2016

Individual Characteristics as Predictive Variables of the Level and Impact of Contrapower Harassment of Faculty Teaching in Schools of Pharmacy

Joel M. Epps
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Joel Epps

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. David Mohr, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Virginia Salzer, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Tom Diebold, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2016

Abstract

Individual Characteristics as Predictive Variables of the Level and Impact of Contrapower Harassment of Faculty Teaching in Schools of Pharmacy

by

Joel M. Epps

MBA, Texas Woman's University, 1987

BA, West Texas A & M, 1979

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

May 2016

Abstract

A review of literature documents that higher education faculty are likely to be the target of student harassment. A scenario in which a person of lesser power in an organization harasses a person of greater power is known as contrapower harassment. Students' acts of harassment range from mild incivilities to aggressive and threatening behaviors. The purpose of this quantitative web-based survey study is to document (a) the prevalence of contrapower harassment in a sample of U.S. pharmacy school faculty (n = 110), a previously unstudied population, (b) gender differences in faculty experiences of contrapower harassment, (c) faculty characteristics which may predict harassment, and (d) differences in the level of contrapower harassment associated with accusing a student of academic dishonesty. It was proposed that contrapower harassment is the result of the college environment in which the student is treated as an entitled consumer. Critical systems, emancipatory, and organizational theories were used to help understand the environment that fosters faculty harassment. Analysis of quantitative data employed MANOVA, chi-square, and multiple linear regression. Results confirmed 94% of pharmacy faculty have experienced at least one of the harassing behaviors. Males reported greater levels of incivility and females experienced greater distress from sexual attention. The act of confronting a student for academic dishonesty increased student harassment including incivility, bullying, and sexual attention. Positive social change may result from identifying the prevalence of contrapower harassment in pharmacyschools, leading to changes in the university environment that foster student harassment of faculty.

Individual Characteristics as Predictive Variables of the Level and Impact of Contrapower Harassment of Faculty Teaching in Schools of Pharmacy

by

Joel M. Epps

MBA, Texas Woman's University, 1987

BA, West Texas A & M, 1979

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

May 2016

Dedication

This study is dedicated to my wife, Dale Ann and two sons Ashley and Ross. They cheerfully braved my years of unending need to locate an internet connection to allow me to post, no matter where in the world we may have found ourselves. For this, I give hearty thanks. I also give thanks to Drs. David Mohr and Virginia Salzer for their unending edits and support.

Table of Contents

Abstract iii

Chapter 1 1

Background of the Study 4

Academic Dishonesty 4

Contrapower Harassment 11

Problem Statement 13

Purpose of the Study 15

Research Questions and Hypotheses 16

Research Question 1 16

Research Question 2 17

Research Question 3 17

Research Question 4 18

Theoretical Framework 18

Nature of the Study 20

Definitions 22

Assumptions 24

Scopes and Delimitations 25

Limitations 25

Significance 26

Summary 27

Chapter 2: Literature Review 29

Literature Search Strategy....34
Contrapower Harassment in Higher Education....35
Contrapower Harassment and Doctor of Pharmacy Students....45
Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education....47
Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty....48
Academic Dishonesty, Individual Student Differences, and Contextual Factors....51
Gender....52
Age....53
Grade Point Average....55
Sorority/Fraternity Membership....56
Peer Level, Acceptance, and Exposure to Academically Dishonest Behaviors 57
Students' Perception of Severity of Punishment for Academic Dishonesty....58
Higher Education's Response to Increased Rates of Academic Dishonesty....58
Academic Dishonesty and Doctor of Pharmacy Students....62
Theoretical Support....63
Critical Systems/Emancipatory Theory....66
Organizational Theory....68
Academic Dishonesty, Contrapower Harassment, and the Quantitative Method....73
Summary....74
Chapter 3: Methodology....77
Research Design and Rationale....77
Population....80
Instrumentation....83
Operationalization....84

Predictors of Contrapower Harassment 87
Data Analysis Plan 87
Research Questions and Hypotheses 87
Research Question 1 87
Research Question 2 89
Research Question 3 90
Research Question 4 91
Threats to Validity 91
Random Sampling 92
Low Response Rates 92
Access Control 92
Reliability of Instrument 93
Ethical Procedures 93
Informed Consent 93
Data Protection 94
Survey Exit Instructions 94
Summary 95
Chapter 4: Results 97
Data Collection 97
Results 98
Descriptive Statistics 98
Principal Components Analysis and Scale Composition 100

Research Questions 107
Research Question 1 107
Research Question 2 109
Hypothesis 2(a) Faculty Characteristics of Increased Bullying. 111
Hypothesis 2(b) Faculty Characteristics of Increased Incivility 112
Hypothesis 2(c) Faculty Characteristics of Increased Sexual Attention 113
Research Question 3 114
Research Question 4 115
Summary 117
Chapter 5 119
Interpretation of the Findings 121
Hypothesis 1 125
Hypothesis 2 126
Hypothesis 3 127
Hypothesis 4 127
Theoretical Support 129
Limitations of the Study 131
Recommendations 133
Implications 134
Conclusion 135
References 138
Appendix A: Informed Consent 157
Appendix B: Consent to Use Instrumentation 158

Appendix C: Survey.....160

Appendix D: Respondent Responses to the question, “In a few sentences, can you describe the troubling student behavior?”.....176

List of Tables

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Participants' Demographics 99

Table 2. Summary of PCA Analysis and Variable Reduction..... 101

Table 3. Faculty Prevalence and Distress Associated with Student Incivility Bullying and Aggression 103

Table 4. Faculty Prevalence and Distress Associated with Student Sexual Attention ... 105

Table 5. Faculty Consequences Associated with Harassment..... 106

Table 6. Dependent Variables by Gender..... 108

Table 7. Distress Scales Means and Standard Error by Gender 109

Table 8. Bivariate Correlations..... 111

Table 9. Coefficients for Model Variables for Bullying..... 112

Table 10. Coefficients for Model Variables for Mean Incivility..... 113

Table 11. Coefficients for Model Variables for Sexual Attention Scale..... 114

Table 12. Coefficients for Model Variances forConsequences Scale..... 115

Table 13. Means and Standard Deviations Confront Academic Dishonesty..... 116

Table 14. Summary of Significant Findings..... 117

Chapter 1

A review of literature documents that faculty teaching in higher education are likely to be the target of student harassment. Student harassment of faculty, known as contrapower harassment, is a scenario in which a person of lesser position in an organization harasses a person of greater position or power (Benson, 1984). Recent studies of contrapower harassment indicate that up to 96% of faculty have experienced an act of harassment perpetrated by their student (DeSouza, 2011; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009). These acts of harassment range from mild incivilities such as answering a cell phone during class to aggressive and threatening behaviors such as the threat of a lawsuit or act of violence. Lampman et al. (2009) developed a survey of behaviors considered by faculty to represent contrapower harassment. These behaviors ranged from low aggression incivil behaviors, for example, sleeping in class or answering a cell phone call, to higher aggression behaviors, such as, yelling, hostile or threatening emails, violating the faculty members' personal space, or even threats of physical harm and violence (Lampman et al., 2009). A form of contrapower harassment not included in the Lampman et al. (2009) study is academic dishonesty.

