaware of the extent of power they possess (Weimer, 2002). When teachers understand the reality of the power inherent in the teaching role and use it within a context of caring, interpersonal, communication skills, then learning is facilitated (Turman & Schrodt, 2006). However, if power is abused, learning suffers and the integrity of the teacher-student relationship is violated (Markie, 1994).

Negative student perceptions of faculty can be related to the different expectations that faculty and students bring to their interactions, inside of the classroom and out (Anderson & Carta-Falsa, 2002; Cotten & Wilson, 2006; Endo & Harpel, 1982). For example, faculty members have had years of exposure to having their scholarly work analyzed and critiqued. Indeed, it is a clear expectation of the academy that scholarly efforts should be appropriately reviewed. As a result, college teachers often feel compelled to remain objective and aloof in order to provide appropriate feedback to students about their work. Kuh and Hu (2001)
discovered that students are prone to misinterpreting such faculty criticism as personally directed and harsh. Students may then interpret faculty objectivity and the resulting feedback as overly critical and unhelpful (Cotten & Wilson, 2006).

Regardless of whether faculty members mean to convey harshness or whether they are truly attempting to appropriately teach and evaluate students, it is prudent to conduct further research in order to understand the dynamics of faculty-student interactions so that healthier relationships can be built. Faculty need to reflect upon their behaviors and motivations so that they can better serve the student, assisting the student to achieve cognitive and social gains (Anderson & Carta-Falsa, 2002; Rupert & Holmes, 1997; Turman & Schrodt, 2006). Richmond (1990) contended that professors must be taught behaviors to help them build more functional relationships with students. One of the predominant ways instructors learn the faculty role is through processes of socialization that occur during their undergraduate and graduate education, as well as upon entry to the profession.

Professional Socialization of Registered Nurses and Nurse Educators

Austin (2002) noted that a person’s understanding of the academic culture begins in graduate school, not with the first faculty position. Graduate education is regarded as a powerful socialization mechanism, not only because knowledge and skills are developed, but also because norms, attitudes, and values are conveyed in the process (Braxton, 1991; Clark & Corcoran, 1986). Socialization takes place formally through classes, examinations, work on dissertations, and also informally through the building of interpersonal relationships with professors and other graduate students (Austin, 2002). Socialization is a dynamic process involving the interaction of both the student and the organization. All individuals involved in the process bring their own experiences, values, and ideas into the arena (Austin, 2002).
Yet, much of the time in graduate studies is focused upon development of research interests and aptitude in research design, techniques, and evaluation (Nyquist et al., 1999). Very little emphasis is placed on teaching and the faculty role (Austin, 2002; Nyquist et al., 1999). Graduate students tend to enter the world of academia ill-equipped to handle the demands of the professoriate and the teaching duties inherent in the academic role (Rosser, 2003; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Ruscio (1987) asserted that students complete graduate school with “virgin ideologies” that are easily “violated by the organization” (p. 357) employing them. Arriving to their new positions with enthusiasm, new faculty members are often quickly overwhelmed with the many obligations they face beyond teaching and research (Sorcinelli, 1994). These obligations include committee assignments, advising appointments, and office hours.

A discussion of graduate socialization would be incomplete without taking into account disciplinary differences (Austin, 2002). Each academic discipline is unique and the diversity among the disciplines is a cause of fragmentation within academic organizations (Ruscio, 1987) that complicates the development of academia as a cohesive profession (Becher, 1987; Braxton & Hargens, 1996). The various academic disciplines represent a significant facet of the collegiate environment with powerful implications for the development of faculty perceptions and expectations (Pike & Killian, 2001). Anderson, Louis, and Earle (1994) noted that “academic disciplines have distinct cultures with different beliefs, norms, values, patterns of work, and interpersonal interaction” (p. 332). As a result, the academic department plays a pivotal role in the determination of what professional activities are valued. One such example is the differences among academic disciplines as they relate to teaching goals (Barnes, Bull, Campbell, & Perry, 2001; Braxton & Hargens, 1996; Smart & Ethington, 1995). Often, disciplinary differences may determine whether research is preferred over teaching (Becher,
In nursing, one such applied discipline, professional socialization begins upon entry to a basic nursing educational program (Chitty & Black, 2007). There are a variety of educational routes available to a student entering the profession (Brady et al., 2001; Speziale & Jacobson, 2005). These routes are the hospital-based diploma program, the Associate of Science degree program, and the Bachelor of Science degree program. Successful completion of any of these allows the graduate to sit for the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses. Registered nurses (RNs) may then continue their education at the master’s and doctoral levels.

Graduate nursing programs have evolved over the past two decades to include more information related to preparation for faculty practice. Braxton (1991) noted that graduate education is regarded as a powerful socialization mechanism, not only because knowledge and skills are developed, but also because norms, attitudes, and values are conveyed in the process. However, focus on preparation for teaching nursing is typically limited to graduate programs providing the choice of an “education” track. Graduate nursing curricula include varied tracks, such as nurse practitioner, nurse anesthetist, clinical nurse specialist, and administrator in addition to collegiate educator. Yet, the only requirement for teaching nursing at the undergraduate level, particularly an associate degree, is a master’s degree in nursing, regardless of graduate school specialization (Lindell et al., 2005). An important limitation in research conducted relative to graduate school socialization for collegiate faculty is its exclusivist tendency to view graduate school as doctoral education, as opposed to a master’s level education. In 2000, only 7.5 percent of all registered nurses (total RN population = 2,696,540) had obtained a master’s degree in nursing and only 0.6 percent of RNs had obtained the doctoral degree.
(HRSA, 2002). This represents a significant gap in the literature for examining the implications relative to graduate socialization within master’s programs for these nurse educators.

The American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) noted that the professional education of nurses serves as a vehicle for transmitting professional values, core competencies, and the development and understanding of professional roles (Secrest et al., 2003). Professional socialization has been defined as “a process of acquiring professional knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and behaviors described by the profession” (Fetzer, 2003). Socialization into a profession is a developmental process in which both teachers and students play active roles (Secrest et al., 2003). Teachers determine and oversee the classroom and clinical learning opportunities students will experience. Students take measures to adequately prepare for these opportunities so that they can achieve a high level of competence. If teachers behave in demeaning ways that alienate students, professional socialization is developed in a “negative, self-defeating” way (Secrest et al., p. 81). However, if faculty members choose to affirm their students and create a sense of belonging to the profession, learning is enhanced (McGregor, 2005; Poorman et al., 2002; Secrest et al., 2003). As indicated previously, healthy teacher-student relationships can have a positive impact on student outcomes. Findings within the nursing literature corroborate these findings and additionally support the idea that functional teacher-student relationships have a positive effect on students’ professional socialization (McGregor, 2005; Poorman et al., 2002).

Summary

While a variety of research exists relative to the concepts presented in this review of the literature, the intersection of these concepts has yet to be explored. In 1980, Pascarella and Terenzini issued a call for additional research to explore what factors underlie and impact faculty-student interactions. Yet, most research in the area of teacher-student relationships or
interactions continues to focus upon the student side of this equation, while simultaneously asserting the significant impact faculty has upon student learning and concepts of self-worth. Braxton and Bayer (1999) suggested that faculty look inward and ask themselves if their own behavior has a positive or negative impact upon their students. Viewing the teacher-student relationship as value-laden, Braxton and Bayer (1999) noted that additional research should be conducted in order to move to a “more general theory of norm espousal” (p. 170) for collegiate faculty.

If ethical norms of professorial behavior do exist (Bruhn et al., 2002; Eimers, Braxton, & Bayer, 2001; Feldman, 2001; Hackett, 1994; Knight & Auster, 1999; Victor & Cullen, 1988) and if the understanding of these norms has its roots in the professional socialization process (Fetzer, 2003; McGregor, 2005; Poorman et al., 2002; Secrest et al., 2003), then it is reasonable to assume that such factors have implications for the practical day-to-day ethos of the teacher-student relationship. It is the purpose of this study to advance an understanding of faculty norm espousal in their relationships with students, particularly within the applied discipline of nursing. The following chapter addresses the methods utilized to develop this understanding.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides information regarding this study’s research design, survey instrument description, population and sampling methods, and data collection procedures.

Research Design

A sequential explanatory mixed methods design was employed for this study. In this type of design, quantitative data is first obtained in order to provide a “picture of the research problem” (Creswell, 2008, p. 560). Next, qualitative data are collected for the purpose of explaining or illustrating the quantitative data.

This study is a modified operational replication of the original research conducted by Braxton and Bayer (1999). Replication has the potential to validate earlier research by extending its results and determining its degree of generalizability (Fitzpatrick & Wallace, 2006). Originally, the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) was administered to collegiate educators in the disciplines of biology, history, mathematics, and psychology. The current study examines the applied discipline of nursing. In so doing, this study provides opportunity to check the validity of the original research findings within a different population (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003).

In the first phase of this study, a cross-sectional survey design utilizing the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) developed by Braxton and Bayer (1999) was employed. In this type of quantitative design, data are collected at one point in time for the purpose of measuring current attitudes or practices (Creswell, 2008). Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) noted that before attempting to explain or change educational practice, researchers must first generate accurate descriptions of educational phenomena. Valuable data can be obtained regarding the attitudes and practices of educators through use of a survey design. Advantages of survey
research are that it is economical, can be distributed in a short time period, can reach a “geographically dispersed population” (Creswell, p. 414), and allows for confidentiality of response.

Instrument

The CTBI, a 126-item Likert-style survey instrument designed by Braxton and Bayer (1999), was developed for the purpose of describing the attitudes and practices of educators as related to professional ethics and teaching behavioral norms. The original reported sample was of 949 professors in four academic disciplines (biology, mathematics, history, and psychology). From this sample, the CTBI was used to extract from the obtained data a list of “inviolable” and “admonitory” norms. Inviolable norms are defined as those that, when violated, invoke a high degree of moral outrage, demanding administrative sanctions to be taken against the transgressor. Examples of inviolable norms include condescending negativism, inattentive planning, moral turpitude, and particularistic grading. Violation of admonitory norms tends to “evoke less indignation” (p. 7) and faculty is cautioned to avoid violating these norms. Faculty indicate that any type of sanctioning in such instances is best handled informally among colleagues (Braxton & Bayer, 1999). Examples of admonitory norms include advisement negligence, inadequate communication, inadequate course design, and instructional narrowness. The CTBI concludes with a demographic section designed to elicit information about an individual faculty member’s academic rank, full-time work status, previous administrative work history, number of years in higher education, and institution type.

A sanctioning action scale specifying the appropriateness of any listed behavior and the degree of sanction that should be associated with that behavior was developed in a Likert-style format. Ratings on the scale are from 1 to 5 and are described as follows:
appropriate behavior, should be encouraged; (2) discretionary behavior, neither particularly appropriate or inappropriate; (3) mildly inappropriate behavior, generally to be ignored; (4) inappropriate behavior, to be handled informally by colleagues or administrators suggesting change or improvement; and (5) very inappropriate behavior requiring formal administrative intervention (Braxton & Bayer, 1999), p. 14).

If the mean value of a specific behavior in the survey instrument was rated higher than 4.00, it received the designation of “inviolable norm” (Braxton & Bayer, 1999). Admonitory norms registered a mean value between 3.00 and 3.99. Factor analysis using the principal components approach was conducted to determine if there were any underlying patterns of meaning for behaviors receiving the designations of inviolable or admonitory. A scree test was then employed to determine that the obtained factor solution was appropriate (Braxton & Bayer, 1999).

Braxton and Bayer (1999) employed a rigorous process for development of the CTBI. This process involved querying faculty colleagues, mainly social scientists and sociologists, on their campuses for a list of expected teaching norms; constructing a list of normative behaviors from the literature on ethics in college teaching; and compiling their own list of observed behaviors during their years in academia. Braxton and Bayer (1999) submitted a final list of normative teaching behaviors to an expert panel of collegiate educators for review. These educators were members of the Project on Teaching for the American Sociological Association. Each of the reviewers worked independently to not only critique the list given to them by the authors, but also to add to the list as well. At the end of this entire development process, the authors had compiled 126 specific statements broken into eight categories: course preplanning, first day of class, in-class behaviors, course content, examination and grading practices, faculty-student interactions in class, relationships with colleagues, and out-of-class interactions.
The completed survey was administered on three separate occasions over a six-year period to specifically targeted faculty (n=2400) from a random sample of approximately 3,000 institutions of higher education in one of three categories: Research I universities, liberal arts colleges, and two-year community colleges (Braxton & Bayer, 1999). An equal number of faculty members from four disciplines were chosen in each administration of the survey. Using Biglan’s (Biglan, 1973a, 1973b) classification scheme, the disciplines selected were biology, mathematics, psychology, and history. Research utilizing the Biglan typology supports that there are differences among academic disciplines in the amount of time spent on teaching and the importance attached to teaching (Braxton & Bayer, 1999). Ultimately, the researchers aggregated the collected data according to academic discipline, resulting in the final reported sample of 949 participants.

The current study described in this report replicated Braxton and Bayer’s use of the CTBI, using the same criteria to designate inviolable and admonitory norms. Modifications were made to the demographic portion of the CTBI in order to elicit information that is specific to the discipline of nursing and particularly associate degree education. The original CTBI and the modified version are located respectively in Appendix A and Appendix B. Permission to use the CTBI was obtained from the authors prior to modification and use. A copy of those permissions is located in Appendix C.

Population and Sampling Methods

The population of Associate of Science in Nursing (ASN) programs in the United States accredited by the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC) consists of 628 programs in 49 states and the District of Columbia. Only the state of North Dakota has no ASN programs. The number of full time equivalent (FTE) faculty within these programs is approximately 7800 (NLNAC, 2006). ASN programs were chosen as the focus of this study.
because not only are the programs situated in the collegiate environment, but also the teaching function of the academic role is typically the primary and almost exclusive emphasis for faculty in ASN programs (Speziale & Jacobson, 2005). There are two other educational routes available to prepare a student to become a registered nurse: the hospital-based diploma program and the bachelor of science degree program (Brady et al., 2001; Speziale & Jacobson, 2005). However, diploma programs are non-collegiate and baccalaureate programs are typically situated within higher education institutions where there is a research expectation of the faculty, as opposed to a full teaching responsibility.

Non-probability census sampling was utilized through construction of a list of all 628 National League for Nursing Accreditation Commission (NLNAC) accredited ASN programs in the U.S. Census sampling is appropriate when the target population to be studied can be easily identified (Creswell, 2008). Based on the size of the population (N=7800), a total sample of 366 participants is needed to achieve a 95% confidence interval (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). The final sample consisted of 604 respondents (n=604). Of these, 171 were deans and the remaining 433 were faculty members, representing 229 different ASN programs in 44 states and the District of Columbia. The only states from which there were no responses were Alaska, Colorado, Idaho, Oregon, and Wyoming. The demographics of the participants in this study are remarkably similar to those of the nursing population in the United States in which the profession is predominantly comprised of white females with an average age of 49 years (NLNAC, 2006). Table 3.1 illustrates the demographic profile of the study participants.
Table 3.1. Demographic Profile of Study Participants (n=604)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Age**        | Mean: 51.75 years  
SD: 8.89  
Range: 25 – 70 years |
| **Gender**     | Female: 97.4%  
Male: 2.8% |
| **Ethnicity**  | African-American: 4.5%  
American Indian or Alaska Native: 0.4%  
Asian: 0.8%  
Caucasian/White: 92.1%  
Hispanic, Latino/a: 1.3%  
Native Hawaiian or Other  
Pacific Islander: 0.0%  
Other: 1.1% |
| **Faculty Rank** | Professor: 26.0%  
Associate Professor: 12.9%  
Assistant Professor: 16.5%  
Instructor: 30.7%  
Lecturer: 0.9%  
Other: 13.1% |
| **Employment Status** | Full time: 91.6%  
Part time, but more than half time: 1.5%  
Half time: 2.4%  
Less than half time: 4.7% |
| **Years of Clinical Practice** | Mean: 12.73 years  
SD: 8.22  
Range: 1 – 45 years |
| **Years in Nursing Education** | Mean: 14.35 years  
SD: 9.96  
Range: 0.5 – 49 years |

Procedures and Data Collection

The quantitative portion of this study was conducted in Fall 2007. Initially, the names and contact information of every ASN program dean or director was obtained from the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission website (www.nlnac.org). A spreadsheet with this information was constructed for ease of developing future electronic correspondence with the study participants.
An introductory letter (appendix D) with consent form (appendix E) was mailed to the dean/director of each of the ASN programs to elicit administrative support for the project. One week after these letters were mailed, the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) survey was sent to program deans and directors, utilizing Survey Monkey©. At the same time, another email instructing the dean to forward the information about survey access and completion to her/his faculty was also sent. This email contained instructions for the faculty and included the participant consent form. Copies of all email communications are located in Appendix F.

