Abstract

The primary purpose of this research was to study the differences of perceptions, beliefs as well as the level of enforcement of the institution’s Honor Code/Code of Conduct between full time and part time College of Business faculty at a private mid-Atlantic university. The objective was to develop a better understanding of faculty perceptions, faculty beliefs, and factors that influence faculty behavior to either take action or inaction with regards to the institution’s Academic Integrity polices. The research examined material on academic integrity/honor codes in higher education, faculty enforcement of honor codes, faculty perceptions of honor codes, perceptions of full time vs. part time faculty of the higher education experience, higher education leadership, honor codes in business degree programs, student course evaluations and faculty reactions to student course evaluations. This research study concluded that an overwhelming majority of full time and part time faculty at the College of Business did not ignore academic dishonesty and enforced the University’s honor code. Furthermore, the research determined that in general, full time and part time faculty perceptions regarding Academic Integrity were similar.

Statement of Problem

It is unknown if there is a difference between full time and part time faculty in perceptions, knowledge and enforcement of the university’s Academic Integrity policy.

Hypotheses

H1: Full time and part time faculty perceptions do vary regarding Honor Codes/Code of Conduct. Part time employees perceive the Honor Code/Codes of Conduct as less important.

H2: Part time faculty members do have a lower participation/enforcement rate of the institution’s Honor Code/Code of Conduct.

H3: Multiple factors do influence part time faculty members behavior and cause them to have a lower enforcement rate, e.g. lack of a connection to the institution, lack of time, lack of desire, apathy, fear of student reprisal or lack of institutional support.

Literature Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity.</td>
<td>Over 75% of all undergraduate students admitted to “some” cheating.</td>
<td>The Center for Academic Integrity (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Codes and Other Contextual Influences on Academic Integrity.</td>
<td>Students cheat more when they believe that the faculty member is ambivalent or apathetic towards academic dishonesty and does not follow the institution’s policy.</td>
<td>McCabe, Trevino, &amp; Butterfield (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity: What the latest research shows?</td>
<td>47% of the faculty at institutions with honor codes said, “they would go to little or very little effort to document an incident” of cheating.</td>
<td>McCabe (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors concerning Student Cheating.</td>
<td>79% of the faculty caught a student cheating but only 9% reprimanded the student for cheating.</td>
<td>Volpe, Davidson, &amp; Bell (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a Campus Culture of Integrity: Comparing the Perspectives of Full- and Part-Time Faculty.</td>
<td>A difference does exist between full and part time faculty when dealing with academic integrity issues...“their interest, willingness and ability to participate in the campus dialogue about integrity in structurally constrained.”</td>
<td>Hudak, Apper, Bronson, &amp; Lee (2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology- Instrument

- Academic Integrity Survey developed by Dr. Donald McCabe of Rutgers
- Validity: established by experts
- Reliability: Cronbach Alpha of .911
- Pilot study-Spring 2013
- Cross-sectional-Spring 2014
- Post survey interviews-Fall 2014

Discussion

Full time and part time faculty had the same perceptions about the types and seriousness of cheating.

Full time faculty perceived the student judicial process to be more fair in comparison to part time faculty.

Full time faculty perceived that students should be held responsible for monitoring the academic integrity of other students in comparison to part time faculty.

Full time and part time faculty addressed cheating the vast majority of time.

Understanding of university’s Academic Integrity policy
- students’ understanding lower than faculty’s
- Full time and part time faculty beliefs are the same

Support of the university’s Academic Integrity policies
- student’s support lower than faculty’s
- Full time and part time faculty beliefs are the same

Full time and part time faculty addressed cheating the vast majority of time.

Part time faculty were impacted more by the lack of time to address Academic Integrity.

Conclusion

H1: Perceptions of Academic Integrity are the same for both FT and PF faculty

H2: Majority (77.4%) of both FT and PF faculty did not support Academic Integrity policies

H3: Enforcement of Academic Integrity policies
- Majority (90%) of faculty enforced the University’s honor code.
- Small number (5%) lax with enforcement
- Lack of time most common reason