Recent research connects contrapower harassment to academic dishonesty. Galbraith and Jones (2010) regard a student's engagement in academic dishonesty an act of contrapower harassment in the form of incivility. Fontana (2009) discovered that the organizational procedure of confronting and reporting students for academic dishonesty resulted in student harassment of the faculty member so severe as to damage the faculty member's professional reputation and create a fear of engaging in future behaviors that

may engender student aggression. Other studies support these findings that faculty change their behaviors to avoid future reoccurrences of aggressive student behavior (DeSouza, 2011; Fontana, 2009; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009). Highlighting the connection between contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty is the comment of one participant in the Fontana (2009) study, "When you charge a student with academic misconduct, it becomes the accused and the accuser, and some people will say it is the accuser's fault that it happened in the first place, sort of like domestic violence" (p. 182). Harassed faculty members reported experiencing distress because of the experience of harassment perpetrated by students (Lampman, 2012).

Researchers have generated several explanations of motivation and the empowerment of students to harass a faculty member. The terms academic entitlement and student consumerism describe the motivators for student acts of academic dishonesty and harassment of faculty members. Student consumerism suggests that students are customers of the university and, as such, have the right to demand the privileges afforded a customer of the university (Delucchi & Korgen, 2002; Naidoo, Shankar, & Veer, 2011). Students develop the attitude of a customer who pays tuition in exchange for the education commodity. There are indications that the increasing prevalence of contrapower harassment is the result of the changing college environment in which the student is seen and treated as an academically entitled consumer and faculty are expected to meet student needs (Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Dubovsky, 1986; Greenberger, Lessard, Chuansheng, & Farruggia, 2008; Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhart, 2010). Critical systems, emancipatory, and organizational

theories were used to help understand the impact of contrapower harassment on faculty, as well as, the organizational environment of the university fostering contrapower harassment.

Currently, there are few studies focused on understanding demographics and impact of contrapower harassment upon harassed faculty members (DeSousa & Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009; Matchen & DeSousa, 2000); only one known study focused upon the interaction of contrapower harassment with academic dishonesty (Fontana, 2009) and no known study documenting the prevalence of contrapower harassment in schools of pharmacy within the United States. The majority of these studies are concerned with documenting the existence of contrapower harassment in higher education and determining the demographics of those most harassed and impacted by student harassment (DeSousa & Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009; Matchen & DeSousa, 2000). Lampman et al. (2009) supported the concept that faculty experience of contrapower harassment (defined as incivility, bullying, and sexual behaviors) provides the catalyst for the faculty member to change their behavior to avoid entering into situations that may engender aggressive student behaviors. The experience of harassment by students accused of academic dishonesty provides the impetus for the faculty member to avoid future occurrences (Fontana, 2009). Faculty with a history of harassment show reluctance to confront students for academic dishonesty for fear that the act of confrontation may engender additional student harassment (Fontana, 2009; Lampman et al., 2009).

This quantitative web-based study extends the body of literature focused on contrapower harassment and the interaction with academic dishonesty by further documenting the existence of contrapower harassment in higher education. The results of this study documents the prevalence of contrapower harassment in a previously unstudied population, schools of pharmacy. In addition, positive social change may arise from the understanding of faculty characteristics that may contribute to increased student harassment. Understanding which faculty characteristics engender greater student harassment has the potential to help universities predict faculty that are at risk for increased harassment allowing the university to take action to prevent and reduce the impact of harassment upon the faculty member.

The background section of this chapter provides a brief overview of the literature documenting historical and current prevalence of academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment. Following this review, the remainder of the chapter focuses on a brief description of the theoretical support for the study and describing the study research question and hypotheses.

Background of the Study

Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty represents more than individual acts of deviant student behavior to get ahead. Acts of academic dishonesty disrupt the connection between student learning and the measurement of student learning (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Johnson, 2008; Kramer et al., 2011; Vonderwell, Xin, & Alderman, 2007). As a result, the disconnect caused by cheating represents course material not mastered by

academically dishonest students and suggests universities are matriculating students into their chosen career lacking essential knowledge of their profession. In addition, significant numbers of cheating students create scandals usually followed by a harmful media focus on the university, creating a negative environment for the university to pursue educational or fundraising goals (DiBartolo &Walsh, 2010; Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009; Kramer et al., 2011).

Academic dishonesty results as an interaction of students and student assessments of learning. Assessments as diverse as traditional pen and paper tests, online evaluations, and the application of knowledge revealed in individualized projects yield valuable insights into the growth of student skills and provide a baseline of student's knowledge (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Johnson, 2008; Kramer et al., 2011; Vonderwell et al., 2007). In addition, assessments serve as an essential element in the process of improving the curriculum and substantiating schools' ultimate goal of achieving the desired learning outcomes (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Johnson, 2008; Kramer et al., 2011; Vonderwell et al., 2007). Faculty not only develop and grade these assessments but also expect to utilize the results of assessments to modify and tweak the delivery of instructional strategies to meet the needs of the learners (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Johnson, 2008; Kramer et al., 2011; Vonderwell et al., 2007). When students cheat, the instructor is unaware of the changes needed in their teaching style, for example, the need to slow down or speed up teaching, or to focus on items students fail to master to meet the needs of the learners (Passow, Mayhew, Finelli, Harding, & Carpenter, 2006). As a result, the link between assessment and learning is invalidated (DiBartolo &Walsh, 2010; Hollinger & Lanza-

Kaduce, 2009; Kramer et al., 2011). Students progress without the essential knowledge of their chosen profession; societal faith in the degree awarded by institutions of higher education no longer conveys the prestige and respect the achievement of higher learning once deserved (Happel & Jennings, 2008). In the past, small numbers of academically dishonest students committing random acts had little impact on faculty and the university, however, the greater prevalence of academic dishonesty witnessed today has a much greater impact.

Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty. Academic dishonesty is not a new phenomenon. In 1964, Bowers found that 39% of students had cheated on a test or exam with 75% reporting that they had engaged in at least one act of academic dishonesty. Since Bowers' 1964 study, the rapid rise in the frequency of academic dishonesty parallels the growth of technology in the classroom as technology offers an even broader array of potential ways to commit academically dishonest behaviors (Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2009). Today, depending on the institution and field of study, approximately 50% to 90% of students report engaging in at least one act of academic dishonesty (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009; McCabe, 2009). The propensity that a student will commit an academically dishonest act is dependent upon many factors, one of which is the field of study that the student enrolls.

Variation in the rate of academic dishonesty committed in different educational disciplines partially explains the wide range of estimations of the prevalence of academic dishonesty (Harding, Passow, Carpenter, & Finelli, 2004; Harp & Taietz, 1966; Nazir, Aslam, & Nawaz, 2011). For example, students enrolled in vocationally oriented

educational programs such as business, nursing, law, engineering, pharmacy, or medicine self-report higher rates of cheating than those enrolled in more intellectually oriented educational programs such as literature, philosophy, and the humanities (Harding et al., 2004; Harp & Taietz, 1966). This variation could be attributable to the emphasis of vocationally oriented programs upon licensure as a gateway to the profession (Harding et al., 2004; Harp & Taietz, 1966). There is also evidence suggesting that academic dishonesty is on the rise in professions traditionally known for high ethical standards (McCabe, 2009; Muhney et al., 2011; Rennie & Crosby, 2001; Ryan, Bonanno, & Krass, 2009; Tippitt, Ard, & Kline, 2009). The act of academic dishonesty becomes a function of the discipline the student is enrolled and most egregiously impacts the reputation of once highly esteemed professions.

As noted above, student cheating suggests that knowledge essential to the student's chosen profession is unlearned. The gap in knowledge created by cheating creates disconnect between student learning and the measurement of student learning which is unknown to the student's teacher (Johnson, 2008; Kramer et al., 2011; Vonderwell et al., 2007). As a result, the disconnect caused by cheating represents course material not mastered by academically dishonest students and suggests universities are matriculating students into their chosen career lacking essential knowledge of their profession. Further, there is evidence that students who cheat in school go on to cheat in their chosen profession (Harding et al., 2004; Lovett-Hooper, Komarraju, Weston, & Dollinger, 2007; Nonis & Swift, 2001).

Pharmacy education is one example of a healthcare profession and licensure program characterized by increased levels of cheating. The entry degree into pharmacy is the doctor of pharmacy (Pharm.D.). Becoming a pharmacist requires the completion of 2 years of prerequisites and a 4 year program accredited by the Accreditation Council of Pharmacy Education (ACPE) (ACPE, 2013). Following successful completion, graduates must sit for and pass national and state exams (ACPE, 2013). A study of the prevalence of cheating in pharmacy school indicated that 80% to 90% of students self-report cheating (Aggarwal, Bates, Davies, & Khan, 2002; Austin, Simpson, & Reynen, 2005; Rabbi, Patton, Fjortoft, & Azarrick, 2006). Documentation of increased cheating amongst pharmacy students suggests unlearned material and the tendency to cheat in their roles as healthcare providers. In summary, a pharmacy student's propensity to cheat in pharmacy school suggests these students matriculate without the required knowledge to be effective in their professional roles and increase the likelihood to cheat in their professional role due to a lack of fundamental knowledge.

High levels of cheating suggest that students most likely to cheat in college are also those having the greatest impact upon their constituents, such as, patients of doctors, nurses, pharmacists, or perhaps the occupants of buildings designed by academically dishonest engineering students (Harding et al., 2007; Lovett-Hooper et al., 2007; Nonis & Swift, 2001). Several studies reveal a correlation between college cheating behaviors and a willingness to violate the rules later in professional careers (Harding et al., 2007; Lovett-Hooper et al., 2007; Nonis & Swift, 2001). The relationship between cheating in college and willingness to commit such behaviors in their professional roles becomes

particularly disturbing in relationship to healthcare. As stated above, pharmacy students self-report cheating at rates approaching 90% (Rabbi et al., 2006). One study reported that pharmacy students simply cheat more than students enrolled in other disciplines (Bates, Davies, Murphy, & Bone, 2005). Students cheating during their university years continue in their professional roles as pharmacists can result in serious, sometimes life threatening harm to patients (Nonis & Swift, 2001). For example, pharmacist Robert Courtney diluted the breast cancer drug Gemzar to less than 1% of the prescribed dose deleteriously affecting the medical outcome of an estimated 4,200 patients and sent Robert to federal prison for 30 years (Freed, 2001). This notion that an academically dishonest student will commit further acts of dishonesty in their professional role makes it even more important to detect, prosecute, and expel or reeducate the academically dishonest student.

Student Motivation to Commit Academic Dishonesty. Simply stated, students undertake academically dishonest behaviors to receive grades higher than they would have received without engaging in academic dishonesty (Michaels & Miethe, 2011; Vowell & Chen, 2004). Each student makes the decision to engage in deviant cheating behavior by weighing the expected gain from cheating against the duality of the probability of exposure and the harshness of potential punishment (Vowell & Chen, 2004). Differential association theory may explain a student's academically dishonest behaviors (Vowell & Chen, 2004). This theory suggests that students whose friends cheat provide the rationale for the student cheating behaviors (Vowell & Chen, 2004). Further, the relationship developed with these friends help build positive norms toward cheating

(Alleyne & Phillips, 2011; Vowell & Chen, 2004). Similarly, other research supported the idea of the importance of social norming, but found student's attitudes toward cheating exerted more influence over the decision to cheat (Alleyne & Phillips, 2011).

Student Predictors of Cheating Behavior. Several studies document the existence of personal student factors associated with academic dishonesty. For example, fraternity and sorority membership is associated with higher levels of academic dishonesty (McCabe & Bowers, 2009; Pino & Smith, 2003). Suggested by some studies as a predictor of academic dishonesty (e.g., Aiken, 1991; Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992; Ward & Beek, 1990), student gender has been disputed by other studies (Baird, 1980; Haines, Diekhoff, LaBeff, & Clark, 1986; McCabe & Trevino, 1997). Some researchers suggest that gender as a predictor of cheating behaviors has dissipated with the entry of women into traditionally male academic programs (McCabe & Trevino, 1996; Pino & Smith, 2003). Student predictors of lower rates of academic dishonesty are described as the presence of academic ethics including an academic locus of control, infrequency of missing classes, and a low focus on grade point average (Christensen & McCabe, 2006a; Pino & Smith, 2003). Student predictor's of increased levels of academic dishonesty include increased levels of television viewing and high levels of participation in student clubs or groups (Christensen & McCabe, 2006b; Pino & Smith, 2003). Many studies have been completed with the intent to discover predictors of student cheating behavior; Chapter 2 presents an inclusive review of studies determining predictors of student cheating behavior.