After two weeks, a follow-up email was sent to those schools whose deans and/or faculty had not responded. After two more weeks, a final email was sent to all programs to solicit participation. Multiple contacts were used to facilitate the achievement of as high a response rate as possible (Dillman, 2007).

The qualitative data collection for this study occurred early in the spring semester of 2008. In this phase, the goal was to solicit information regarding the real life experiences of the participants, as related to their observation of or participation in violation of the identified normative behaviors. A purposeful sampling technique was employed for this portion of the study. An email communication was constructed (Appendix F) and sent to the deans/directors of the 229 nursing programs whose faculty had participated in completing the CTBI during the quantitative phase. Attached to this email were the consent form and a document that provided a brief explanation of the initial findings of the study.

Participants were asked to reflect upon the named normative clusters. If any of these norms particularly resonated with them and brought to mind a real example of the violation of that norm, they were asked to respond with an email describing that example. A time limit of one week for responses was set, and all participants were offered an incentive of a gift certificate in order to enhance the response rate (Dillman, 2007).
A total of 36 responses were obtained. These responses represent faculty who work in 25 of the institutions contacted in this study. Table 3.2 provides a demographic overview of the respondents. The written reflections sent by the participants provided examples of all normative clusters given to the participants. The information contained in these examples was used to construct the fictional vignettes presented in the next chapter.

Table 3.2. Demographic Profile of Respondents in Qualitative Data Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female: 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ethnicity       | African-American: 5.5%  
|                 | Caucasian/White: 94.5% |
| Employment Status | Full-time: 100% |
| Years of Clinical Practice | Mean: 30.6 years  
|                 | SD: 9.08  
|                 | Range: 8 – 44 years |
| Years in Nursing Education | Mean: 15.7 years  
|                 | SD: 9.21  
|                 | Range: 2 – 36 years |
| Highest Level of Educational Preparation | MSN: 77.7%  
|                 | Doctorate: 22.3% |
| Type of MSN Program | Education: 47%  
|                 | Clinical Nurse Specialist: 35.4%  
|                 | Nurse Practitioner: 17.6% |

Summary

This chapter provided a review of the methods used in this sequential explanatory mixed methods study of normative teaching behaviors identified by ASN educators. Information regarding the survey instrument, sampling techniques, and data collection procedures were discussed. The next chapter presents an analysis and synthesis of the results obtained using these methods.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed methods design to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent do data obtained from associate degree nursing educators in the current study match the original findings from Braxton and Bayer (1999)?
2. What behaviors do undergraduate nursing faculty from associate degree programs identify as inviolable norms of teaching behavior?
3. What behaviors do undergraduate nursing faculty from associate degree programs identify as admonitory norms of teaching behavior?
4. How do educators from associate degree nursing programs describe the transgression of normative teaching behaviors?

In this chapter, a synthesis of the research results is presented, beginning with an overview of the data analysis and the initial findings relative to the identification of normative teaching behaviors by ASN educators. These findings are compared to those of Braxton and Bayer (1999). Following this is a discussion of both inviolable and admonitory norms. For each identified norm, a fictional vignette created from the narratives and provided by the respondents is presented.

Identification of Inviolable and Admonitory Norms by Nursing Educators

Survey data collected during the quantitative phase of this study were initially analyzed in the manner used by Braxton and Bayer (1999) through the use of descriptive statistics. Results obtained from the administration of the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) during Fall 2007 were entered into SPSS version 16.0 and were cleaned to ensure that errors did not exist due to keystroke or delinquent mistakes by the study participants. Descriptive statistics
including the means and standard deviations of all 126 items of the CTBI were obtained. These data are provided in Appendix G. As previously determined by Braxton and Bayer (1999), items on the CTBI, scoring mean values 4.00 or higher on the sanctioning action scale (Likert values of 1 to 5 points), were labeled as “inviolable norms.” Items on the CTBI with mean values between 3.00 and 3.99 were noted as “admonitory norms.” Of the 126 behaviors described on the CTBI, a total of 61 items met the criteria to be labeled as inviolable norms. Another 38 items met the criteria to be labeled as admonitory norms.

Next, confirmatory factor analysis using the principal components approach (Harris, 1985; Sheskin, 2004) was employed to determine the presence of underlying patterns of meaning for behaviors receiving a mean score between 4.0 and 5.0 (inviolable norms). Bartlett’s test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy were used to evaluate the strength of the linear association among the 61 items in the correlation matrix. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 9081.355, p = .000$), which indicated that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix. The KMO statistic (.904), an index that compares the magnitude of the observed correlations with the magnitude of the partial correlation coefficients, was “marvelous,” according to Kaiser’s criteria (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). These results suggest that the sample used for this study is adequate and the use of factor analysis is appropriate. Diagonals of the anti-image correlation matrix were all over .5, supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis. Finally, the communalities were all $\geq .437$, further confirming that each item shared some common variance with other items. Given these overall indicators, factor analysis was conducted with all 61 items.

Principle components analysis of the list of inviolable norms extracted a total of 18 factors. A scree test was used to determine that a final factor solution of five factors was appropriate (Harris, 1985; Sheskin, 2004). Components with initial eigenvalues of 1.5 or higher
accounted for 35% of the total variance. Varimax orthogonal rotation was then used to maximize the loadings of each variable in the survey on one factor. From this rotation, a list of five patterns of inviolable norms was identified: *condescending negativism, uncooperative cynicism, personal disregard, unrealistic course standards,* and *undermining colleagues.* The five factors exhibited Cronbach’s coefficient alpha (α) scores ranging from .548 to .811. The Cronbach’s coefficient alpha is used to assess the internal consistency of a given set of items. Specifically, it represents the proportion of total variance in a given scale that can be attributed to a common source (Pett et al., 2003). Creswell (p. 171) states that the Cronbach alpha is used to test for internal consistency of items that are scored as continuous variables (such as a Likert scale), “The alpha provides a coefficient to estimate consistency of scores on an instrument.” Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003, p.198) note, “Cronbach alpha is a widely used method for computing test score reliability” (p. 198).

Confirmatory factor analysis using the principal components approach (Harris, 1985; Sheskin, 2004) was then employed to determine the presence of underlying patterns of meaning for behaviors receiving a mean score on the CTBI sanctioning action scale between 3.0 and 3.99 (admonitory norms). Bartlett’s test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy were used to evaluate the strength of the linear association among the 38 items in the correlation matrix. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 6542.840, p = .000$), which indicated that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix. The KMO statistic (.919) was “marvelous” according to Kaiser’s criteria (Pett et al., 2003). These results suggest that the sample used for this study is adequate and the use of factor analysis is appropriate. Diagonals of the anti-image correlation matrix were all over .8, supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis. Finally, the communalities were all ≥ .3, further confirming that each
item shared some common variance with other items. Given these overall indicators, factor analysis was conducted with all 38 items.

Principle components analysis of the list of admonitory norms extracted a total of 8 factors. A scree test was used to determine that a final factor solution of 4 factors was appropriate (Harris, 1985; Sheskin, 2004). Components with initial eigenvalues of 1.5 or higher (range = 1.502 – 9.925) accounted for 39.9% of the total variance. Varimax orthogonal rotation was then used to maximize the loadings of each variable in the survey on one factor. The four patterns of admonitory norms identified were instructional narrowness, teaching secrecy, inadequate communication, and inattentive planning. The four factors exhibited Cronbach’s coefficient alpha (α) scores ranging from .698 to .813. A more thorough discussion of these norms is provided later in this chapter.

As noted previously, of the 604 participants in the quantitative phase, 171 were deans and 433 were faculty. Independent t tests were conducted to determine if there were any differences in identification of inviolable and admonitory normative clusters between these two groups. The use of the independent t test is appropriate because the intent of this test is to compare the statistical significance of a possible difference between the means of two groups on an independent variable when the two groups are independent of one another (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). Analysis of independent t test results in this study revealed that no significant difference existed between deans and faculty in regard to identification of either inviolable or admonitory normative clusters. Alpha was set at .05 and p values ranged from .291 to .952. These data are illustrated in Table 4.1. These results are not surprising in light of the fact that most deans of nursing programs come from the faculty ranks and quite often maintain faculty teaching responsibilities (Salewski, 2002).
Table 4.1. Independent $t$-test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative cluster</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>$p$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condescending negativism</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative cynicism</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal disregard</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealistic course standards</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undermining colleagues</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional narrowness</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching secrecy</td>
<td>-.732</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate communication</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive planning</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative data for this study were collected from nursing educators who had previously participated in the quantitative phase of the research project. Respondents ($n=36$) in the qualitative phase of the current study provided written, personal narratives of their lived experiences as related to the violation of normative teaching behaviors. An important component of narrative research is identification of the theoretical lens utilized for data analysis. Creswell (2008) defines this theoretical lens as “a guiding perspective or ideology that provides structure for advocating for groups or individuals” (p. 515). For the current study, the lens used is the recounted experiences of nursing educators as told in personal stories. It has been noted that experience “is the stories people live” and these stories have the capacity to “educate the self and others” (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994. p. 415).

In this vein, the stories contributed by the 36 respondents were analyzed to determine whether they illustrated the identified normative clusters. It was determined that the written
narratives provided examples of all normative clusters given to the participants. Where similarities existed among stories, these similarities were assimilated to reflect the related experiences expressed. This information was then used to construct fictional vignettes to illustrate each of the normative clusters.

Comparison of Findings to Braxton and Bayer Analysis

In the original distribution of the CTBI, Braxton and Bayer (1999) determined that there were seven inviolable normative clusters and nine admonitory. A total of 33 behaviors from the CTBI comprised the inviolable norms and 53 behaviors defined the admonitory. In the current study, five inviolable normative clusters and four admonitory were identified. However, the total number of behaviors from the CTBI meeting the sanctioning criteria established by Braxton and Bayer was greater. The nursing educators in the current study identified 61 items from the CTBI as inviolable and 38 as admonitory. Based on factor analysis, particularly scree plots and eigenvalues, only 21 inviolable norms and 25 admonitory ones are used for discussion.

An examination of the factors under consideration in the current study and the normative behaviors contained within those factors displays a coherence that is lacking in the original findings by Braxton and Bayer. For example, when Braxton and Bayer defined the norm of teaching secrecy, their data included the item “a cynical attitude toward the subject matter is expressed by the instructor.” Factor loading for this item in the original study was only .310, far lower than the previous item that loaded at .533. All factors in the current study have factor loadings of .40 or higher.

Another difference between the two studies is the lack of agreement regarding what constitutes inviolable and admonitory behaviors. Table 4.2 illustrates that nursing educators agreed with their colleagues in the original study regarding the norms of *condescending negativism, uncooperative cynicism,* and *personal disregard* as inviolable in nature. However,
nurses also identified *undermining colleagues* as inviolable rather than admonitory as the participants in the original study had determined. Additionally, the data from the current study led to creation of a new inviolable cluster labeled *unrealistic course standards*.

Table 4.2. Comparison of Normative Clusters in Two Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Braxton and Bayer</th>
<th>Current study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inviolable norms</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inviolable norms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condescending negativism</td>
<td>Condescending negativism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive planning</td>
<td>Uncooperative cynicism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral turpitude</td>
<td>Personal disregard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularistic grading</td>
<td>Unrealistic course standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal disregard</td>
<td>Undermining colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommunicated course details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative cynicism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admonitory norms</strong></td>
<td><strong>Admonitory norms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisement negligence</td>
<td>Instructional narrowness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian classroom</td>
<td>Teaching secrecy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate communication</td>
<td>Inadequate communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate course design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconvenience avoidance</td>
<td>Inattentive planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional narrowness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching secrecy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undermining colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining Table 4.2 in regard to the inviolable and admonitory norms identified in the current study, a thematic difference is noted between the two. Those normative clusters labeled as inviolable connote a strong emphasis upon the social behavior of faculty, while the norms noted as admonitory address tasks that are more technical in nature. Such congruity is lacking in the original analysis conducted by Braxton and Bayer. Educators in the current study convey a sense that behaving in a manner that is socially destructive toward colleagues and/or students is something deserving of administrative sanction. This result is encouraging and will be further discussed in the following chapter.
Inviolable Norms

From a social identity perspective, group norms serve as behavioral standards, but are capable of guiding behavior only to the extent that the members of the group have adopted the group’s identity (Christensen, Rothgerber, Wood, & Matz, 2004). Durkheim (1957) observed that the best way to determine if a norm existed was to identify the degree of outrage its violation elicits. As established for the purpose of this study, inviolable norms are expected normative behaviors that when violated, invoke a high degree of moral outrage demanding administrative sanctions to be taken against the transgressor (Braxton & Bayer, 1999). The participants of this study (n=604) identified 61 behaviors on the 126-item College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) as inviolable (a mean score of 4.0 or higher on a Likert scale of 1 to 5). Upon completion of confirmatory factor analysis, the following five clusters of normative behavior were extracted: condescending negativism, uncooperative cynicism, personal disregard, unrealistic course standards, and undermining colleagues. Each of these normative clusters is discussed below, utilizing information from the current scholarly literature. For each norm, a “fictional” vignette derived from the narratives collected from the respondents for this study is provided to more richly illustrate the aspects of the behavioral norm.

Condescending Negativism

Braxton and Bayer (1999) define the normative pattern of condescending negativism as a proscription of “the treatment of both colleagues and students in a condescending and demeaning way” (p. 21). Literature from nursing describes this type of behavior as “horizontal violence” (Heinrich, 2007) and defines it as “aggressive behaviors directed horizontally within an oppressed group” (Glass, 2003). Indeed, nursing has long understood its professionals to be members of an oppressed group due to the sense of powerlessness and marginalization they have experienced (Roberts, 2000). This oppression stems from the socially constructed position of the
nurse in which the engendered nature of nursing as “woman’s work” has been devalued (David, 2000). The resulting sense of inferiority can lead group members to behave in aggressive and self-defeating ways that ultimately limit the ability of the group to function productively (David, 2000; Roberts, 2000).

It is an unfortunate, but common expression within nursing to state, “nurses eat their young” (Meissner, 1986). Such behavior begins from the moment students enter basic educational programs to become registered nurses and continue throughout their careers as they are first oppressed, then become the oppressors in a perpetual cycle of abusive behavior (McGregor, 2005). Glass (2003) validated the existence of such behavior in her ethnographic study of nurse educators in nine universities in four different countries. She concluded that academic nurses are at high risk for emotional, cognitive, and behavioral vulnerability due to overwork, competing time demands, and workplace violence (Glass, 2003).

Faculty serve as role models for their students (Clark & Springer, 2007). Research validates that student motivation for and confidence in learning can be adversely affected by the control teachers exert over the processes involved with learning (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Richmond, 1990; Weimer, 2002). If teachers do not comprehend the asymmetry of power that exists between them and their students, abuse of this power can occur resulting in a negative impact upon learning (Cotten & Wilson, 2006; Markie, 1994; Wilson, 1982). Acknowledging the prevalence of classroom incivility, Boice (1996) charged collegiate faculty to consider both the commonness and the cost of such behavior.

The inviolable norm of condescending negativism is comprised of eight behaviors from the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (Table 4.3). The behaviors with the highest loadings on this normative factor are “an advisee is treated in a condescending manner;” “the instructor
expresses impatience with a slow learner in class;” and “an instructor makes condescending remarks to a student in class.” To further illustrate this behavioral cluster, a fictional vignette is provided.

Table 4.3. Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of the Inviolable Proscriptive Norm Against Condescending Negativism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTBI Item</th>
<th>LOADING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H9. An advisee is treated in a condescending manner</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3. The instructor expresses impatience with a slow learner in class.</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5. An instructor makes condescending remarks to a student in class.</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8. A faculty member does not refer a student with a special problem to the appropriate campus service.</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2. Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor.</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7. A clear lack of class members’ understanding about course content is ignored by the instructor.</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12. A faculty member neglects to send a letter of recommendation that they had agreed to write.</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. A faculty members criticizes the academic performance of a student in front of other students.</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent of explained variance = 19.439; Cronbach alpha = .837. Extent of consensus against condescending negativism at the level of 4.0 and higher = 63.5%.

- **Case: Condescending Negativism**

Susan Smith worked as a staff nurse in an acute care hospital for ten years before completing her master’s degree in nursing with the goal of teaching undergraduate nursing students. For too long in her staff practice she had noticed how ill prepared the new graduates were for independent practice. She began her work as an instructor for Contented Valley Community College with the clear intention of making a real impact on improving the quality of nursing graduates’ readiness for practice. Upon completion of her first year as both a classroom and clinical instructor, her student evaluations were dismal. Students recalled how during one class session Smith had chided a classmate who asked one too many questions in class by saying,
“You are stupid, stupid, stupid. Why don’t you read the book?” After one particularly difficult exam, she had been observed to say, “Well, based on the results of this test, it’s apparent that a lot of you shouldn’t be nurses.” If the class performance on an exam was especially high, she had even been known to accuse the entire class of cheating, claiming that this was the only way so many high grades could have been achieved.

Her behavior with students in the clinical setting was not any different. When one student failed to show up one day due to illness, Smith proceeded to make derogatory comments about the student to the clinical group. Other students joined in with similar negative observations about the absent peer. It was not unusual for Smith to yell down a hospital hall to a student, “Could you pretend to act like a nurse today?” or to chide a student for poor performance right in front of a patient and his family members. When approached about this behavior by her program director, Smith usually replied by saying, “If we baby them now, they won’t be any use once they’ve graduated. You’ve got to be tough.”

**Uncooperative Cynicism**

The second inviolable norm identified in this study, uncooperative cynicism, is comprised of four behaviors as illustrated in Table 4.4. Uncooperative cynicism can be described as “the refusal to participate in departmental matters as part of the role of college teaching” (Braxton & Bayer, 1999, p. 38). While academics enjoy autonomy in their individual practice, it still remains a reality that there are obligations that come with being a member of a discipline and an academic department. The principle of “fair share” (Rawls, 1971) asserts that within an organization a person is obligated to do her part and to not “gain from the cooperative efforts of others without doing our fair share.” The American Association of University
Professors (AAUP) Statement on Professional Ethics echoes this principle when it states, “Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution” (¶ 5).

Table 4.4. Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of the Inviolable Proscriptive Norm Against Uncooperative Cynicism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTBI Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H13. A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors.</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1. Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G16. A faculty member refuses to participate in departmental curricular planning</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Office hours are not communicated to the students.</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent of explained variance = 4.549; Cronbach alpha = .633. Extent of consensus against uncooperative cynicism at the level of 4.0 and higher = 88.3%.

- **Case: Uncooperative Cynicism**

At Cordova Community College School of Nursing, the full time faculty job description clearly specifies the responsibilities inherent in that role. Besides teaching as the primary obligation, full time faculty members are expected to participate on committees of the school and college, schedule and post regular office hours, and participate in student advising. Yet, two of the instructors who have been with the nursing program for a number of years continually fail to meet these expectations. Jamie Hester, assistant professor, lives a long distance from the campus and has expressed her dissatisfaction with being required to “come back to campus on days I don’t teach just to sit in my office for students who are never going to show up anyway.”

Frequently, when her assigned advisees show up for scheduled advising appointments, other faculty members who are present in their offices have to step in and conduct the appointments because Jamie is nowhere to be found. These faculty members feel a responsibility to the students, but resentment in the department is beginning to run high for Jamie’s lack of concern.
Barbara Towson serves as the coordinator of the LPN-RN program, a position she reluctantly assumed after the previous coordinator of seven years retired. To compensate her for this new responsibility, Barbara is given administrative release time to handle the extra work that comes with the position. The ASN program coordinator’s office is next door to Barbara’s and she often notes that Barbara’s phone rings incessantly, but Barbara does not answer it. When confronted about this, Barbara replies, “Look, this phone has two ring tones to let me know if the call is from within the school or from the outside. Frankly, I’m getting way too many calls from potential students wanting information about the program and we already have plenty of qualified applicants. So I’ve just stopped answering those outside calls. I’ve got too much work to do to waste my time with people who probably don’t need to be in our program anyway.”

Personal Disregard

Personal disregard occurs when “disrespect for the needs and sensitivities of students” is exhibited by a faculty member (Braxton & Bayer, 1999, p. 34). Smith (1996) contends that two underlying principles that govern teaching actions are promise-keeping and respect for persons.

Our syllabi, assignments, and class and office hour schedules involve promises to students. We gripe plenty when the rules are changed on us in the middle of the game – the criteria for tenure and promotion, for example. Do we recognize that students might have similar feelings?” (Smith, 1996)

Boice (1996), in his study of classroom incivilities, found that in addition to other behaviors, students are negatively impressed with instructors who arrive late or cancel classes without warning. This type of behavior communicates a lack of respect for students and their time investment. It is prudent for professors to recall that teaching is not only a transmission of skills and knowledge, but also an impartation of values that their own behavior transmits (Hardy, 2002).
Of the three behaviors from the CTBI that loaded onto the factor of personal disregard, one of these deals with the introduction of teacher opinions outside of the subject under study. In its “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure,” the AAUP states that while college teachers are entitled to freedom in discussion of course subjects, “they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject” (AAUP, 1970).

Table 4.5. Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of the Inviolable Proscriptive Norm Against Personal Disregard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTBI Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C13. The instructor routinely holds the class beyond its scheduled ending time.</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12. The instructor is routinely late for class meetings.</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. The instructor frequently introduces opinion on religious, political, or social issues clearly outside the realm of the course topics</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent of explained variance = 3.226; Cronbach alpha = 540. Extent of consensus against personal disregard at the level of 4.0 and higher = 72.2%.

- **Case: Personal Disregard**

  The students at Tri-State Technical and Community College filter into the classroom for another lecture session with Carolyn Henderson. As expected, she is late again. As the minutes tick past the time class should have started, students continue to trickle into the room. The latecomers taunt those already seated for believing that class would actually begin on time. Members of Ms. Henderson’s clinical group regale the class with stories of how the students have to arrive at 6:45 am to the hospital unit, but that Ms. Henderson usually makes it in between 7:00 and 7:30 a.m.. To compound her tardiness, she is known to tell the students to not talk to her until 9:00 a.m., because she “is not a morning person.” Just yesterday, when the students
assembled for a post-clinical conference, they were subjected to yet another of her complaint sessions about the staff nurse on this hospital unit who had an affair with her husband, and how difficult it is to work anywhere near her.

In another classroom, Cheryl Marks arrives late and hurriedly turns on the computer and projector to begin her lecture on gastrointestinal disorders. Weaving her way through the material for that class session, she frequently pauses to talk about how the upcoming presidential election is going to negatively impact the country if candidate X is elected. Once on this topic, she tells the class that her church is actively involved in this particular election because so many social issues are at stake, enumerating those issues and her view of them one by one. Cheryl continues in this vein until a student interrupts her with a question about the postoperative care of a cholecystectomy patient, at which point she abruptly returns to the lecture topic. As usual, so much time has been lost that Cheryl must rush to get all of the material in for that day. She apologizes, but tells the class that if they want to hear all the content for the next test, they had better stay over for at least 15 minutes.

**Unrealistic Course Standards**

Four behaviors from the CTBI comprise this inviolable, normative cluster that is unique to the current study. The original research conducted by Braxton and Bayer (1999) did not provide for this particular factor loading. The two items loading the highest in this normative cluster were “standards for a course are set so high that most of the class receives failing grades” and “requirements in a course are so great that they prevent enrolled students from giving adequate attention to their other courses.”

In undergraduate nursing programs designed to prepare students for registered nurse licensure, there is tremendous pressure placed upon faculty to see that graduates pass the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN) on the first
The “pass rate” generated by this is held as the gold standard for nursing education programs. State licensing boards and accrediting agencies will not provide approval status to programs that fail to meet a certain passing standard. Consequently, nursing faculties feel an obligation to design curricula, develop exam items, and create clinical opportunities that maximize their students’ chances of passing this exam (McQueen, Shelton, & Zimmerman, 2004; Sayles, Shelton, & Powell, 2003; Vervena & Fulcher, 2004). The result can be an overemphasis on making nursing courses rigorous and difficult to complete. It is not unusual for nursing instructors to refer to such courses as “weed out” courses and to defend these as necessary, if the “best” students are going to be extracted from the weaker ones.

Table 4.6. Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of the Inviolable Proscriptive Norm Against Unrealistic Course Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTBI Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E8. The standards for a course are set so high that most of the class receives failing grades for the course.</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11. The requirements in a course are so great that they prevent enrolled students from giving adequate attention to their other courses.</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10. A faculty member aggressively promotes enrollment in his/her courses at the expense of the courses of departmental colleagues.</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5. Examination questions do not represent a range of difficulty.</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent of explained variance = 2.895; Cronbach alpha = .617. Extent of consensus against unrealistic course standards at the level of 4.0 and higher = 54.4%.

- **Case: Unrealistic Course Standards**

  At Central City School of Nursing, there is a course in the ASN program that is notorious for striking fear into prospective students. The same two instructors have taught this course for the past five years and the attrition rate is typically near 50 percent. Every semester these two
instructors begin the first day of class with a warning to those enrolled that at least half of them will not pass the course. Students are warned that if they fail to make a C or higher on the first unit exam, they will not be allowed to attend clinical and consequently, will fail the course due to lack of attendance in a required course component.

In the past two semesters, the course instructors found “cheat sheets” with extensive handwritten notes that appeared to be student attempts to reconstruct exams. Because of this, the instructors worked long hours to write new exam items. The perception of cheating among the students so inflamed the faculty members that they pledged to make the test questions as difficult as possible so that students would appreciate that nursing was not to be taken lightly. After all, they were not preparing these students to balance cash drawers at a local retail store, these students were going to have peoples’ lives in their hands. If they couldn’t be responsible to take their exams seriously, what confidence did the teachers have to believe the students would take actual patient care seriously?

It is not unusual for the parents and spouses of some of the students in this course to make appointments to see the dean. In these meetings, they express their concern about how their family member (the student) is studying “all the time” and “never sleeps.” They assert that their family member cannot concentrate on anything but this one particular course, how other courses had to be dropped in order for the student to pay more attention to this “flunk out course.”

**Undermining Colleagues**

Braxton and Bayer (1999) originally defined this normative cluster as one that centers upon “faculty efforts to demean or belittle courses offered by colleagues” (p. 64, emphasis added). However, results of the current study expand this definition beyond simply the belittling
of another faculty member’s courses and include the behavior of faculty demeaning faculty in front of students.

“As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues” (AAUP, 1987). A simple deconstruction of two key words used in the AAUP statement above leads one to understand how the undermining of colleagues is in direct opposition to the heart of the academy. The word “colleague” connotes a sense of camaraderie; similarly, the word “community” evokes a vision of unity among a group of people. When professorial colleagues engage in verbal exchanges that denigrate one another, not only does the professoriate suffer, but students as well. Trust and respect is lost, and the learning environment is poorer for it.

The response of participants in the current study validates that making negative comments about a colleague in front of students and also in front of other instructors during faculty meetings are perceived as actions deserving of strong administrative sanction against the transgressor. The literature in nursing supports the importance of conducting oneself in a professional and collegial manner. In previous studies, when student nurses are asked what constitutes unethical teaching behavior, the perception of faculty engaged in disrespectful behavior toward other faculty is often cited (Benor & Leviyof, 1997; Gillespie, 2005; Wehrwein, 1996). Wehrwein (1996) contends “the behavior of the faculty serves as a reference point for the student to assess his or her own behavior” (p. 297). Table 4.7 lists the specific behaviors associate with the inviolable norm of undermining colleagues.
Table 4.7. Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of the Inviolable Proscriptive Norm Against Undermining Colleagues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTBI Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G9. A faculty member makes negative comments about a colleague in public</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8. A faculty member makes negative comments in a faculty meeting about</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the courses offered by a colleague.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent of explained variance = 2.743; Cronbach alpha = .548. Extent of consensus against undermining colleagues at the level of 4.0 and higher = 75.0%.

• **Case: Undermining Colleagues**

Maria Jones, an associate professor of nursing at Mount Carmel School of Nursing, completed her doctoral studies while continuing to work full time in education. She was proud of her ability to persevere through the rigors of obtaining a PhD and of the expanded perspective it provided her in understanding curricular matters. The new dean appointed Maria as chair of the curriculum committee, and Maria was excited about the prospects this appointment afforded her: making positive changes that needed to be made for a long time.

At first, she and the dean collaborated well. They held several meetings brainstorming ideas about innovative strategies that could improve the ASN program. However, a couple of months into this collaboration, faculty members noted that Maria’s attitude toward the dean had chilled. As a matter of fact, Maria’s attitude toward several other faculty members cooled as well. In faculty meetings, Maria began to make derogatory comments about the dean and those she perceived as her cronies.

Eventually, Maria’s discontent extended to talking with students about her “concerns” regarding the leadership in the program. One day, she ran into one of her clinical students, Tracy, at a local coffee shop. Inviting Tracy over, Maria proceeded to confide to her specific
instances that Maria felt illustrated the dean’s lack of ability and that of other faculty members. Maria encouraged Tracy to be a voice in “making things right” and take this information back to the student body. While this made Tracy very uncomfortable, she had always respected Ms. Jones. Surely Ms. Jones would not tell her something that was not true.

Admonitory Norms

As defined, admonitory norms are those that when violated evoke less indignation than inviolable norms, but sanctioning action in such cases should be handled between professorial peers (Braxton & Bayer, 1999). The participants of this study (n=604) identified 38 behaviors on the 126-item College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) as admonitory (a mean score between 3.0 and 3.99 on a Likert scale of 1 to 5). Upon completion of confirmatory factor analysis, the following four clusters of normative behavior were extracted: *instructional narrowness, teaching secrecy, inadequate communication, and inattentive planning*. Each of these normative clusters is discussed below, utilizing information from the current literature. For each norm, a fictional vignette derived from the respondents’ narratives collected for this study is provided to more richly illustrate the aspects of the behavioral norm.

**Instructional Narrowness**

Instructional narrowness refers to “narrowness in the assessment of students and in the use of teaching methods” (Braxton and Bayer, 1999, p. 57). The AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics begins with an advancement of the primacy of the professor’s obligation to “devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence” (¶ 3). The idea of scholarly competence is conceptualized as encompassing the use and transmission of knowledge. When transmitting knowledge to students, Markie (1994) notes that such an action should be undertaken with the intent to promote intellectual inquiry. In order for that to happen, the instructional setting needs to be one that makes it comfortable for students to take risks by
asking questions and having them answered, discussing alternative views, and understanding how course content relates to the overall course of study (Benor & Leviyof, 1997; Feldman, 1994; Leslie, 2002).

Recognizing that there are a variety of learning styles among any given group of students, the college educator exhibits integrity in instruction when utilizing new teaching strategies (Murray, Gillese, Lennon, Mercer, & Robinson, 1996). Such attention to pedagogical competence is held in high regard within nursing education (Brady et al., 2001; NLN, 2002). The Pew Health Professions Commission sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trust outlines expected graduate competencies for health profession programs, including nursing. Brady et al. (2001) developed a framework of teaching-learning strategies to assist the nursing educator in reflecting upon the most effective ways to transmit the knowledge needed for students to meet these competencies. Recently, the National League for Nursing created a new certification entitled “Certified Nurse Educator.” The purpose of this certification is to promote excellence in classroom and clinical teaching. To that end, one of the emphases is a focus upon use of a variety of teaching strategies grounded in educational theory and evidence-based teaching practices (NLNAC, 2005). The behaviors associated with instructional narrowness identified by nursing educators in this study are noted in Table 4.8. A fictional vignette depicting this admonitory norm is provided.
Table 4.8. Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of the Admonitory Proscriptive Norm Against Instructional Narrowness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTBI Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D7. Connections between the course and other courses are not made clear by the instructor.</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4. The instructor does not encourage student questions during class time.</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21. Examination questions do not tap a variety of educational objectives ranging from the retention of facts to critical thinking.</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8. The relationship of course content to the overall departmental curriculum is not indicated.</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11. Written comments on tests and papers are consistently not made by the instructor.</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6. The instructor does not learn the names of all students in the class.</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor.</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15. The instructor does not introduce new teaching methods or procedures</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14. The instructor does not ask students if they have questions regarding the course.</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent of explained variance = 26.117; Cronbach alpha = .805. Extent of consensus against instructional narrowness at the level of 3.0 and higher = 99.5%.