Contrapower Harassment

In the past, faculty held a position of respect and high esteem in the learning community. Many changes in the university environment have changed the hierarchy of respect and power. Today, students frequently feel that they have power over faculty members (Delucchi & Korgen, 2002; Naidoo et al., 2011). Although there is scarcity of information directly related to student harassment of a faculty member for confrontation for academic dishonesty, there is information regarding student justification for harassing a faculty member. For example, one justification for harassing faculty members suggests the view of the student as a consumer of education (Delucchi & Korgen, 2002; Naidoo et al., 2011) and student's sense of academic entitlement (Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011; Dubovsky, 1986; Greenberger, Lessard, Chen, & Farruggia, 2008; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010) encourages the student to see themselves as bosses who have the right to harass their professors. There are other examples of student motivation to harass faculty members. For example, large classroom size makes it difficult for the professor to maintain the attention of all students and some students may express anger over being in such a large class (Schneider, 2002). Whatever the rationale, the concept of students, individuals with lesser organizational power, confronting faculty, an individual with greater organizational power, has become a reality in higher education (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000; Kolanko et al., 2006; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009).

Initially, the definition of harassment was a person with higher power intimidating, persecuting, or persistently tormenting a person of lesser power in the

organization. Crocker (1983) published an article describing the university definition of sexual harassment. Crocker presented the university definition of sexual harassment as a male supervisor sexually harassing a female employee (Crocker, 1983). In reaction, Benson (1984) suggested that Crocker left out an important genre of sexual harassment, male or female students sexually harassing male or female faculty. Benson (1984) thus proposed the concept of contrapower harassment, he inverted the organizational hierarchy persons of lesser status harassed someone of higher rank. Early on, the concept of contrapower harassment described incidences of sexual harassment of faculty by students. Researchers following Benson applied the broadened applications of contrapower harassment to the student/faculty relationship, but still primarily linking harassment deemed sexual or sexist in nature (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Matchen &DeSouza, 2000). Benson (1984) also pointed out that Crocker (1983) overlooked the reality that a student can sexually harass male faculty as well as female faculty. Several researchers have documented Benson's observation of Crocker's omission that students of both genders harass faculty of both genders in a sexual manner (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Matchen &DeSouza, 2000). Until Lampman et al. (2009), studies of student contrapower harassment of faculty focused on harassment of a sexual nature. These authors enlarged the definition of contrapower harassment by documenting faculty experiences of student harassment to include not only behaviors sexual or sexist in nature, but also harassing behaviors labeled student incivility and bullying (DeSouza, 2011; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009). The study by Lampman et al. (2009) also revealed that some faculty would change their

behaviors to avoid aggressive interactions with students (Lampman et al., 2009). For example, 10% of participants changed a test to avoid aggressive student interactions (Lampman et al., 2009). Historically, Benson (1984) and other researchers (DeSouza, 2011; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009) have developed the concept of harassment to include contrapower harassment that embraces all forms of harassment including sexual, incivil, and bullying behaviors.

A study documenting the impact of student harassment associated with confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty was still lacking. Fontana (2009) completed a qualitative study documenting nursing faculty's like experiences of contrapower harassment. This study substantiates the development of the link between contrapower harassment accompanying a faculty's confrontation of students for acts of academic dishonesty (Fontana, 2009). To date, there are no available data, neither documenting contrapower harassment in pharmacy education nor quantifying the relationship between increased levels of contrapower harassment and the faculty members' history of confronting a student for academic dishonesty. Chapter 2 offers an in-depth study of contrapower harassment literature.

Problem Statement

The concepts of academic entitlement (Dubovsky, 1986; Naidoo et al., 2011; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010) and student consumerism (Delucchi & Korgen, 2002; Naidoo et al., 2011) describe an educational environment in which students demand high academic achievement without investing significant time or effort into the process. Students hold faculty responsible for student learning and students justify engaging in

aggressive interactions with faculty members when these outcomes are not met (Dubovsky, 1986; Naidoo et al., 2011; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010).

The term contrapower harassment was unidentified prior to Benson (1984). After Benson, early studies of contrapower harassment studied harassment primarily sexual in nature. A study of contrapower harassment defined experience of student acts of incivility; bullying and sexual attention indicated that 99% of male and 96% of female faculty members had been the victim of at least one incidence of student incivility and bullying (Lampman et al., 2009). Another similar study of faculty across the U.S. indicated that 91% of faculty participants had experienced contrapower harassment (Lampman, 2012). Not all of the studies of contrapower harassment have shown such a high level of faculty experience with contrapower harassment, DeSouza (2011) indicated that 72% of the faculty participant population experienced at least one harassing behavior. This difference may be due to the design of the data collection discussed in Chapter 2. In addition, faculty experience of contrapower harassment leads some faculty to change their behaviors to avoid controversy and the potential of threatening interactions with students (Fontana, 2009; Lampman et al., 2009). There is limited research examining contrapower harassment and contrapower harassment's effect on faculty and only one study documenting the experience of contrapower harassment of faculty resulting from accusing a student of academic dishonesty (Fontana, 2009). There is no known study documenting the prevalence of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education. Only a few studies have documented the prevalence of contrapower harassment in higher education and no known quantitative study exists documenting the

relationship between accusing students with academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment. This study builds upon the works of Lampman (2012), Lampman et al. (2009), and Fontana (2009), as well as, addresses the gap in the literature, by establishing the prevalence of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education. In contrast to Lampman, et al. (2009) and suggested by Fontana (2009), this study quantifies a relationship between faculty with a history of confronting students with charges of academic dishonesty and higher levels of contrapower harassment. In addition, this study develops an equation to predict faculty characteristics that engender greater levels of contrapower harassment.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative nonexperimental study is to examine the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment in a group of faculty employed in pharmacy education. Specifically, to examine how individual faculty variables of age, racial or ethnic minority group status, the absence or presence of a terminal degree, tenure status, teaching experience, and history of accusing students of acts of academic dishonesty impact and predict the experience of contrapower harassment. I used an online survey of contrapower harassment by Lampman et al. (2009) designed to collect data concerning the prevalence of disrespectful, hostile, or student behaviors of a sexual nature with the addition of one question. This question documents the faculty participants' history of confronting students with charges of academic dishonesty. Dependent variables are (a) rate of incivility/bullying from students, (b) rate of sexual attention from students, (c) rate of negative consequences associated with student

incivility/bullying, (d) rate of distress related to harassing student behaviors, and (e) the rate of formal faculty action taken to confront student behaviors. Independent (predictor) variables include (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, (d) teaching experience, and (e) history of accusing students of acts of academic dishonesty.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The general research question, "What is the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment of faculty by students in pharmacy education?" The following specific research questions guided the formulation of the associated hypotheses:

Research Question 1

What is the difference between male and female faculty member's experiences of contrapower student harassment?