- **Case: Instructional Narrowsness**

  Whitney Masters began teaching in the ASN program of Suburban College of Nursing and Allied Health three years ago. During that time, she had been assigned to teach the same two courses every semester. The director of her program believed that if a faculty member had enough time to engage with the content of only one or two courses, then it would follow that the instructor would be better able to develop a comfort level in front of the class. This would
decrease any propensity toward defensiveness on the part of the instructor when confronted with questions by the students and it could also translate into use of innovative teaching strategies.

When Whitney began teaching her courses, a colleague who had taught those courses provided her with a full set of lecture notes, PowerPoint slides, and handouts for the students. This colleague even gave Whitney exams she had created so that Whitney could concentrate on getting comfortable interacting with the students in the classroom. However, after three years, Whitney came to each class session with the same notes, same PowerPoint presentation, and same handouts. She didn’t bother to update her information with the latest information on nursing practice and advances in medical sciences. When students attempted to ask questions during a class session, Whitney would usually reply, “We don’t have enough time to discuss that now. You can read your text if you need more information than this.”

In clinical, things were no better. Every week students turned in their required clinical paperwork as directed. Yet, the clinical rotation would end and invariably, Whitney would still have all of the students’ paperwork from the past seven weeks in her office. If she returned any of it to the students, the papers rarely had written comments from her. If Whitney felt particularly communicative, she would occasionally make a checkmark or write “good” at the top of a page. When a student had turned in especially poor work, Whitney typically only wrote “unacceptable” or “redo this” as her comments. Once, one of her teaching colleagues was approached by a student who said that he had tried phoning Whitney, leaving voice messages, sending emails, and even leaving notes on her door in order to get his paperwork back. When the colleague confronted Whitney with this information, she nonchalantly replied, “Yeah, I know. I have no idea where it is. The student got an ‘A,’ so what’s the problem?” Students continued to complain about Whitney’s lack of responsiveness and uninspired teaching on the semester evaluations, but nothing changed.
Teaching Secrecy

Teaching secrecy “involves faculty refusal to provide colleagues with information and materials relevant to the role of college teaching” (Braxton & Bayer, 1999, p. 62). Indeed, it is an accepted practice in the academy to share the results of scholarship with colleagues through both peer review processes and publication or presentation of those results. It is not surprising that educators would expect a similar type of disclosure regarding college teaching. Boyer (1990), in his inclusive exposition on what constitutes scholarly work, encouraged faculty to disseminate information regarding teaching strategies among themselves and to engage in peer review of teaching practices. Reminding college educators that they are themselves learners, Boyer asserted that the work of teaching “becomes consequential only as it is understood by others” (p. 23). Refusal to share ideas about teaching or to allow colleagues to observe classroom teaching is reflective of the kind of behaviors included under the admonitory normative cluster of teaching secrecy. Table 4.9 provides a complete list of the behaviors noted by nursing educators as constituting this norm.
Table 4.9. Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of the Admonitory Proscriptive Norm Against Teaching Secrecy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTBI ITEM</th>
<th>LOADING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G4. A faculty member refuses to share course syllabi with colleagues.</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5. A faculty member avoids sharing ideas about teaching methods with colleagues.</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6. A faculty member refuses to allow colleagues to observe his/her classroom teaching.</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G13. A faculty member avoids talking about his/her academic specialty with departmental colleagues.</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7. A faculty member assumes new teaching responsibilities in the specialty of a colleague without discussing appropriate course content with that colleague.</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G12. A faculty member refuses to team teach a course.</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent of explained variance = 5.574; Cronbach alpha = .813. Extent of consensus against teaching secrecy at the level of 3.0 and higher = 97.9%.

- **Case: Teaching Secrecy**

  Jackie Edwards consistently receives glowing student evaluations of her classroom teaching. Students often remark about her ability to hold them spellbound as she relates stories of her years in nursing practice and how such stories help them better comprehend the course content. When Jackie attends meetings of the curriculum committee, she is quick to remind the other members of the committee of her extensive experience in curriculum development and the awards she has garnered for her teaching excellence. Yet, this past summer, when Jackie decided to take an extended leave for a long overdue vacation, she refused to provide faculty with any of her notes for teaching a course she usually taught by herself. Actually, she didn’t so much refuse as she simply “forgot” to give her notebooks to anyone before she left for Europe.

When contacted by phone to ask if she could just email the documents, Jackie cheerfully assured
the caller that she would take care of that “right away,” but the requested documents never appeared.

When her peers attempted to observe her classes, Jackie would acknowledge their appearance in the room and then proceed to regale the class with stories about times she and these peers had spent together at an educational conference or on the clinical unit. With her charming personality, Jackie would quickly engage the visiting peer with questions like “You remember that, don’t you?” and “You know what I’m talking about, right?” The students would laugh, but never would her peers be able to hear any of her lecture material. Some of her colleagues had asked her why she never gave them any of her resources, and she replied, “All you have to do is look on the share drive on the computer. All of my files are there.” But, of course, nothing was there.

**Inadequate Communication**

The admonitory normative cluster labeled as inadequate communication pertains to a “failure to convey course details to students” (Braxton & Bayer, 1999, p. 48). Wehrwein (1996) contended that one of the undergirding principles of ethical teaching practice is communication. Communication from teacher to student must include not only course details, but also a sense of security in which the student understands that the teacher is available and non-threatening (Markie, 1994; Weimer, 2002). The National League for Nursing Core Competencies of Nurse Educators promotes communication as a primary mechanism to facilitate learning and further qualifies that skilled communication is that which “reflects an awareness of self and others, along with an ability to convey ideas in a variety of contexts” (NLNAC, 2005). Nursing faculty convey overwhelming agreement on the extent of disapproval for the four behaviors reflective of the admonitory norm of inadequate communication, as noted in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10. Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of the Admonitory Proscriptive Norm Against Inadequate Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTBI ITEM</th>
<th>LOADING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B12. The first reading assignment is not communicated to the class.</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Joke-telling and humor unrelated to course content occurs routinely in class.</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9. An overview of the course is not presented to students on the first day.</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. The topics or objectives to be covered for the day are not announced at the beginning of the class.</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7. The instructor routinely allows one or a few students to dominate class discussion.</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent of explained variance = 4.261; Cronbach alpha = .715. Extent of consensus against inadequate communication at the level of 3.0 and higher = 99.8%.

- **Case: Inadequate Communication**

Recently, the curriculum committee recommended and the ASN faculty approved a standard format for course syllabi to be used in all nursing courses at City College. The impetus for this action was based upon the behaviors of one particular instructor, Patty Jacobs. For several semesters, student evaluations of Patty’s courses indicated that her syllabi provided no direction regarding reading assignments, nor was there any type of topical outline given. Patty would simply start the first day of class by immediately delving into the subject of the day. She was very knowledgeable about the course material and able to answer student questions. She was even quite entertaining with her repertoire of funny stories, but Patty eventually frustrated the majority of students because her stories did nothing to illustrate the course material. They were just funny for the sake of humor alone.

In any class, it is not unusual for students to begin talking among themselves at various times. At City College, nursing students were confident that their instructors would halt that type of behavior before it became a real distraction. This was not so in Patty’s class. Once
students started talking among themselves, Patty would simply ignore their conversations and continue with her lecture. Her peers would advise Patty to confront disruptive students by reminding them that their talking was making it difficult for other students to hear. While Patty knew she should do this, she couldn’t bring herself to be a “big meanie” and risk the students disliking her. After all, they already tore her up on her classroom evaluations about not writing out their assignments on the syllabus!

**Inattentive Planning**

Failure on the part of a faculty member to plan adequately for a course constitutes the admonitory norm of inattentive planning (Braxton & Bayer, 1999). In a meta-analysis of 31 studies examining the importance that students and faculty attributed to various instructional characteristics, Feldman (1994) found that students ranked teacher preparation and organization of the course very highly as one of their expectations for faculty. When faculty members fail to plan appropriately for their teaching assignments, students can construe this as a lack of concern and respect for them (Smith, 1996). Table 4.11 lists the five behaviors ASN educators in the current study identified as constituting inattentive planning. Substantial consensus regarding this behavior exists among nursing faculty with 98.7% of those surveyed rating this norm at the 3.0 level or higher.
### Table 4.11. Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of the Admonitory Proscriptive Norm against Inattentive Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTBI Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A7. The instructor does not read reviews of appropriate textbooks.</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9. Colleagues teaching the same or similar courses are not consulted on ways to teach the particular course.</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Prior to the first meeting of a class, the instructor does not visit the assigned classroom and assess its facilities.</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10. Required course materials are not kept within reasonable cost limits as perceived by students.</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12. In-class activities are not prepared and anticipated in advance, but are developed while the class is in session.</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent of explained variance = 3.953; Cronbach alpha = .698. Extent of consensus against inattentive planning at the level of 3.0 and higher = 98.7%.

- **Case: Inattentive Planning**

  The dean of nursing at Immaculata College School of Nursing recently hired Catherine Brown to fill a vacancy left by a faculty member, who had resigned abruptly. Catherine had worked at five different schools of nursing in the past ten years. She attributed this to her husband’s work that required them to move frequently. Her curriculum vita described a wide array of teaching assignments from adult health nursing to mental health nursing to pediatrics. This same CV also declared that Catherine was ABD with a doctoral program well known for the quality of its education. When questioned about when she intended to complete her dissertation, Catherine responded that her time to complete the degree expired before she could finish. She indicated she had no intention of returning to the studies and that she was satisfied to remain ABD.
The program director assigned Catherine to teach in the pediatric course vacated by the faculty member who had resigned. Catherine changed the required text for the course to one for which she had been a contributing author several years before. While significantly more expensive than the text usually required and also changing the reading at the last minute, Catherine felt justified that her choice for text was superior.

On the first day of class, Catherine was late, because she became lost looking for her classroom. She had told herself to remember to look at the campus map and get a sense of the buildings and their general layout, but she just hadn’t had a chance to do that. Moving to another city and setting up a new home was so much work! She fumbled around with the computer and projection equipment until a student came to her assistance. Kindly thanking the student, Catherine quickly appointed her as “my personal keeper” and proceeded to seek the student’s technical assistance on many other occasions.

As the semester progressed, it became a common sight to see pizzas delivered to the hospital unit Catherine used for clinical. Every week, her clinical group would arrive late to the unit because Catherine kept them in the cafeteria in an extended pre-clinical conference. While the students were scheduled for an eight-hour shift, it wasn’t unusual for them to leave the unit around lunchtime, never to return. When the nursing staff grumbled about the way the students “just dropped in and out” without really doing anything, Catherine would order pizza for the staff to thank them for being “such a great group to work with.” The reality was that it had been years since Catherine had worked in the clinical setting and she was terrified that everyone would figure out how little she actually knew. Instead of committing to better preparation, she had learned over the years that pizza, cookies, and candy covered a multitude of sins!
Summary

Results of both descriptive and confirmatory factor analyses, presented in this chapter, revealed that associate of science in nursing educators identified five inviolable normative clusters and four admonitory. Inviolable norms are those that when committed invoke in colleagues a high degree of moral outrage that is best dealt with by administrative sanctions. The inviolable norms are *condescending negativism, uncooperative cynicism, personal disregard, unrealistic course standards*, and *undermining colleagues*. Admonitory norms evoke less indignation on the part of one’s colleagues, but are best handled when peers confront peers with the transgression. The admonitory norms are *instructional narrowness, teaching secrecy, inadequate communication*, and *inattentive planning*. For each norm presented, information from the current literature regarding that norm was synthesized, and a fictional vignette depicting the violation of the norm was presented. The final chapter will examine this information in light of the literature review, identify implications for higher education and nursing, and provide recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter provides a review of the research problem that guided this study and the methodology used to examine it. The major sections of this chapter summarize the results, consider the results in light of the existing research previously reviewed in this report, discuss implications, and suggest areas for future research.

Review of Findings

Utilizing the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) developed by Braxton and Bayer (1999), a sequential explanatory mixed methods design was employed to examine what associate of science in nursing educators identified as normative teaching behaviors. The population for this study consisted of educators in the United States teaching in associate of science in nursing programs accredited by the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC). Through construction of a list of all 628 such programs, non-probability census sampling was utilized to contact program deans and directors in order to solicit both their and their faculty’s participation in completion of the CTBI. The final sample consisted of 604 participants from 229 ASN programs in 44 states and the District of Columbia.

Confirmatory factor analysis of the results from the CTBI revealed that nursing educators identified a total of nine normative behavioral clusters. Five of these clusters were considered inviolable; meaning that transgression of these norms should result in administrative sanction. The inviolable norms were labeled: *condescending negativism, uncooperative cynicism, personal disregard, unrealistic course standards*, and *undermining colleagues*. The remaining four behavioral clusters were admonitory in nature; meaning that transgression of these norms evokes less indignation from peers but requires peer-to-peer confrontation. The admonitory norms
identified in this study are *instructional narrowness, teaching secrecy, inadequate communication,* and *inattentive planning.*

Distribution of the CTBI was followed by a call for qualitative data from the research participants. In this portion of the study, participants submitted personal narratives of actual circumstances that represented one or more of the normative clusters. This information was then used to construct fictional vignettes to more richly illustrate each of the identified norms.

**Consideration of Findings in Light of Current Research**

As noted in Chapter 2, the intersection of the concepts of social norms of behavior, the teacher-student relationship, and the professional socialization of registered nurses represented an area that had yet to be empirically studied. The current study was designed to examine those concepts by exploring what nursing educators believe are essential normative teaching behaviors. A discussion of the findings begins first with a comparison of the current study’s results to those of Braxton and Bayer (1999). This is followed by a consideration of the findings in light of the core concepts from the literature presented earlier in this paper.

**Original Study Conducted by Braxton and Bayer**

The results of this study generally confirm those found by Braxton and Bayer (1999). In the original study, the researchers assumed that norms of behavior are constructed and communicated within individual social groups. Asserting that the academic discipline provides a means for making a distinction between groups of college educators, the study conducted by Braxton and Bayer produced a determination of what faculty within the disciplines of biology, mathematics, history, and psychology identified as normative teaching behaviors. From the development and distribution of the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI), Braxton and Bayer discovered that a set of seven inviolable and nine admonitory teaching norms existed.
Extending these assumptions to the applied discipline of nursing, the current study produced similar results with a few exceptions. When associate of science in nursing educators were asked the same 126 questions from the CTBI, they identified a set of five inviolable and four admonitory norms. Eight of these normative clusters closely aligned with the definitions provided by Braxton and Bayer. Only one of the behavioral patterns identified by nurse educators, unrealistic course standards, had not been previously identified in the original study.

The participants in this study ranked a total of 99 of the 126 CTBI items at a level of 3.0 or higher on the sanctioning scale provided, whereas the participants in the original study chose a total of 88 items. In the final factor analysis, based on scree plots and eigenvalues to determine the explained variance, only 46 items were utilized to construct the context for this study. If all 99 had been used, there would have been 18 inviolable and 8 admonitory normative clusters, well exceeding that identified by Braxton and Bayer. The influence of the nursing discipline may be responsible for the high number of items receiving scores, reflective of the need for sanctioning actions by either administrators or peers. This influence is discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

Shifts in societal scrutiny of ethics in the public square provides another possible explanation for the higher number of items rated as requiring some form of sanction. The current study was conducted approximately one decade after the original. Since that time, the United States has not only dealt with a greater awareness of improprieties within the academy, but also with horrific events such as the shooting on the Virginia Tech campus in 2007 and other similar extreme forms of uncivil behavior at institutions of higher education. It is distinctly possible that such realities provided context for nursing educators when answering the CTBI.

Coinciding with the ascendance of these societal issues is the emergence of research in higher education related to spirituality, a topic long avoided by scholars (Bryant, Choi, &
Yasuno, 2003; Gallagher, 2007; Hindman, 2004; Love & Talbot, 2000). In the literature, it is asserted that failure to recognize the importance of the spiritual dimension of human development is a failure on the part of the academy to truly consider students and faculty in a holistic fashion. The challenge issued to the professoriate is to see spirituality as something that is “already there” (Hindman, p. 181) and that is deserving of closer scrutiny. The surging emphasis on student civic engagement during the college years is yet one more example of the trend in the academy toward issues of values, ethics, and accountability. Any or all of these examples potentially provide perspective for better understanding possible reasons that educators in the current study identified more items on the CTBI as requiring sanction than did educators in the original study.

Social Norms of Behavior

The distribution of the CTBI in the current study gave nursing educators an opportunity to reflect upon what teaching behaviors were acceptable or not and what type of sanction should take place if those behaviors were transgressed. These findings align with those of Feldman (2001) who discovered that the development of group norms occurs as social groups decide what behaviors have significance for the proper functioning of that group. These behaviors are then communicated as a set of informal rules that serve to regulate the behavior of the group. Violation of the behaviors deserves some type of enforcement (Braxton, 1991; Durkheim, 1957; Eimers et al., 2001; Fox & Braxton, 1994).

The faculty in this study displayed the highest disdain for actions involving the demeaning of students or faculty colleagues. Labeled condescending negativism, this inviolable normative cluster elicited the most examples from the study participants when qualitative narrative accounts were solicited. The disdain for this type of behavior by the participants in this study suggests that nursing educators sense the connection between teacher actions and their
influence upon student behavior. This supports the findings of Boice (1996) who found that teachers who behave in antisocial ways have a negative impact upon student classroom behavior. Hippocrates once admonished, “Physician, heal thyself”. The disdain for the behavior of *condescending negativism* suggests a current day corollary to that rebuke.

The admonitory norm receiving the highest scores from nursing faculty was that of *instructional narrowness*. The common theme reflected in this normative cluster is intolerance for teacher behaviors that fail to fairly assess a student’s learning or fail to utilize teaching methods that assist the student to properly understand the curriculum. Those who choose to teach nursing have opportunity to attend graduate programs that offer coursework in curriculum and instruction for the purpose of providing a foundation for teaching practice. Almost 50 per cent of the respondents in the current study who gave examples of actual practice situations involving norm transgression completed this type of graduate program. One of the respondents indicated she held certification as a Certified Nurse Educator (CNE), a mark of distinction created by the National League for Nursing. Representing a growing emphasis on the quality of nursing education, the intent of the CNE program is to promote faculty development and excellence in teaching (NLN, 2002). Rating *instructional narrowness* as a set of behaviors requiring colleagues to confront each other is fitting based on such trends as the CNE. Indeed, it speaks well of nursing’s concern for professional accountability handled best between peers.

Of particular interest is the inviolable norm of *unrealistic course standards* because of its uniqueness to the current study. As discussed in Chapter 4, nursing educators are especially concerned with preparing their students for licensure upon graduation. To this end, examination items are designed to facilitate clinical decision-making skills and critical thinking. The format for these test items is usually limited to multiple-choice questions that are difficult and time-consuming to write. Also, the gravity of the professional responsibility accorded to registered
nurses for preserving and enhancing the lives of their patients plays significantly into both
classroom and clinical instruction. It is not unusual for students in nursing programs to be
advised to avoid taking anything but nursing courses, once admitted to the clinical component of
the curriculum. Yet, even with all of these pressures, nursing educators in the current study
identified that it is not acceptable to make nursing courses too difficult or unrealistic.

Such findings are consistent with the American Nurses’ Association promulgation of
elevating the standards of nursing education (Freitas, 1990). The charge to nursing educators in
the American Nurses’ Association Code of Ethics is clear:

The nurse educator is responsible for promoting and maintaining optimum standards of
both nursing education and nursing practice in any settings where planned learning
activities occur. Nurse educators must also ensure that only those students who possess
the knowledge, skills, and competencies that are essential to nursing graduate from their
nursing programs (ANA, 2001).

The Teacher-Student Relationship

While the American Nurses’ Association has this statement in its established code of
ethics, it does not provide specific guidance for negotiating the teacher-student relationship. The
results of the current study provide evidence for the profession of nursing to consider as it
develops a clearer understanding of the responsibilities inherent in that relationship.

Previous studies designed to examine the teacher-student relationship indicate that faculty
have a remarkable ability to either positively or negatively impact student learning (Clark,
Walker, & Keith, 2002; Endo & Harpel, 1982; Kuh, 1995; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1981). This
ability lies in the teacher’s expert knowledge, preparation for classroom teaching, attitude toward
students, and effective interaction with students both in and out of the classroom (Clark &
Springer, 2007; Clark et al., 2002; Kuh, 1995; Kuh & Hu, 2001; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).
The literature is clear that instructors cannot rely solely upon the mere conveyance of course content to students as the sum total of the teaching relationship. They also need to remain conscious of the value-laden context of the teacher-student relationship (Shulman, 2002; Teven & McCroskey, 1997).

As Rupert and Holmes (1997) observed, faculty members are engaged in “multiple professional relationships” (p. 660) with their students. From teaching to advising to socializing, the activities that are an inherent part of the teacher-student relationship are complex. This complexity requires the academician to be cognizant of the power differential that exists between teacher and student and not to exploit it (Markie, 1994; Rupert & Holmes; Turman & Schrodt, 2006). Encouragingly, the results of this study confirm that nursing educators are aware of the potentially negative impact that poor teaching behaviors and inattention to the special relationship between teacher and student can have upon students. This is evidenced in the high level of disdain demonstrated by the participants in this study for such behaviors.

Professional Socialization of Registered Nurses and Nurse Educators

It is alternately encouraging and discouraging to consider the degree to which nursing educators in this study rated the items in the CTBI. Encouraging, because such high levels of disdain hold promise for enhancing awareness among faculty of acceptable ways of behaving with their students. Perhaps it can be extrapolated that nursing educators truly care about their students and want to create respectful and trusting learning environments. But it is also discouraging because it provides additional evidence to suggest that nurses can be remarkably rigid.

Nursing, as a unique disciplinary culture, has a long history of oppressive and abusive behavior in its practitioners (Diekelmann, 2001; McGregor, 2005). While this has been attributed to the sense of powerlessness nurses have experienced due to the profession’s
predominantly female membership and the socially constructed superiority of medicine over nursing (Roberts, 2000), it remains nonetheless an area for continued improvement and study. The literature documents that nurses often participate in a perpetual cycle of abuse toward each other (Diekelmann) and that they tend to “eat their young” (Meissner, 1986, p. 52). If socialization into nursing begins at a student’s point of entry into a basic nursing educational program as Chitty and Black asserted (2007), then nursing educators are at the forefront of influencing the professional socialization of registered nurses. The ability of educators to influence the profession continues in graduate programs designed to prepare nurses for advanced practice. Austin (2002) noted that graduate education is ripe with possibilities for not only developing disciplinary skills and knowledge, but also for transmitting norms, attitudes, and values. Recall the thematic differences evident in Table 4.1 in which the educators in the current study identified inviolable normative clusters as suggestive of social behaviors toward other faculty and students. Such an emphasis upon these types of behaviors that when violated require administrative sanction suggests that the participants in this study are desirous of bringing such negativity to an end. The results of the current study provide data for educators to reflect upon if the destructive cycle of abuse in nursing is to be broken.

Implications for Higher Education and Nursing

The identification of normative teaching behaviors by college educators as presented in this study suggests implications for improving the learning environment in higher education. In particular, issues relative to reflective teaching practice, preparation of graduate students for college teaching, enhancement of student retention, and development of institutional policies regarding appropriate faculty conduct will be considered.

The academy is not an insular entity protected from public scrutiny. Instead, it is responsible to the society from which it springs. If the practitioners of higher education, the
members of the professoriate, are to continue practicing autonomously and enjoying the benefits of being considered professionals, then it is wise to engage in reflection upon the profession’s obligation to society. Schon (1987) asserted that the ability to practice professionally depends less on attaining factual knowledge than it does on developing the capacity to reflect before acting. Metaphorically likening professional practice to a terrain characterized by high ground overlooking a swamp, Schon noted that the high ground represents the easy application of classroom and book-learned theory (technical rationality) to the solving of day-to-day problems. However, he warned that the swamp is where the real challenges for decision-making lie. Characterizing the swamp as “messy” and “confusing”, Schon posited that this is where the “problems of greatest human concern” exist (p. 3). The swamp represents the areas of professional practice that lie beyond the grasp of a positivist epistemology. Coining the phrase “reflection-in-action,” Schon advanced the idea that if professionals intend to maintain their contract with society, professionals must begin to really “stop and think” about their actions (p. 26).

Brookfield (1995) echoes these ideas. A critically reflective attitude requires one to “identify and scrutinize the assumptions that undergird how we work” (Brookfield, 1995). Sensitive to issues of power in the classroom, Brookfield challenged teachers to understand that “teaching can never be innocent” (p. 1). Instead, the classroom is best understood as a representation of the larger world, a world filled with hegemonic political and social forces. When hooks (1994) collected her essays on teaching and published them as the book, Teaching to Transgress, she noted, “If we are to meet the needs of our students, if we are to restore to education and the classroom excitement about ideas and the will to learn” (p. 12), then it is important to see the classroom as a “location of possibility” (p. 207) in which teachers have opportunity to truly engage with their students. Critical reflection assists educators to create
learning experiences that are grounded in respect for self and others. An explanatory study such as the one presented in this report has the capacity to provide a foundation from which educators can begin to consider the impact of their actions upon the students they teach. From that consideration, a catalyst is provided whereby actual practice can be changed, if change is indeed necessary or desirable (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003).

Teaching practice can also be greatly influenced by the preparation afforded educators while they are in graduate school. Because graduate education serves as a powerful socialization mechanism, curricula at the graduate level need to be enhanced with activities that help students better understand the multiple skills and abilities they will need in academia (Austin, 2002). Part of this skill set will be an increased awareness of and appreciation for the role and responsibilities of the academic in American society. Results of a study such as the current one challenge the academy to consider what graduate education can do to better prepare its students to become teachers as well as scholars. Raising issues of academic impropriety and classroom ethics as early as possible in graduate classes has potential to positively impact the future college students who will be taught by these graduate students.

College student retention is another important area that can and should be considered when looking at the results of the current study. Previous research regarding college student retention supports the importance of high quality interactions between students and faculty, both in and out of the classroom (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1998, 2005; Schulte, Thompson, Hayes, Noble, & Jacobs, 2001; Thompson, 2001a). Schulte et al. found that due to the power differential between faculty and students, it is not unusual for faculty to perceive themselves more positively than do students. Yet, data reveal that students who choose not to return to college often rate their instructors as displaying a lack of respect for them or failing to show real concern for their academic progress (Schulte, et al.). The current study provided opportunity for
the research participants to consider what behaviors they as faculty believe to be violations of normative teaching practice. The dissemination of these results has potential to challenge nursing educators and other academicians to reflect upon ways in which they impact student learning and retention through their day-to-day interactions with students. As one of the participants in the current study commented, “Perhaps we can add these areas [of normative behavior] to our faculty evaluation tools to draw more attention to our behavior.”

Finally, institutional policy may be impacted by campus-wide discussions of what constitutes ethical teaching behavior. In the interest of shared governance, it is imperative that these conversations include the voices of students, faculty, and administrators. Universities and colleges that already have ethics committees and formalized statements approximating a community creed should consider the development of formal codes of teaching conduct. These codes can identify clear expectations for teaching responsibilities and define what types of sanction are necessary if the code is violated. If sanction is required, the type and degree of sanction needs to be determined, then enforced. For schools where such dialogue does not already exist, results of studies such as the current one can provide a beginning point for these discussions.

Recommendations for Future Research

While the current study provided a preliminary understanding of what nursing educators believe constitutes normative teaching behavior, there are many facets of this topic left to explore. First, the current study only examined associate of science in nursing programs. Preparatory nursing education also encompasses hospital-based diploma programs and baccalaureate programs as well. As such, it would be beneficial to use the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory to survey educators within those programs to provide a clearer picture of what nursing educators in general espouse as teaching norms. An accompanying aspect to be
considered here would be to determine if differences exist among these groups of nurse educators. Such differences might be anticipated when one considers that educators in diploma and associate degree programs focus almost solely on the teaching role, whereas BSN educators usually have a scholarship expectation as well and cannot devote as much time toward teaching.

An expansion of the qualitative portion of this study is advisable. In-depth, face-to-face interviews or focus group sessions designed to elicit information relative to the lived experiences of nursing educators would provide a rich source of data to provide greater context for understanding why nursing educators espouse certain norms. During interviews, factors such as early experiences in basic nursing preparation and beginning nursing practice could be explored to determine how socialization to the profession occurred and if those experiences impacted performance in the educator role.

An unexplored area in the current study is the impact of race and gender upon the professional socialization of registered nurses and nurse educators and their developmental understanding of normative teaching behaviors. This provides an additional area deserving examination. With an increasing call for diversity initiatives in nursing after a long history of a predominance of white females within the profession, a study designed to examine the experiences of male faculty and faculty of color could provide valuable insight into an aspect of the profession where little empirical study has been conducted.

Another area of study would be to examine the graduate preparation of nurse educators. Most nursing educators who teach in undergraduate collegiate programs are prepared at the master’s level with multiple educational tracks to obtain that degree, all of which will allow the nurse to teach in an undergraduate program. Even at the doctoral level, nurses have multiple options. If a degree in nursing is sought, then there are tracks for the PhD, Doctor of Nursing Science, and Doctor of Nursing Practice. Nursing also embraces degrees from related fields such
as education and the social sciences. Such diversity in educational backgrounds could have an impact on the ways in which the nurse educator carries out the teaching role and its responsibilities and as such, provides an area for further study relative to understanding teaching norms.

Additionally, it would be pertinent to examine whether sanctioning of faculty misconduct actually occurs on college campuses and what form it takes. If it does occur, is the process informal (i.e., colleagues speaking with each other) or formal (i.e., reporting to administrators or ethics committees)? Where sanctions are enacted, how effective is it perceived to be?

Another area for additional research would be to study faculty misconduct from the perspective of current nursing students, those who have dropped out of nursing programs, and recent graduates. Recommended questions for study include: What experiences do these students recall with their instructors that they would characterize as effective, ineffective, intimidating, or successful? Do students who experience teaching improprieties discuss their concerns with the involved faculty member or anyone else (i.e., another faculty member, administrators, or student)? If students do discuss their concerns, what actions followed? How was the offending behavior addressed?

A final area for future research would be to study what nursing educators do well. The current study and the recommendations up to this point carry more of a negative slant. To turn this focus toward a more positive one could generate valuable information about what nursing educators perceive to be ways in which they excel. This could provide a discussion point for instructing graduate students how to teach effectively and the data gathered could serve as a catalyst to produce positive changes in the professional socialization of nurses.
Summary

This dissertation extends the previous research conducted by Braxton and Bayer (1999) on faculty misconduct by determining what members of the applied discipline of nursing identify as normative teaching behaviors. The results of this study provide evidence for a broadened understanding of academic impropriety and faculty responsibilities in the teaching role. If the academy is to maintain its right to autonomous self-governance, then it is time for those within the academy to seriously consider this facet of its obligation to society. Where the academy is judged to inadequately govern itself, then it is merely a matter of time before external bodies will intervene to see that the academy is governed from without.

If the classroom is a “microcosm of the external community” and if the manner in which professors conduct their classes “says something about how we conceive of proper human relationships” (Loui, 1997), then additional research in the area of normative teaching behaviors will provide valuable data for facilitating faculty recognition of ways in which positive, respectful, and caring learning environments can be achieved. College students and those faculty members who already behave with this level of dedication deserve nothing less.
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APPENDIX A
ORIGINAL COLLEGE TEACHING BEHAVIORS INVENTORY (CTBI)
COLLEGE TEACHING BEHAVIORS INVENTORY

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

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

### A. PRE-PLANNING FOR THE COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Required texts and other reading materials are not routinely ordered by the instructor in time to be available for the first class session.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. A course outline or syllabus is not prepared for a course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Prior to the first meeting of a class, the instructor does not visit the assigned classroom and assess its facilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. A course outline or syllabus does not contain dates for assignments and/or examinations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. Objectives for the course are not specified by the instructor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. Changes in a course are made without seeking information from students who have previously taken the course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. The instructor does not read reviews of appropriate textbooks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8. The course is designed without taking into account the needs or abilities of students enrolling in the course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9. Colleagues teaching the same or similar courses are not consulted on ways to teach the particular course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10. Required course materials are not kept within reasonable cost limits as perceived by students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11. New lectures or revised lectures which reflect advancements in the field are not prepared.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12. In-class activities are not prepared and anticipated in advance, but are developed while the class is in session.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13. The Instructor does not request necessary audio-visual materials in time to be available for class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14. Assigned books and articles are not put on library reserve by the instructor on a timely basis for student use.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. FIRST DAY OF CLASS

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

### C. IN-CLASS BEHAVIORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1.</td>
<td>Class sessions are begun without an opportunity for students to ask questions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.</td>
<td>The topics or objectives to be covered for the day are not announced at the beginning of the class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.</td>
<td>Joke-telling and humor unrelated to course content occurs routinely in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.</td>
<td>The instructor frequently uses profanity in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5.</td>
<td>Class is usually dismissed early.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6.</td>
<td>The instructor meets the class without having reviewed pertinent materials for the day.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7.</td>
<td>The instructor routinely allows one or a few students to dominate class discussion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8.</td>
<td>Instructions and requirements for course assignments are not clearly described to students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9.</td>
<td>Class does not begin with a review of the last class session.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10.</td>
<td>Joke-telling and humor related to course content occurs frequently in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C11. The instructor does not end the class session by summarizing material covered during the class.