H_0: There will be no statistically significant difference in the frequency of contrapower student harassment reported by men and women faculty as measured by dependent variables of (a) rate of incivility/bullying from students, (b) rate of sexual attention from students, (c) rate of negative consequences associated with student incivility/bullying, (d) rate of distress related to harassing student behaviors, and (e) the rate of formal faculty action taken to confront student behaviors.

H_1: There will be statistically significant differences in the frequency of contrapower student harassment reported by men and women with women faculty reporting greater levels of the dependent variables: (a) rate of incivility/bullying from students, (b) rate of sexual attention from students, (c) rate of negative consequences associated with student

incivility/bullying, (d) rate of distress related to harassing student behaviors, and (e) the rate of formal faculty action taken to confront student behaviors.

Research Question 2

Do faculty characteristics, including ethnic or racial minority status, terminal degree status, tenure status, and years of teaching experience predict the rate of contrapower harassment?

$H_{0:}$ The independent variables of (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience will not predict the rate of incivility, (hypothesis 2a), bullying (hypothesis 2b) or sexual attention (hypothesis 2c).

$H_{1:}$ The independent variables of (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience will predict the rates of incivility (hypothesis 2a), bullying (hypothesis 2b) and sexual attention (hypothesis 2b).

Research Question 3

Do faculty characteristics, including ethnic or racial minority status, terminal degree status, tenure status, and years of teaching experience predict the negative consequence associated with the presence of contrapower student harassment?

H_0: The independent variables, (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience will not predict the dependent variable, negative consequences.

H_1: The independent variables (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience will predict the dependent variable, negative consequences.

Research Question 4

Do faculty members with a history of confronting and reporting a student with charges of academic dishonesty experience higher levels of contrapower harassment?

H_1: There will be no statistically significant difference in the level of contrapower student harassment for faculty with experiences of confronting students with acts of academic dishonesty.

H_0: There will be a statistically significant difference in the level of contrapower student harassment for faculty with experiences of confronting students with acts of academic dishonesty.

Theoretical Framework

The qualitative study by Fontana (2009), extended by this research, is grounded in the critical systems theories of Habermas (Habermas & Blazek, 1984) and the emancipatory theory of Freire (1996). Fontana focused on investigating the experiences of nursing faculty involved in the university process of confronting and reporting nursing students for committing academic dishonesty. The study revealed participants experienced increased fear of students after confronting and/or reporting acts of academic dishonesty (Fontana, 2009). Faculty members also described feelings of physical, emotional, and professional endangerment surrounding the event of reporting a student

for cheating. Some faculty participant's anxiety escalated to the point that they felt compelled to leave academia (Fontana, 2009).

Faculty participants from Fontana's study suggest that the harassment of faculty by students specifically focuses on reducing the propensity of faculty to confront academically dishonest behaviors. Both critical systems and emancipatory theories support changing organizational policies, which fail to achieve outcomes and harm members of the organization. Expunging academic dishonesty and harassing behaviors require critical organizational change to alleviate the restrictions of a hostile work environment and to achieve the organization's goals of eliminating academic dishonesty and fostering learning. Chapter 2 presents an expanded discussion of emancipatory theory, critical systems, and organizational theories.

The rising prevalence of academic dishonesty (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009; McCabe, 2009) reinforces the notion that current organizational strategies designed to curb incidences of academic dishonesty are flawed (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2009; McCabe et al., 2001). Gallant and Drinan (2006b), based on the concept of organizational change, suggest applying the theoretical concept of organizational theory to the problem of academic dishonesty. The authors see organizational theory as moving away from "piecemeal efforts" (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b, p. 840) designed to combat individual acts of academic dishonesty and instead invest in the integration of academic integrity as a core value of the organization (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Central to the issue of addressing the problem of academic dishonesty is fully realizing the complications academic dishonesty inflicts on the institution while

staying mindful of the constituency of higher education. The ultimate thrust of the solution to extinguish academic dishonesty must propel the organization to move from theory to effective strategy (Gallant & Drinan, 2006a, 2006b). Chapter 2 contains a complete discussion of organizational theory as applied to academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment.

Nature of the Study

This quantitative observational study examined the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment in a group of faculty employed in higher education. This study used an online survey of faculty teaching in Doctor of Pharmacy programs throughout the United States who are members of a professional association of pharmacy faculty. Lampman et al. (2009) developed the survey to collect data concerning the prevalence of disrespectful, hostile, or student behaviors of a sexual nature. This survey included the addition of one question asking the faculty member's history of prosecuting a student for academic dishonesty. I used quantitative methodology to quantify the qualitative results of the Fontana (2009) study. In contrast to Lampman et al. (2009) and Lampman (2012), this study focused on faculty teaching in one discipline, faculty within a college or school of pharmacy. Pharmacy faculty were chosen to examine contrapower harassment in a healthcare profession to help bridge the literature gap and document the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education.

Reluctance to confront a pharmacy student for academic dishonesty may represent knowledge unlearned by the student. In their professional roles, these students lack of knowledge may contribute to medication errors. These errors harm an estimated 1.5

million patients each year costing an estimated $77 million (Institute, 2007). Pharmacists play an important role in preventing medication errors as a checkpoint between medication prescriber and patient (Knudsen, Herborg, Mortensen, Knudsen, & Helebek, 2007).

Data analysis used the MANOVA, chi-square, and multiple regression analysis functions of the Statistical Product and Services Solutions (SPSS). Hypotheses 1: H_0 and H_1 utilized a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVAs). The frequency of contrapower student harassment reported by men and women faculty is measured by dependent variables of (a) rate of incivility/bullying from students, (b) rate of sexual attention from students, (c) rate of negative consequences associated with student incivility/bullying, and (d) rate of distress related to harassing student behaviors. A chi square test was used to examine gender and (e) the rate of formal faculty action taken to confront student behaviors. The decision to use the MANOVA statistical analysis resulted from the analysis by Lampman et al. (2009) reporting the interdependence of these variables.

Hypotheses 2 utilized multiple regression analysis to predict the levels of incivility-bullying (hypothesis 2(a) and sexual attention (hypothesis 2(b) associated with faculty characteristics of (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience. Hypothesis 3 utilized multiple regression to determine how well faculty characteristics (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d)

teaching experience predict negative consequences associated with contrapower harassment. Hypothesis 4 utilized a MANOVA. The dependent variables are student incivility-bullying, sexual attention and negative consequences scales and the history of confronting a student for academic dishonesty (yes/no) the independent grouping variable.

Nonexperimental survey methodologies frequently used in research to examine current existing characteristics such as attitudes, perceptions, and values (Creswell, 2009). The assumptions of the performance of MANOVA and multiple regression were tested and discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

Definitions

Academic Dishonesty: This study will use the following definition:

> …an intentional act of fraud, in which a student seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without authorization, or uses unauthorized materials or fabricated information in any academic exercise. We also consider academic dishonesty to include forgery of academic documents, intentionally impeding or damaging the academic work of others, or assisting other students in acts of dishonesty (Gehring & Pavela, 1994, p. 5).

No collective definition of academic dishonesty exists making it difficult to describe the entire range of behaviors that may constitute the phenomena (Schmelkin, Gilbert, Spencer, Pincus, & Silva, 2008). Some cheating behaviors are considered more egregious. For example, cheating

on a test is the most egregious whereas other behaviors such as plagiarism are considered less egregious forms of academic dishonesty (McCabe, 2009). The advent of electronic teaching technologies has greatly expanded and enhanced those behaviors viewed as cheating (McCabe, 2009).

Academic Entitlement: Academic Entitlement "defined as the tendency to possess an expectation of academic success without taking personal responsibility for achieving that success (Chowning & Campbell, 2009, p. 982)."

Bullying: Bullying is defined as "physical and verbal aggressive behavior that has the potential to cause physical and/or psychological distress to the victim (DeSouza and Ribeiro, 2005, p. 1019)."

Contrapower Harassment: Contrapower harassment is a circumstance in which an individual with lesser position in an organization harasses an individual with greater power in the organization (Benson, 1984; Lampman et al. 2009). In this study, the individual with lesser power is a student within the institution of higher education and the faculty member as the individual with greater power within the hierarchy of the university. Contrapower harassment includes student incivility, bullying, and acts of unwanted or unsolicited sexual innuendos.

Negative Consequences (faculty): Contrapower harassment has the potential to affect faculty recipients of the abuse negatively (Lampman et al., 2009). The study survey measures the "perceived negative consequences that contrapower harassment has had on

faculty members' physical and emotional well-being (including embarrassment and hesitance to speak about it, teaching and work life." (Lampman et al., 2009, p. 334).

Sexual Attention: Sexual attention includes both student incivility and bullying but is sexual in nature including comments that are of a sexist or sexual nature, unelicited sexual attention, and verbal or physical aggressive behavior that is sexual in nature (Lampman et al., 2009).

Student Consumerism: The term student consumerism represents the construct that education and the university are marketplaces in which the student is the customer and faculty serve to meet the needs of the student (Delucchi & Korgen, 2002; Naidoo et al., 2011). The term student consumerism is closely associated with the term academic entitlement.

Student Incivility: Student incivility defined as "rude or discourteous behavior demonstrating a lack of regard or respect for others" (Lampman et al., 2009, p. 334) with the intent to harm or discredit.

Assumptions

This study makes several assumptions concerning the data collection method and truthfulness of the respondents answers. The impact of harassment of faculty members is a sensitive subject carrying significant emotional and social impact (DeSouza, 2011; Fontana, 2009; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009). Faculty may believe that the act of receiving harassment from a student implies teacher weakness and hesitate to participant in a survey concerning their history of contrapower harassment (Lampman et al., 2012). The research assumes that a study utilizing a cross-sectional survey designed

as an anonymous online survey will increase participants' willingness to disclose sensitive information. The design and anonymous delivery of online surveys increases participants' honesty and promotes honesty of participants greater than the traditional pen and paper questionnaire (Cook, 2011). In addition, the study researcher assumes that the study will be sensitive to the difference between the genders concerning the impact of harassment. Some studies have shown differences between the genders concerning the type and impact of harassment (Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009), whereas similar studies have revealed no significant difference (DeSouza, 2011).

Scopes and Delimitations

The scope of this study is the examination of the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment within higher education. Study participants are faculty members of schools of pharmacy offering the Pharm.D. degree and members of a professional organization of pharmacy faculty. A survey instrument developed by Lampman et al. (2009) was emailed to members of a pharmacy faculty professional association. Study participants were given a period of 3 weeks to complete the survey and received a reminder at week 1 and 2.

Limitations

This study is limited to school of pharmacy faculty teaching within a doctor of pharmacy program and volunteer members of the professional association of pharmacy educators. Several studies have shown a variance in the frequency of academic dishonesty between vocationally oriented programs such as healthcare and other types of educationally oriented programs (Harding et al., 2004; Harp & Taietz, 1966). No

information is available reporting the impact of the frequency and impact of contrapower harassment on pharmacy faculty. It is not known if the results of a study based on healthcare oriented pharmacy participants will generalize to other disciplines of education.

In addition, the study is limited to data gathered via self-reporting through an anonymous online questionnaire. Many of the study's limitations are associated with the survey instrument developed by Lampman et al. (2009). The authors discuss five limitations associated with the survey:

1. Respondents are asked to reflect upon their entire teaching career suggesting a long enough time period for respondents to forget earlier experiences of student contrapower harassment;
2. The five point scale used in the survey may have been too subjective and without a clear point of reference;
3. Respondents were only asked to indicate how upsetting student were if they had experienced them, disallowing statistical comparison of differences in distress;
4. The survey was entirely self-report and; the study did not assess personality traits of faculty members (Lampman et al., 2009, p. 345).

Significance

Contrapower harassment negatively affects faculty teaching in higher education. Teachers may alter their classroom plans to accommodate the demands of harassing students or in the extreme may choose to leave the teaching profession (Lampman et al.,

2009). This study will contribute to the overall literature encompassing academic dishonesty and the impact of contrapower harassment. In addition, the study provides data in an area of contrapower harassment currently not researched: the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education. As a result, significant social change may come from understanding of the issue of contrapower harassment on faculty and its impact on academic dishonesty.

Organizational change may take place through the adoption of programs designed to educate students and faculty to the problem of contrapower harassment and provide a process to reprimand students found guilty of the behavior. The reduction of the harassment of faculty members confronting students for academic dishonesty may lead to greater faculty willingness to confront students for cheating. Students will evolve to become reluctant to commit an act of academic dishonesty within institutions that have established protocols and zero tolerance for academic dishonesty and harassment resulting in the positive outcome of extinguishing or greatly reducing the prevalence of both. Understanding faculty characteristics that may contribute to increased levels of student harassment will help university administration both identify at risk faculty and develop tailored programs designed to protect faculty at higher risk.