C12. The instructor is routinely late for class meetings.

C13. The instructor routinely holds the class beyond its scheduled ending time.

C14. The instructor does not take class attendance every class meeting.

C15. The instructor does not introduce new teaching methods or procedures.

C16. The instructor does not provide in-class opportunities for students to voice their opinion about the course.

C17. The instructor calls on students to answer questions in class on a non-voluntary basis.

C18. The instructor does not follow the course outline or syllabus for most of the course.

C19. The instructor practices poor personal hygiene and regularly has offensive body odor.

C20. The instructor routinely wears a sloppy sweatshirt and rumpled blue jeans to class.

C21. While able to conduct class, the instructor frequently attends class while obviously intoxicated.

D. TREATING COURSE CONTENT

D1. The instructor does not have students evaluate the course at the end of the term.

D2. The instructor insists that students take one particular perspective on course content.

D3. The instructor’s professional biases or assumptions are not explicitly made known to students.

D4. The instructor frequently introduces opinion on religious, political or social issues clearly outside the realm of the course topics.

D5. The instructor does not include pertinent scholarly contributions of women and minorities in the content of the course.

D6. Memorization of course content is stressed at the expense of analysis and critical thinking.

D7. Connections between the course and other courses are not made clear by the instructor.

D8. The relationship of the course content to the overall departmental curriculum is not indicated.

D9. A cynical attitude toward the subject matter is expressed by the instructor.

E. EXAMINATION AND GRADING PRACTICES

E1. The instructor does not give assignments or examinations requiring student writing skills.
E2. When examinations or papers are returned, student questions are not answered during class time.

E3. Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor.

E4. Individual student course evaluations, where students can be identified, are read prior to the determination of final course grades.

E5. Examination questions do not represent a range of difficulty.

E6. Grades are distributed on a "curve.

E7. An instructor lowers course standards in order to be popular with students.

E8. The standards for a course are set so high that most of the class receives failing grades for the course.

E9. Individual students are offered extra-credit work in order to improve their final course grade after the term is completed.

E10. Explanation of the basis for grades given for essay questions or papers is not provided to students.

E11. Written comments on tests and papers are consistently not made by the instructor.

E12. The instructor allows personal friendships with a student to intrude on the objective grading of their work.

E13. Student papers or essay examination questions are not read at least twice before a grade is given.

E14. Social, personal or other non-academic characteristics of students are taken into account in the awarding of student grades.

E15. Final examinations are administered during a regular class period rather than at the official examination period.

E16. Student class participation is considered in awarding the final course grade.

E17. Student attendance in class is weighted in determining the final course grade.

E18. Student opinions about the method of grading are not sought.

E19. Students' work is not graded anonymously.

E20. The final course grade is based on a single course assignment or a single examination.

E21. Examination questions do not tap a variety of educational objectives ranging from the retention of facts to critical thinking.

E22. Sexist or racist comments in students' written work are not discouraged.

E23. An instructor does not hold review sessions before examinations.

E24. All student grades are publicly posted with social security numbers and without names.

E25. Graded papers and examinations are left in an accessible location where students can search through to get back their own.
### F. FACULTY-STUDENT IN-CLASS INTERACTIONS

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1.</td>
<td>Stated policies about late work and incompletes are not universally applied to all students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2.</td>
<td>Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3.</td>
<td>The instructor expresses impatience with a slow learner in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4.</td>
<td>The instructor does not encourage student questions during class time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5.</td>
<td>An instructor makes condescending remarks to a student in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6.</td>
<td>The instructor does not learn the names of all students in the class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7.</td>
<td>A clear lack of class members' understanding about course content is ignored by the instructor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8.</td>
<td>A faculty member is not encouraged to speak in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9.</td>
<td>The instructor does not allow students to direct their comments to other members of the class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G. RELATIONSHIPS WITH COLLEAGUES

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1.</td>
<td>A faculty member refuses to share academic information about mutual students with colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2.</td>
<td>A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committees that there are very low grading standards in a colleague's course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3.</td>
<td>A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committees that a colleague's course content largely includes obsolete material.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4.</td>
<td>A faculty member refuses to share course syllabi with colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5.</td>
<td>A faculty member avoids sharing ideas about teaching methods with colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6.</td>
<td>A faculty member refuses to allow colleagues to observe his/her classroom teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7.</td>
<td>A faculty member assumes new teaching responsibilities in the specialty of a colleague without discussing appropriate course content with that colleague.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8.</td>
<td>A faculty member makes negative comments in a faculty meeting about the courses offered by a colleague.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9.</td>
<td>A faculty member makes negative comments about a colleague in public before students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10.</td>
<td>A faculty member aggressively promotes enrollment in his/her courses at the expense of the courses of departmental colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11.</td>
<td>The requirements in a course are so great that they prevent enrolled students from giving adequate attention to their other courses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G12.</td>
<td>A faculty member refuses to team teach a course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G13.</td>
<td>A faculty member avoids talking about his/her academic specialty with departmental colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G14. A faculty member gives unsolicited advice on the content of a colleague's course.

G15. A faculty member gives unsolicited advice to a colleague about teaching methods.

G16. A faculty member refuses to participate in departmental curricular planning.

H. OUT-OF-CLASS PRACTICES

H1. Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept.

H2. Individual counseling on matters unrelated to course content is not provided to students enrolled in one's courses.

H3. A faculty member utilizes the academic performance of a student in front of other students.

H4. A faculty member avoids spending time with students outside of class time and/or regular office hours.

H5. A faculty member insists that they never be phoned at home by students, regardless of circumstances.

H6. A faculty member makes suggestive sexual comments to a student enrolled in the course.

H7. A faculty member has a sexual relationship with a student enrolled in the course.

H8. A faculty member does not refer a student with a special problem to the appropriate campus service.

H9. An advisee is treated in a condescending manner.

H10. A faculty member avoids giving career or job advice when asked by students.

H11. A faculty member refuses to write letters of reference for any student.

H12. A faculty member neglects to send a letter of recommendation that they had agreed to write.

H13. A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors.

H14. A cynical attitude toward the role of teaching is expressed by an instructor.

H15. A faculty member's involvement in scholarship is so great that he/she fails to adequately prepare for class.

H16. Scholarly literature is not read for the purpose of integrating new information into one's courses.

H17. A faculty member avoids reading literature on teaching techniques or methods.

H18. A faculty member avoids professional development opportunities that would enhance their teaching.
A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR AND YOUR INSTITUTION'S TEACHING OBJECTIVES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) My teaching goals, (circle one)</th>
<th>(b) Overall institutional goals, (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not important, or irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To master knowledge in a discipline</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To convey a basic appreciation of the liberal arts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To increase the desire and ability to undertake self-directed learning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To develop the ability to think clearly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To develop creative capacities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>To develop the ability to pursue research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>To prepare students for employment after college</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>To prepare students for graduate or advanced education</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>To develop moral character</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>To develop religious beliefs or convictions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>To provide for students' emotional development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>To achieve deeper levels of students' self-understanding</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>To develop responsible citizens</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>To provide the local community with skilled human resources</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>To provide tools for the critical evaluation of contemporary society</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>To prepare students for family living</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU AND YOUR INSTITUTION

1. Are you considered a full-time faculty member by your institution for the current academic year? (check one)
   ____ Yes, full-time
   ____ No, part-time, but more than half-time
   ____ No, half-time
   ____ No, less than half-time

2. Your academic rank: (check one)
   ____ Professor
   ____ Associate Professor
   ____ Assistant Professor
   ____ Instructor
   ____ Lecturer
   ____ Other (specify, )

3. Your tenure status: (check one)
   ____ Tenured
   ____ Untenured, but on tenure track
   ____ Untenured, and not on tenure track

4. Are you, or have you ever been, a Department Head/Chair or a Dean? (check one)
   ____ No
   ____ Yes, but not now
   ____ Yes, and am currently

5. Your gender:
   ____ Female
   ____ Male
6. Name of your present employing institution: __________________________________________

7. What kind of academic year calendar is there at your institution? (check one)
   ______ Semester calendar ______ Quarter system ______ Other (specify: __________________)

8. Year you were first employed at present institution: ________________________________

9. Discipline of your present academic department: __________________________________

10. Which one statement do you think best reflects the attitude of the principle administrator for your department or program? (check one):  
    ______ Consistently strong advocate of quality undergraduate teaching  
    ______ Consistently strong advocate maintaining or improving teaching quality  
    ______ Laissez-faire on teaching; generally neither emphasizes nor deprecates teaching  
    ______ Stresses other professional roles (e.g., research and writing) over teaching

11. Information concerning your highest earned degree: 
    Highest earned degree: __________________________________________________________
    Year highest degree received: _________________________
    Name of degree-granting institution: _____________________________________________
    Discipline/field of highest degree: ______________________________________________

12. During the past three years, how many of each of the following have you published:

   Journal articles (circle one):   None  1-2  3-4  5-10  11 or more
   Books and monographs (circle one):  None  1  2  3 or more

13. How many classes did you teach during the past full academic year? ______________

14. How many different course preparations did you have during the past full academic year? ______________

15. During the past full academic year, have you taught any lower division (freshman or sophomore) courses? (check one) ______ yes ______ no

16. During the past full academic year, what is the approximate total number of undergraduate students enrolled in all the classes you taught? (check one)
   ______ none ______ 100 or fewer ______ 101 to 200 ______ 201 to 500 ______ over-500

17. Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or in research?
   ______ heavily in research
   ______ in both, but leaning toward research
   ______ in both, but leaning toward teaching
   ______ heavily in teaching

On a separate sheet, please note any comments or clarifications of your answers which you would like to provide; and insert it inside this booklet.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP AND YOUR RESPONSES.

Please return this completed form to: National College Teaching Project Survey
                                     Center for Survey Research
                                     Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
                                     207 West Roanoke Street
                                     Blacksburg, VA 24061-0943

Copyright © 1993 by Vanderbilt University and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
**APPENDIX B**
**MODIFIED CTBI**

**College Teaching Behaviors Inventory**

1. **Introduction**
   Teaching is a complex activity composed of many behaviors and expectations. This survey lists some behaviors related to college teaching. Using the response codes listed below, please indicate your opinion on each of the listed behaviors as you think they might best ideally apply to a faculty member teaching a nursing course of about 40 enrolled students. The response categories are as follows:

   (1) Appropriate behavior, should be encouraged  
   (2) Discretionary behavior, neither particularly appropriate or inappropriate  
   (3) Mildly appropriate behavior, generally to be ignored  
   (4) Inappropriate behavior, to be handled informally by colleagues or administrators suggesting change or improvement.  
   (5) Very inappropriate behavior, requiring formal administrative intervention

This survey contains 126 items plus demographic questions. It should take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

2. **A. Pre-planning for the Course**

A1. Required texts and other reading materials are not routinely ordered by the instructor in time to be available for the first class session

A2. A course outline or syllabus is not prepared for a course.

A3. Prior to the first meeting of a class, the instructor does not visit the assigned classroom and assess its facilities.

A4. A course outline or syllabus does not contain dates for assignments and/or examinations.

A5. Objectives for the course are not specified by the instructor.

A6. Changes in a course are made without taking into account the needs or abilities of students enrolling in the course.

A7. The instructor does not read reviews of appropriate textbooks.

A8. The course is designed without taking into account the needs or abilities of students enrolling in the course.

A9. Colleagues teaching the same or similar courses are not consulted on ways to teach the particular course.
A10. Required course materials are not kept within reasonable cost limits as perceived by students.

A11. New lectures or revised lectures which reflect advancements in the fields are not prepared.

A12. In-class activities are not prepared and anticipated in advance, but are developed while the class is in session.

A13. The instructor does not request necessary audio-visual materials in time to be available for class.

A14. Assigned books and articles are not put on library reserve by the instructor on a timely basis for student use.

3. B. First Day of Class

B1. Class roll is not taken.

B2. The instructor does not introduce her/himself to the class.

B3. Office hours are not communicated to the students.

B4. The instructor changes classroom location to another building without informing students in advance.

B5. The instructor changes class meeting time without consulting students.

B6. Students are not informed of the instructor’s policy on missed or make-up examinations.

B7. Students are not informed of extra credit opportunities which are available in the course during the term.

B8. Students are not asked to record their background, experiences, and interests for reference by the instructor.

B9. An overview of the course is not presented to students on the first day.

B10. An introduction to the first course topic is not begun on the first day.

B11. The first class meeting is dismissed early.

B12. The first reading assignment is not communicated to the class.

B13. A course outline or syllabus is not prepared and passed out to students.

B14. The instructor does not ask students if they have questions regarding the course.
4. C. In-Class Behaviors

C1. Class sessions are begun without an opportunity for students to ask questions.

C2. The topics or objectives to be covered for the day are not announced at the beginning of the class.

C3. Joke-telling and humor unrelated to course content occurs routinely in class.

C4. The instructor frequently uses profanity in class.

C5. Class is usually dismissed early.

C6. The instructor meets the class without having reviewed pertinent materials for the day.

C7. The instructor routinely allows one or a few students to dominate class discussion.

C8. Instructions and requirement for course assignments are not clearly described to students.

C9. Class does not begin with a review of the last class session.

C10. Joke-telling and humor related to course content occurs frequently in class.

C11. The instructor does not end the class session by summarizing material covered during the class.

C12. The instructor is routinely late for class meetings.

C13. The instructor routinely holds the class beyond its scheduled ending time.

C14. The instructor does not take class attendance every class meeting.

C15. The instructor does not introduce new teaching methods or procedures.

C16. The instructor does not provide in-class opportunities for students to voice their opinion about the course.

C17. The instructor calls on students to answer questions in class on a non-voluntary basis.

C18. The instructor does not follow the course outline or syllabus for most of the course.

C19. The instructor practices poor personal hygiene and regularly has offensive body odor.

C20. The instructor routinely wears a sloppy sweatshirt and rumpled blue jeans to class.

C21. While able to conduct class, the instructor frequently attends class while obviously intoxicated.
5. D. Treating Course Content

D1. The instructor does not have students evaluate the course at the end of the term.

D2. The instructor insists that students take one particular perspective on course content.

D3. The instructor’s professional biases or assumptions are not explicitly made known to students.

D4. The instructor frequently introduces opinion on religious, political, or social issues clearly outside the realm of the course topics.

D5. The instructor does not include pertinent scholarly contributions of women and minorities in the content of the course.

D6. Memorization of course content is stressed at the expense of analysis and critical thinking.

D7. Connections between the course and other courses are not made clear by the instructor.

D8. The relationship of the course content to the overall departmental curriculum is not indicated.

D9. A cynical attitude toward the subject matter is expressed by the instructor.

6. E. Examination and Grading Practice

E1. The instructor does not give assignments or examinations requiring student writing skills.

E2. When examinations or papers are returned, student questions are not answered during class time.

E3. Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor.

E4. Individual student course evaluations, where students can be identified, are read prior to the determination of final course grades.

E5. Examination questions do not represent a range of difficulty.

E6. Grades are distributed on a “curve”.

E7. An instructor lowers course standards in order to be popular with students.

E8. The standards for a course are set so high that most of the class receives failing grades for the course.

E9. Individual students are offered extra credit work in order to improve their final course grade after the term is completed.
E10. Explanation of the basis for grades given for essay questions or papers is not provided to students.

E11. Written comments on tests and papers are consistently not made by the instructor.

E12. The instructor allows personal friendships with a student to intrude on the objective grading of their work.

E13. Student papers or essay examination questions are not read at least twice before a grade is given.

E14. Social, personal or other non-academic characteristics of students are taken into account in the awarding of student grades.

E15. Final examinations are administered during a regular class period rather than at the official examination period.

E16. Student class participation is considered in awarding the final course grade.