Summary

Chapter 1 introduced a study designed to examine the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment in higher education. Benson (1984) described the phenomena of college students harassing faculty members, naming the experience contrapower harassment. Recent research shows that a large percentage (96%) of faculty report

experiencing at least one act of contrapower harassment (Lampman et al., 2009). Evolving college student attitudes of academic entitlement and student consumerism suggest students hold faculty responsible for student learning, the lack of student performance and feel empowered to commit aggressive acts against faculty. A small number of studies exist documenting the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment. These studies also documented a change in faculty behaviors designed to avoid future student aggression. Fontana (2009) documented the experience of nursing faculty harassed by students confronted with academic dishonesty. This study differs from previous studies in that the goal of the study is to survey a group of faculty teaching in a pharmacy curriculum and quantify the relationship between faculty's experience of contrapower harassment and their history of confronting a student with academic dishonesty.

The Literature Review presented in Chapter 2 will expand the discussion of the relevant literature begun in Chapter 1 by exploring documentation related to the major concepts of academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment. The Literature Review also presents an anthology of established methodologies used in this study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to examine the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education and the relationship between a faculty member's history of harassment associated with confronting a student with an act of academic dishonesty. I also attempted to develop an equation predicting faculty characteristics which increase levels of contrapower harassment. This literature review was employed to determine the status of research of the societal problem of contrapower harassment in higher education. The review of studies of faculty employed in higher education indicates that harassment of faculty by students is increasing (DeSousa & Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009; Matchen & DeSousa, 2000). Surveys of higher education faculty teaching in a number of disciplines suggest that up to 96% of faculty experienced some form of contrapower harassment, a term used to describe the harassment of faculty by students (DeSousa & Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009; Matchen & DeSousa, 2009). The motivation of students to harass faculty is unclear. Some literature suggests that students feel a sense of entitlement to receive high academic marks without investing significant effort in the educational process (Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Dubovsky, 1986; Greenberger et al., 2008; Nordstrom, Bartel, Bucy, 2009; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010). Faculty responsible for assessing student performance may be the target of aggressive behaviors when students do not receive treatment or grades they feel they deserve (Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011; Chowning &

Campbell, 2009; Dubovsky, 1986; Greenberger et al., 2008; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010).

Exacerbating students' sense of academic entitlement is the attitude of student as a consumer (Delucchi & Korgen, 2002; Naidoo et al, 2011). Universities struggle to survive under intense economic pressures and the economic need to attract larger numbers of students creates pressure to treat the student as a consumer and as such, the student consumer demands ever increasing levels of services and an educational outcome of a degree without a high level of personal responsibility or effort (Delucchi & Korgen, 2002; Naidoo et al., 2011). Taken together, the student attitudes of academic entitlement and student consumerism create an organizational environment in which faculty are at risk for acts of student aggression (Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Delucchi & Korgen, 2002; Dubovsky, 1986; Greenberger et al., 2008; Naidoo et al., 2011; Nordstrom et al., 2009; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010). This process, the student as customer exchanging tuition dollars for a specified outcome of a degree, may unintentionally change the student's perception of the student-faculty relationship, suggesting that the student is now in control (Long & Lake, 1996). Similar to the business mantra the customer is always right, students assume the role of customers when presented a challenge to their right to own a purchased commodity, becoming irate, engaging in harassing behaviors to receive the paid for product (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010). In the student as customer university, the process of learning becomes secondary to the outcome of a degree and high paying job. In this atmosphere, students will do whatever necessary to achieve the outcomes they feel they are entitled.

Additionally, the literature confirms that one type of contrapower harassment, academic dishonesty (Galbraith & Jones, 2010), is also increasing significantly (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2009). Depending on the educational discipline, as many as 90% of students admit to some form of academic dishonesty (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2009). In its most benign form, academic dishonesty disrupts the classroom and represents material not learned by students (Johnson, 2008; Kramer et al., 2011; Vonderwell et al, 2007). In its most aggressive form, academic dishonesty may damage the reputation of the graduating students and the university (Happel & Jennings, 2008). One study reported faculty confronting and reporting students for acts of academic dishonesty are at risk for severe acts of aggression by students (Fontana, 2009). Faculty victims of student aggression may alter their behavior in the classroom to decrease their risk of future student harassment (Fontana, 2009; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009) while other faculty may protect themselves by leaving academia altogether (Fontana, 2009).

The review of contrapower harassment literature also suggests characteristics unique to each faculty member, which may alter the faculty member's risk of being the victim of student harassment. These faculty variables include gender, ethnic or racial minority status, terminal degree status, tenure status, and years of teaching experience (DeSousa & Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009; Matchen & DeSousa, 2009).

There is limited research examining contrapower harassment and contrapower harassment's effect on faculty (DeSousa & Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Lampman,

2012; Lampman et al., 2009; Matchen & DeSousa, 2009) and only one study, a qualitative study documenting the experience of contrapower harassment of faculty resulting from accusing a student of academic dishonesty (Fontana, 2009). There is no known study documenting the prevalence of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education.

Pharmacy education is one example of a healthcare profession characterized by increased levels of cheating. The entry degree into pharmacy is the doctor of pharmacy (Pharm.D.). A study of the prevalence of cheating in pharmacy school indicated that 80% to 90% of students self-report cheating (Aggarwal et al., 2002; Austin et al., 2005; Rabbi et al., 2006). Several studies reveal a correlation between college cheating behaviors and a willingness to violate the rules later in professional careers (Harding et al., 2007; Lovett-Hooper et al., 2007; Nonis & Swift, 2001). The relationship between cheating in college and willingness to commit such behaviors in their professional roles become particularly disturbing in relationship to healthcare. Students cheating may represent gaps in their knowledge of disease states and medication regimens and these gaps may continue in their professional roles as pharmacists, resulting in serious, sometimes life threatening harm to patients (Nonis & Swift, 2001). Pharmacists are frequently the last healthcare professional the patient sees before beginning a medication regimen. The patient's health outcome may directly relate to their pharmacists' knowledge and skill. Pharmacists who cheat in school are also more likely to fabricate clinical data in their roles as professional pharmacists (Hilbert, 1988). Only a few studies have documented the prevalence of contrapower harassment in higher education and no known quantitative

study exists documenting the relationship between accusing students with academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment. The current study builds upon the works of Lampman (2012), Lampman, et al. (2009) and Fontana (2009) and addresses the gap in the literature by examining the prevalence of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education. In contrast to Lampman (2012), Lampman, et al. (2009) and suggested by Fontana (2009), this study quantified a relationship between faculty with a history of confronting students with charges of academic dishonesty and higher levels of contrapower harassment.