E17. Student attendance in class is weighted in determining the final course grade.

E18. Student opinions about the method of grading are not sought.

E19. Students’ work is not graded anonymously.

E20. The final course grade is based on a single course assignment or a single examination.

E21. Examination questions do not tap a variety of educational objectives ranging from the retention of facts to critical thinking.

E22. Sexist or racist comments in students’ written work are not discouraged.

E23. An instructor does not hold review sessions before examinations.

E24. All student grades are publicly posted with social security numbers and without names.

E25. Graded papers and examinations are left in an accessible location where students can search though to get back their own.

7. F. Faculty-Student In-Class Interactions

F1. Stated policies about late work and incompletes are not universally applied to all students.

F2. Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor.

F3. The instructor expresses impatience with a slow learner in class.

F4. The instructor does not encourage student questions during class time.
F5. An instructor makes condescending remarks to a student in class.

F6. The instructor does not learn the names of all students in the class.

F7. A clear lack of class member’s understanding about course content is ignored by the instructor.

F8. Shy students are not encouraged to speak in class.

F9. The instructor does not allow students to direct their comments to other members of the class.

8. G. Relationships with Colleagues

G1. A faculty member refuses to share academic information about mutual students with colleagues.

G2. A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committee that there are very low grading standards in a colleague’s course.

G3. A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committee that a colleague’s course content largely includes obsolete material.

G4. A faculty member refuses to share course syllabi with colleagues.

G5. A faculty member avoids sharing ideas about teaching methods with colleagues.

G6. A faculty member refuses to allow colleagues to observe his/her classroom teaching.

G7. A faculty member assumes new teaching responsibilities in the specialty of a colleague without discussing appropriate course content with that colleague.

G8. A faculty member makes negative comments in a faculty meeting about the courses offered by a colleague.

G9. A faculty member makes negative comments about a colleague in public before students.

G10. A faculty member aggressively promotes enrollment in his/her courses at the expense of the courses of departmental colleagues.

G11. The requirements in a course are so great that they prevent enrolled students from giving adequate attention to their other courses.

G12. A faculty member refuses to team teach a course.

G13. A faculty member avoids talking about his/her academic specialty with departmental colleagues.
G14. A faculty member gives unsolicited advice on the content of a colleague’s course.

G15. A faculty member gives unsolicited advice to a colleague about teaching methods.

G16. A faculty member refuses to participate in departmental curricular planning.

9. H. Out-of-Class Practices

H1. Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept.

H2. Individual counseling on matters unrelated to course content is not provided to students enrolled in one’s courses.

H3. A faculty member criticizes the academic performance of a student in front of other students.

H4. A faculty member avoids spending time with students outside of class time and/or regular office hours.

H5. A faculty member insists that they never be phoned at home by students, regardless of circumstances.

H6. A faculty member makes suggestive sexual comments to a student enrolled in the course.

H7. A faculty member has a sexual relationship with a student enrolled in the course.

H8. A faculty member does not refer a student with a special problem to the appropriate campus service.

H9. An advisee is treated in a condescending manner.

H10. A faculty member avoids giving career or job advice when asked by students.

H11. A faculty member refuses to write letters of reference for any student.

H12. A faculty member neglects to send a letter of recommendation that they had agreed to write.

H13. A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors.

H14. A cynical attitude toward the role of teaching is expressed by the instructor.

H15. A faculty member’s involvement in scholarship is so great that he/she fails to adequately prepare for class.

H16. Scholarly literature is not read for the purpose of integrating new information into one’s courses.
H17. A faculty member avoids reading literature on teaching techniques or methods.

H18. A faculty member avoids professional development opportunities that would enhance their teaching.

10. **A Few Questions About You and Your Institution’s Teaching Objectives**

How important is each of the following as: (a) your personal goal or aim in your teaching of undergraduate students; and (b) your institution’s goal in undergraduate education.

1. Essential
2. Very important
3. Somewhat important
4. Not important, or relevant

To master knowledge in a discipline
To convey a basic appreciation of the liberal arts

To increase the desire and ability to undertake self-directed learning
To develop the ability to think clearly
To develop creative capacities
To develop the ability to pursue research
To prepare students for employment after college
To prepare students for graduate or advanced education
To develop moral character
To develop religious beliefs or convictions
To provide for students’ emotional development
To achieve deeper levels of students’ self-understanding
To develop responsible citizens
To provide the local community with skilled human resources
To provide tools for the critical evaluation of contemporary society
To prepare students for family living
11. A Few Questions About You and Your Institution

Are you considered a full-time faculty member by your institution for the current academic year? (Check only one response)

Yes, full time  
No, part time, but more than half time  
No, half time  
No, less than half time

Your academic rank: (check one)

Professor  
Associate professor  
Assistant professor  
Instructor  
Lecturer  
Other

Your tenure status: (check one)

Tenured  
Untenured, but on tenure track  
Untenured, and not on tenure track by choice  
Untenured, institution does not offer tenure

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

No  
Yes, but not now  
Yes, and am currently

Your basic nursing preparation:  

Diploma  
Associate degree  
Bachelor’s degree

Name of degree-granting institution:

Year of completion of basic nursing educational degree/ diploma:

Your highest earned degree and year received:

Name of degree-granting institution:

Discipline/field of highest degree:
Did you complete an education track in your master’s program in nursing?
Yes
No
Not applicable because an education track was not available

Did any of your education courses include information on ethical teaching practices?
Yes
No
Did not take education courses

If so, how many hours would you say were devoted to the topic of ethical teaching practices?
Less than 3 hours
3 to 6 hours
7 to 12 hours
Not applicable

Your gender:
Female
Male

Your race/ethnicity:
African-American
American Indian or Alaska Native
Asian
Caucasian/White
Hispanic, Latino/a
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
Other

Your age:

Name of your present employing institution:

Year you were first employed at present institution:

What kind of academic calendar is there at your institution? (check one)
Semester calendar
Quarter system
Other

Which one statement do you think best reflects the attitude of the principle administrator for your department or program?
Consistently strong advocate of quality undergraduate teaching
Intermittently advocates maintaining or improving teaching quality
Laissez-faire on teaching; generally neither emphasizes nor deprecates teaching
Stresses other professional roles (e.g., research and writing) over teaching
How many classes did you teach during the past full academic year?

How many clinical groups did you teach during the past full academic year?

If you taught clinical, what was the approximate total number of undergraduate students enrolled in the nursing program where you teach? (check one)
- 50 or fewer
- 51 to 100
- 101 to 150
- 151 to 200
- 201 to 300
- 301 or more

How many years did you practice as a clinical nurse (i.e., in hospital or other type of clinical practice) before entering the educator role?

How many total years have you worked as a collegiate educator in nursing?
February 18, 2007

Dr. John M. Braxton
Professor of Education
Peabody College, Vanderbilt University
Box 514
Nashville, TN 37203

Dear Dr. Braxton:

This letter will confirm our recent email correspondence. I am in the process of completing my doctoral dissertation at Louisiana State University and I would like your permission to utilize the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory as printed in Faculty Misconduct in Collegiate Teaching (1999) by John Braxton and Alan Bayer.

It is my intent to distribute the CTBI to a selected sample of undergraduate nurse educators to determine what behaviors they identify as inviolable and admonitory. In this manner, I will be able to extend the research you and Dr. Bayer conducted to include members of an applied discipline. I understand from our email correspondence that you only require I appropriately cite Braxton and Bayer (1999) when referencing the CTBI.

If this meets with your approval, please sign this letter where indicated below and return it to me in the enclosed return envelope. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Melanie H. Green

PERMISSION GRANTED FOR THE USE REQUESTED ABOVE:

Signature

John M. Braxton
Vanderbilt University, Box 514
Nashville, TN 37203

Date: 2-26-2007
Hello John and Melanie.

I'm delighted with the proposal to use the CTBI with nursing educators. I'll be interested in the results.

I regret that I no longer have an electronic version of the instrument. Maybe you can scan the instrument from the book's appendix. Alternatively, I have a clean hardcopy, and would be glad to snailmail it to you at your Zachary, LA, address if you'd like. Just let me know...

Good luck in your study project, and in your completion of your PhD program at LSU.

Cordially, Alan

 ***************

Alan E. Bayer
Professor Emeritus
Department of Sociology (0137)
645 McBryde Hall
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061

e-mail: yogi@vt.edu
office phone: 540.231.8963
fax: 540.231.3860
home phone: 540.951.9703

 ***************

At 10:46 AM 2/13/2007, John Braxton wrote:
>Melanie, I am afraid that I do not have any copies of the instrument. I
>have copied Alan Bayer(<mailto:yogi@vt.edu>yogi@vt.edu) on this message.
>He may have an electronic version he can send to you. Best wishes,
>Professor Braxton
>
>
>John M. Braxton
>Professor of Education

2/22/2007
Dear Colleague,

The teacher-student relationship is one of great importance but fraught with potential for misconduct. Questions of integrity within academia are on the rise. In order to better understand faculty obligations within the teaching role, I would like to invite you and your ASN faculty to participate in a research project to study ethical teaching behaviors among associate degree nursing educators. Your program was chosen randomly from a list of all NLNAC accredited ASN programs in the United States. The results of this project will used in my doctoral dissertation as part of the requirements toward the PhD degree in Educational Theory, Policy, and Practice at Louisiana State University. Through your participation I hope to understand what behaviors associate degree nursing educators identify as ethical within the context of the teacher-student relationship.

This project consists of a 126-item online survey entitled the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI). The CTBI was developed by Braxton and Bayer (1999) and was initially administered to collegiate faculty in the disciplines of biology, psychology, mathematics, and history. The results of that nationwide study led Braxton and Bayer to recommend survey administration to faculty within applied disciplines, such as nursing. Because associate degree nursing educators devote the majority of their workload to teaching activities, they constitute an excellent group to survey using this instrument.

As a nursing dean of an ASN program, I have had opportunity to encourage my faculty to participate in similar research projects not only as a professional courtesy to a colleague, but also to further scholarly works in nursing education. I am soliciting your assistance in facilitating the completion of the CTBI among your faculty.

Your participation and that of your faculty in this study is, of course, voluntary. I do not know of any risks to you or your faculty if you decide to participate in this survey and I guarantee that your responses will not be identified with you personally. I promise not to share any information that identifies you with anyone outside my research committee. Completion and electronic submission of the survey is your consent to participate in this study.

If you have any questions about completing this survey or about being in this study, you may contact me by email at mgree25@lsu.edu or by phone at (225) 939-7932 or (225) 276-1804. If you have any questions about subjects’ rights or other concerns, you may contact Robert C. Mathews, Chairman, LSU Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692. Please keep a copy of this form.
Thank you for your assistance with this study. Your participation is integral to developing a greater understanding of how nursing educators interact ethically with their students. I greatly appreciate your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Melanie H. Green, MN, RNC
APPENDIX E
CONSENT FORM

Study Title: Academic Impropriety: An Exploration of Normative Teaching Behaviors as Identified by Associate of Science in Nursing (ASN) Educators

Performance Site: Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College Baton Rouge, LA

Investigators: The following investigators are available for questions about this study, Monday-Friday from 8:00am – 4:30pm (CST):
Melanie H. Green: (225) 276-1804
Dr. S. Kim MacGregor: (225) 578-2150

Purpose of the Study: To examine the normative teaching behaviors of ASN educators.

Subject Inclusion: ASN educators in the United States.

Number of Subjects: Approximately 600 subjects for the quantitative portion
10 – 50 subjects for the qualitative portion

Study Procedures: The College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) developed by Braxton and Bayer (1999) will be administered. This tool is designed to elicit information relative to identification of normative teaching behaviors. During the qualitative portion of the study, participants will be interviewed about the professional socialization experience and how this has influenced their understanding of ethical teacher-student relationships.

Benefits: This study will yield valuable information about teacher-student relationships and the normative teaching practices that guide them.

Risks: The only study risk is the inadvertent release of sensitive information from the survey or interview. However, every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your study records. Files will be kept in secure cabinets to which only the investigator has access.

Right to refuse: Subjects may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of any benefit to which they might otherwise be entitled.

Privacy: Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Subject identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.
Signatures: The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigators. If I have questions about subjects’ rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigators’ obligation to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

_______________________________________       ____________________
Signature                                      Date
First message sent to dean/directors on 10/17/2007

To: [Email]
From: mgree25@lsu.edu

Subject: Doctoral Study: College Teaching Behaviors Inventory

Body:

Dear Colleagues:

Last week I mailed a letter to you detailing information regarding my doctoral dissertation study: An Exploration of Ethical Teaching Behaviors as Identified by ASN Educators. I requested that you assist me with the data collection for this study by asking your faculty members to participate through completion of the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI), a 126 item online survey. Thank you for your willingness to assist in this project.

This is the first of two messages I am sending you. In this particular email, the link noted immediately below is for you personally to access the survey and complete it. Please DO NOT forward this link to your faculty because it is only good for a one time administration: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

In the second email (titled "Faculty Request for CTBI study") I am sending you, I ask that you forward that particular email to your faculty.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list. https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx
Follow up email to deans/directors sent 10/28/2007

To: [Email]  
From: mgree25@lsu.edu  

Subject: REMINDER: College Teaching Behaviors Inventory  

Body: Dear Colleagues:

Two weeks ago I sent you an email requesting your assistance with data collection for my doctoral dissertation study entitled "An Exploration of Ethical Teaching Behaviors as Identified by ASN Educators". I recognize that your time is valuable and I truly appreciate you taking a few moments to complete this survey.

The link noted immediately below is for you personally to access the survey and complete it. Please DO NOT forward this link to your faculty because it is only good for a one time administration: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

I am also sending you a follow up email to forward to your faculty (titled "Reminder: Faculty Request for CTBI study").

Thank you again for your willingness to participate in this study. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at mgree25@lsu.edu.

Melanie H. Green, MN, RNC

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list. https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx
Final communication sent to dean/directors 11/26/2007

To: [Email]
From: mgree25@lsu.edu
Subject: Doctoral Dissertation Study Opportunity
Body: Dear Colleagues:

In late October, I sent you an email requesting your assistance with data collection for my doctoral dissertation study entitled "An Exploration of Ethical Teaching Behaviors as Identified by ASN Educators". If you have already completed the questionnaire, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Your input as a dean or director of an ASN program is invaluable as I seek to develop a greater understanding of how nursing educators interact ethically with their students.

The link noted immediately below is for you personally to access the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory survey and complete it. Please DO NOT forward this link to your faculty because it is only good for a one time administration:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

I also need your assistance in asking your nursing faculty to complete this survey. In a separate email I am sending to you titled "Doctoral Dissertation: College Teaching Behaviors Inventory", there is a link your faculty members can access to participate in this study.

Thank you again for your willingness to participate in this study. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at mgree25@lsu.edu. Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails regarding this study, you may click the link below and you will be automatically removed from my mailing list.
https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx

First communication sent to faculty 10/17/2007

Dear Faculty Colleagues: Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to complete the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory. Earlier this week, your dean/director received a letter
from me detailing my doctoral study and your rights as potential participants. Please consult this letter (attached) if you have any questions about participating in this study. Your input is vital to this project because nursing instructors are crucial to the overall success of nursing students and nursing programs. I appreciate your agreeing to complete the survey and I will be happy to share my results with you once they are collated and analyzed. Here is the link for accessing the survey (you may have to copy and paste it into your web browser):

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=3dzxeJsB50ONA7_2fglN_2b8sA_3d_3d

Thanks so much for your participation! If you have any questions or problems with this survey, please contact me at mgree25@lsu.edu.

Melanie Green, MN, RNC

Second communication sent to faculty 10/28/2007

Dear Dean/Director: Please forward this email to your faculty.

Dear Faculty Colleagues:

Two weeks ago I sent you an email requesting your assistance with data collection for my doctoral dissertation study entitled "An Exploration of Ethical Teaching Behaviors as Identified by ASN Educators". I recognize that your time is valuable and I truly appreciate you taking a few moments to complete this survey.

The College Teaching Behaviors Inventory is a 126-item survey that should only take you about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you do not have that much time at one sitting, the link is designed to allow you to stop and restart wherever you leave off. Here is the link which you will need to copy and then paste into your web browser:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=MJR4XYe8zZj7BFZReastQ_3d_3d

Thank you again for your willingness to participate in this study. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at mgree25@lsu.edu.

Melanie H. Green, MN, RNC
Doctoral Candidate
Louisiana State University
Geaux Tigers!!

Third communication sent to faculty 11/26/2007

Dear Dean/Director: Please forward this email to all members of your ASN faculty.

Dear Faculty Colleagues:
This email contains a link for accessing the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory, a 126 item survey designed to elicit your identification of appropriate teaching behaviors. I am a doctoral student at Louisiana State University completing my dissertation. I have been a registered nurse for over 25 years and a nursing educator for 18 of those years. My research study is designed to examine the ASN teacher-student relationship, particularly as it relates to ethical teaching behaviors. A review of the current literature suggests that questions of impropriety in academia are on the rise and faculty members need to seriously examine their responsibilities as teachers in light of growing societal concern regarding the efficacy of higher education.

Your input is vital to this project because nursing instructors are crucial to the overall success of nursing students and nursing programs. I appreciate your agreeing to complete the survey and I will be happy to share my results with you once they are collated and analyzed. If you have already completed the survey, please accept my thanks. If not, please take time to complete it today. Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to complete the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory. Here is the link for accessing the survey (you may have to copy and paste it into your web browser):

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=h8oge74Md1UXyVpuPlx_2fow_3d_3d

Melanie H. Green, MN, RNC
Doctoral Candidate, LSU
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Communication sent requesting narrative accounts 2/8/2008

Dear Dean/Director:

You are receiving this email because the data I collected in the fall 2007 indicates that either you or members of your faculty completed the College Teaching Behaviors Inventory I distributed electronically.

I am now in the final phase of data collection for my dissertation study entitled, Academic Impropriety: An Exploration of Normative Teaching Behaviors as Identified by Associate of Science in Nursing Educators. In this qualitative phase, I would like to solicit examples of real-life instances where either you or your faculty observed a transgression in teaching behaviors. The attached document (labeled "inviolable and admonitory norms explanation for email") explains my initial study results and the additional information I seek. I have also attached the consent form for this study.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would forward this information to your faculty members. Anyone who participates in this portion of my study will receive a $10 online gift certificate to Barnes and Noble Booksellers. Instructions for qualifying for this gift are included in the attached documents.

Thank you and your faculty again for your earlier participation, as well as your anticipated participation in this portion of the study. All responses to this inquiry need to be received no
Text of attachment sent with February email

February 2008

Thank you for participating in this research study designed to explore what associate degree nursing educators indicate are normative expectations for the teaching role. In the fall of 2007, I distributed the 126-item College Teaching Behaviors Inventory (CTBI) via email nationwide to all NLNAC accredited ASN programs. In that survey, you were asked to rank the appropriateness of teaching behaviors and any necessary sanctioning activities for those behaviors according to a Likert scale that was defined as follows:

1 = Appropriate/encourage the behavior
2 = Discretionary
3 = Mildly inappropriate/ignore the behavior
4 = Inappropriate/handle informally
5 = Very inappropriate/requires formal administrative intervention

Items on the CTBI receiving a mean score between 4.0 and 5.0 were designated as “inviolable norms”. According to the developers of the CTBI, an inviolable norm is one that when transgressed deserves severe administrative sanctions (Braxton & Bayer, 1999).

Items on the CTBI receiving a mean score between 3.0 and 3.99 were designated as “admonitory norms”. Violation of an admonitory norm evokes less indignation, but faculty members are strongly encouraged not to violate such norms. Sanctioning action in these cases should be handled between peers (Braxton & Bayer, 1999).

Upon determination of the full list of inviolable and admonitory norms identified by this study’s respondents (n=604), a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted. This resulted in a clustering of items into a total of nine factors. The named factors with the items that describe them are provided on the following two pages of this document.

Please review the tables provided. If any of the named normative clusters particularly resonates with you and brings to mind a real-life example or examples, I would appreciate it if you would take a few moments to send me an email describing that example. In this qualitative component of my study, I would like to collect as many responses of this type as possible. Once collected, I will construct “fictional” vignettes to further describe and illustrate the normative clusters.
You may send your responses to me at mgree25@lsu.edu. I would appreciate receiving those responses no later than Friday, February 15, 2008. For your willingness to participate in this phase of the study, I will send you a $10 gift certificate to Barnes & Noble. When you respond, please be sure to note the email address you would like me to use when sending your gift.

Of course, all responses will be completely confidential and in the construction of the vignettes, no information that could possibly identify the scenario with you or your institution will be assiduously avoided. A copy of the consent form for this study is included as another attachment in the email you received today. You should refer to that document if you have any questions regarding this study.

Once again, thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in this phase of my dissertation study. I am excited about the results I have obtained thus far and I anticipate that this final phase of data collection will yield a richer level of description for this study.

Melanie H. Green, Doctoral Candidate, Louisiana State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inviolable norms</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Condescending negativism – I observed a particularly difficult instructor who told some students that “they needed to get their big girl panties on and use their common sense” Since then, this instructor was released from our institution. | - An instructor makes condescending remarks to a student in class  
- The instructor expresses impatience with a slow learner in class  
- A faculty member criticizes the academic performance of a student in front of other students  
- Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor |
| Uncooperative cynicism – As a requirement of employment, all faculty must advise, keep office hours and participate in curriculum planning and NLNAC. | - A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors  
- Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept  
- A faculty member refuses to participate in departmental curriculum planning |
| Personal disregard – No instances with faculty for late faculty or holding students late. We did have an issue with one faculty member regarding religion and sexual preferences. The student felt that homosexuality was a sin and did not really | - The instructor routinely holds the class beyond the class beyond its scheduled ending time  
- The instructor is routinely late for class meetings  
- The instructor frequently introduces
want to deal with a patient new diagnosed with HIV. We reminded students that they are to maintain non-judgmental and must care for all patient regardless of their religious, political or social beliefs. The student took care of the patient in a profession manner and no further issues were ever brought to my attention.

| Unrealistic course standards – Our course standards are realistic. Our curriculum is designed so student do not have a full time load while they are enrolled in the nursing program. | ▪ The standards for a course are set so high that most of the class receives failing grades for the course  
▪ The requirements in a course are so great that they prevent enrolled students from giving adequate attention to their other courses |

| Undermining colleagues – We attempt not to staff split at our institution. If a student talks negatively about an instructor, we inform all faculty that they must have the student speak to the instructor that they are having an issue with. This has really reduced the incidence of negative comments. It has also increased our professionalism in our clinicals. | ▪ A faculty member makes negative comments about a colleague in public before students  
▪ A faculty member makes negative comments in a faculty meeting about the courses offered by a colleague |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admonitory norms</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Instructional narrowness – All my faculty have been encouraged to ask student direct questions during class and clinical. Papers completed by the student have deadline, in our program; faculty must return paperwork within 9 days of completion. | ▪ The instructor does not encourage student questions during class time  
▪ Examination questions do not tap a variety of educational objectives ranging from the retention of facts to critical thinking  
▪ Written comments on tests and papers are consistently not made by the instructor  
▪ Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor  
▪ The instructor does not introduce new teaching methods or procedures |

| Teaching secrecy – No issues have ever occurred. | ▪ A faculty member refuses to share course syllabi with colleagues  
▪ A faculty member avoids sharing ideas about teaching methods with colleagues  
▪ A faculty member refuses to allow |
| Inadequate communication – No issues have ever occurred. | The first reading assignment is not communicated to the class  
- An overview of the course is not presented to students on the first day  
- The topics or objectives to be covered for the day are not announced at the beginning of class  
- The instructor routinely allows one or a few students to dominate class discussion |
| --- | --- |
| Inattentive planning – No issues have ever occurred. At our facility, we have a Learning Activity Guide which is published each year. The syllabus and PowerPoint presentations, and clinical paperwork are all placed in the LAG. | The instructor does not read reviews of appropriate textbooks  
- Colleagues teaching the same or similar courses are not consulted on ways to teach the particular course  
- In-class activities are not prepared and anticipated in advance, but are developed while the class is in session  
- Required course materials are not kept within reasonable cost limits as perceived by students |

# APPENDIX G
## DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Required texts and other reading materials are not routinely ordered by the instructor in time to be available for the first class session</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. A course outline or syllabus is not prepared for a course.</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Prior to the first meeting of a class, the instructor does not visit the assigned classroom and assess its facilities.</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. A course outline or syllabus does not contain dates for assignments and/or examinations.</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. Objectives for the course are not specified by the instructor.</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. Changes in a course are made without taking into account the needs or abilities of students enrolling in the course.</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. The instructor does not read reviews of appropriate textbooks.</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8. The course is designed without taking into account the needs or abilities of students enrolling in the course.</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9. Colleagues teaching the same or similar courses are not consulted on ways to teach the particular course.</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10. Required course materials are not kept within reasonable cost limits as perceived by students.</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11. New lectures or revised lectures which reflect advancements in the field are not prepared.</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12. In-class activities are not prepared and anticipated in advance, but are developed while the class is in session.</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13. The instructor does not request necessary audio-visual materials in time to be available for class.</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14. Assigned books and articles are not put on library reserve by the instructor on a timely basis for student use.</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1. Class roll is not taken.</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. The instructor does not introduce her/himself to the class.</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Office hours are not communicated to the students.</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>The instructor changes classroom location to another building without informing students in advance.</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>The instructor changes class meeting time without consulting students.</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Students are not informed of the instructor's policy on missed or make-up examinations.</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Students are not informed of extra credit opportunities which are available in the course during the term.</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Students are not asked to record their background, experiences, and interests for reference by the instructor.</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>An overview of the course is not presented to students on the first day.</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>An introduction to the first course topic is not begun on the first day.</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>The first class meeting is dismissed early.</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>The first reading assignment is not communicated to the class.</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>A course outline or syllabus is not prepared and passed out to students.</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>The instructor does not ask students if they have questions regarding the course.</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Class sessions are begun without an opportunity for students to ask questions.</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>The topics or objectives to be covered for the day are not announced at the beginning of the class.</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Joke-telling and humor unrelated to course content occurs routinely in class.</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>The instructor frequently uses profanity in class.</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Class is usually dismissed early.</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>The instructor meets the class without having reviewed pertinent materials for the day.</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>The instructor routinely allows one or a few students to dominate class discussion.</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Instructions and requirements for course assignments are not clearly described to students.</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Class does not begin with a review of the last class session.</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Joke-telling and humor related to course content occurs frequently in class.</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>The instructor does not end the class session by summarizing material covered during the class.</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12.</td>
<td>The instructor is routinely late for class meetings.</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13.</td>
<td>The instructor routinely holds the class beyond its scheduled ending time.</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14.</td>
<td>The instructor does not take class attendance every class meeting.</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15.</td>
<td>The instructor does not introduce new teaching methods or procedures.</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16.</td>
<td>The instructor does not provide in-class opportunities for students to voice their opinion about the course.</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17.</td>
<td>The instructor calls on students to answer questions in class on a non-voluntary basis.</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18.</td>
<td>The instructor does not follow the course outline or syllabus for most of the course.</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19.</td>
<td>The instructor practices poor personal hygiene and regularly has offensive body odor.</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20.</td>
<td>The instructor routinely wears a sloppy sweatshirt and rumpled blue jeans to class.</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21.</td>
<td>While able to conduct class, the instructor frequently attends class while obviously intoxicated.</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. The instructor does not have students evaluate the course at the end of the term.</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. The instructor insists that students take one particular perspective on course content.</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. The instructor's professional biases or assumptions are not explicitly made known to students.</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. The instructor frequently introduces opinion on religious, political, or social issues clearly outside the realm of the course topics.</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5. The instructor does not include pertinent scholarly contributions of women and minorities in the content of the course.</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6. Memorization of course content is stressed at the expense of analysis and critical thinking.</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7. Connections between the course and other courses are not made clear by the instructor.</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8. The relationship of the course content to the overall departmental curriculum is not indicated.</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9. A cynical attitude toward the subject matter is expressed by the instructor.</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1. The instructor does not give assignments or examinations requiring student writing skills.</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. When examinations or papers are returned, student questions are not answered during class time.</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. Graded tests and papers are not promptly returned to students by the instructor.</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4. Individual student course evaluations, where students can be identified, are read prior to the determination of final course grades.</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5. Examination questions do not represent a range of difficulty.</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6. Grades are distributed on a &quot;curve&quot;.</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7. An instructor lowers course standards in order to be popular with students.</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8. The standards for a course are set so high that most of the class receives failing grades for the course.</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9. Individual students are offered extra credit work in order to improve their final course grade after the term is completed.</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10. Explanation of the basis for grades given for essay questions or papers is not provided to students.</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11. Written comments on tests and papers are consistently not made by the instructor.</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12. The instructor allows personal friendships with a student to intrude on the objective grading of their work.</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13. Student papers or essay examination questions are not read at least twice before a grade is given.</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14. Social, personal or other non-academic characteristics of students are taken into account in the awarding of student grades.</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15. Final examinations are administered during a regular class period rather than at the official examination period.</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16. Student class participation is considered in awarding the final course grade.</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17. Student attendance in class is weighed in determining the final course grade.</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18. Student opinions about the method of grading are not sought.</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19. Students' work is not graded anonymously.</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20. The final course grade is based on a single course assignment or a single examination.</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21. Examination questions do not tap a variety of educational objectives ranging from the retention of facts to critical thinking.</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22. Sexist or racist comments in students' written work are not discouraged.</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23. An instructor does not hold review sessions before examinations.</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24. All student grades are publicly posted with social security numbers and without names.</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25. Graded papers and examinations are left in an accessible location where students can search through to get back their own.</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1. Stated policies about late work and incompletes are not universally applied to all students.</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2. Students are not permitted to express viewpoints different from those of the instructor.</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3. The instructor expresses impatience with a slow learner in class.</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4. The instructor does not encourage student questions during class time.</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5. An instructor makes condescending remarks to a student in class.</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6. The instructor does not learn the names of all students in the class.</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7. A clear lack of class members' understanding about course content is ignored by the instructor.</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8. Shy students are not encouraged to speak in class.</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9. The instructor does not allow students to direct their comments to other members of the class.</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1. A faculty member refuses to share academic information about mutual students with colleagues.</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2. A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committee that there are very low grading standards in a colleague's course.</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3. A faculty member does not tell an administrator or appropriate faculty committee that a colleague's course content largely includes obsolete material.</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4. A faculty member refuses to share course syllabi with colleagues.</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5. A faculty member avoids sharing ideas about teaching methods with colleagues.</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6. A faculty member refuses to allow colleagues to observe his/her classroom teaching.</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7. A faculty member assumes new teaching responsibilities in the specialty of a colleague without discussing appropriate course content with that colleague.</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8. A faculty member makes negative comments in a faculty meeting about the courses offered by a colleague.</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9. A faculty member makes negative comments about a colleague in public before students.</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10. A faculty member aggressively promotes enrollment in his/her courses at the expense of the courses of departmental colleagues.</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11. The requirements in a course are so great that they prevent enrolled students from giving adequate attention to their other courses.</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G12. A faculty member refuses to team teach a course.</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G13. A faculty member avoids talking about his/her academic specialty with departmental colleagues.</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G14. A faculty member gives unsolicited advice on the content of a colleague's course.</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G15. A faculty member gives unsolicited advice to a colleague about teaching methods.</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G16. A faculty member refuses to participate in departmental curricular planning.</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1. Office hours scheduled for student appointments are frequently not kept.</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Individual counseling on matters unrelated to course content is not provided to students enrolled in one's courses.</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. A faculty member criticizes the academic performance of a student in front of other students.</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. A faculty member avoids spending time with students outside of class time and/or regular office hours.</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5. A faculty member insists that they never be phoned at home by students, regardless of circumstances.</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>A faculty member makes suggestive sexual comments to a student enrolled in the course.</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>A faculty member has a sexual relationship with a student enrolled in the course.</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>A faculty member does not refer a student with a special problem to the appropriate campus service.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>An advisee is treated in a condescending manner.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>A faculty member avoids giving career or job advice when asked by students.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>A faculty member refuses to write letters of reference for any student.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
<td>A faculty member neglects to send a letter of recommendation that they had agreed to write.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13</td>
<td>A faculty member refuses to advise departmental majors.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14</td>
<td>A cynical attitude toward the role of teaching is expressed by the instructor.</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15</td>
<td>A faculty member's involvement in scholarship is so great that he/she fails to adequately prepare for class.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16</td>
<td>Scholarly literature is not read for the purpose of integrating new information into one's courses.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17.</td>
<td>A faculty member avoids reading literature on teaching techniques or methods.</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18.</td>
<td>A faculty member avoids professional development opportunities that would enhance their teaching.</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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