In order to understand the complexity of this problem, a literature review was completed of the major concepts brought together in this study. The first part of Chapter 2 details the strategy used to examine the literature related to contrapower harassment. Following the literature search strategy the next section presents relevant literature concerning the history and status of contrapower research in higher education. The next section deals with a single type of contrapower harassment-academic dishonesty. This section reviews the history of academic dishonesty in higher education, primarily the frequency of academically dishonest acts. Presented next are the main research areas associated with understanding academic dishonesty and lastly, the review of the academic dishonesty literature provides a summary of the current policies geared toward decreasing the frequency of academically dishonest acts adopted by organizations of higher education. The theories suggested by the literature review include organizational theory, critical systems theory, and emancipatory theory. The last section of Chapter 2 presents a

summary including a defense of the quantitative research method chosen to support this study and transitions to Chapter 3.

Literature Search Strategy

The literature review utilized EBSCO Host and the following electronic databases available through the Walden University Library: PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, SocINDEX with Full Text, and Psychology: A SAGE Full-Text Collection, ERIC, Academic Search Complete, and Education Research Complete. Google and Professional Google supplemented EBSCO Host searches specifically to search for popular media supporting literature.

Frequently, the search was enlarged by choosing all databases to find supporting literature. The most significant terms used to conduct this search included the following:

- *contrapower harassment*
- *academic dishonesty*

The literature review revealed that contrapower harassment includes the term *classroom incivilities*. Similarly, academic dishonesty is also known as cheating. These four terms, *contrapower harassment, classroom incivilities, academic dishonesty*, and *cheating* paired with the terms: *classroom, higher education*, and *pharmacy education* produced the following phrases:

- *contrapower harassment in higher education*
- *incivilities in the higher education classroom*
- *contrapower harassment in the higher education classroom*
- *academic dishonesty in higher education*

- *cheating in higher education*
- *contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty in higher education*
- *classroom incivility and academic dishonesty/cheating in higher education*
- *academic dishonesty in pharmacy education*
- *contrapower harassment in higher education*.

This study cites 140 resources including 128 journal articles, 4 books, 6 web sites, and 2 meeting reports. The literature review includes literature published in 1964 to 2014.

Contrapower Harassment in Higher Education

Contrapower harassment is a relatively new concept. Prior to 1984, the concept of harassment on the higher education campus was a person of greater formal power, primarily male, harassing a female subordinate within the organization (Benson, 1984; Crocker, 1984). During this time, much of the literature focused on harassment that was a result of unequal power and was sexual in nature (Grauerholz, 1989). In 1984, Phyllis Crocker wrote an article calling for a broadening of university's definition of sexual harassment. In alliance to existing traditions, Crocker focused on sexual harassment of subordinate females by males holding positions of formal power within the organization (Crocker, 1984). In reaction, Benson (1984) pointed out a different type of sexual harassment, contrapower harassment, the existence of sexual harassment of female faculty members by their male students (Benson, 1984). Regardless of the omission of awareness that males can be the harassed as well as the harasser (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003); Benson (1984) introduced the concept of contrapower harassment. Historically, harassment prior to this time was a person holding higher levels of authority in the

organization harassing a person with less formal power. Contrapower harassment was defined as a situation in which a person of lesser organizational power harasses a person of greater organizational power (Benson, 1984). In summary, Crocker (1984) introduced the traditional view of harassment with a focus on harassment perpetrated by males holding positions of formal power against female faculty in higher education. This thesis provided a platform for Benson (1984) to introduce the concept of contrapower harassment, in Crocker's (1984) example the harassment of female faculty by their female students. After Benson's 1984 introduction of contrapower harassment, research examining the concept of contrapower harassment focused on incidences of sexual harassment of faculty by students. One early study, Grauerholz (1989) examined the sexual harassment of female faculty members by students. This study revealed that nearly half (47.6%) of the respondents experienced at least one of the sexually explicit behaviors listed in the study (Grauerholz, 1989). The most frequent behavior experienced by the largest number of study participants (32%) was linked to sexual comments from students (Grauerholz, 1989). Most (82%) of the harassing behaviors were originated by males, 17% of the behaviors were originated from both males and females, and only 1% of the behaviors originated from females only (Grauerholz, 1989). The Grauerholz (1989) study, although significant for documentation of contrapower harassment of faculty by students, was limited to female faculty. Notably, the study showed a very small portion (18%) of the behaviors included female students (Grauerholz, 1989).

Following the Grauerholz (1989) study, Matchen and DeSouza (2000) published the results of a similar study. In contrast, their study included both male and female

faculty and students. Student participants (n=227) completed questionnaires during class time. Including all three of the study's listed sexually harassing behaviors, 63% of the students indicated they had engaged in at least one behavior (Matchen &DeSouza, 2000). Interestingly, the study reported no significant differences in response rates between male and female students as perpetrators of the three listed types of sexual harassment (Matchen &DeSouza, 2000).

Faculty participants of the Matchen and DeSouza (2000) study received invitations to participate in the study distributed through the university mail system to all faculty teaching at the university. One limitation of the study was the low number of questionnaires returned by faculty. Of the 792 faculty, only 102 returned completed questionnaires, a return rate of only 14% (Matchen &DeSouza, 2000), thus increasing the probability of nonresponse errors (Lumsden & Morgan, 2005). Nonresponse errors occur when the responding study participants differ significantly from the nonrespondents (Lumsden & Morgan, 2005). Fifty-three percent of the study participants experienced at least one of the three sexually harassing behaviors (Matchen & DeSouza, 2000). Similar to the student responses, there were no significant gender differences, both male and female faculty experienced similar levels of sexual harassment, and both genders experienced equal distress caused by the experience (Matchen & DeSouza, 2000). This study is significant for documenting contrapower harassment by students of both male and female faculty and reporting no significant gender differences. The authors indicated that despite the lack of gender differences in both the frequency and amount the faculty member was troubled by the incident, female faculty reported being more distressed than

their male counterparts did by unwanted sexual attention from students (Matchen & DeSouza, 2000). Following Matchen and DeSouza (2000), DeSouza and Fansler (2003) completed a study of contrapower sexual harassment. Previous studies faced significant limitations including a focus on one gender or the other as either harasser or the harassed and grouping all participants together regardless of age or organizational status (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003). In addition, this study broke away from the methods enlisted by previous survey studies by utilizing scenarios of sexual harassment in contrast to asking whether a participant had experienced or engaged in sexual harassment (DeSouza& Fansler, 2003). The findings indicated that 32% of students reported they had harassed a faculty member, further, these results indicated that male students committed significantly more sexually harassing and gender harassing behaviors of faculty than their female counterparts (DeSouza& Fansler, 2003). Regarding professors' gender, there were no significant differences in the gender of the student harasser (DeSouza& Fansler, 2003). Students of both genders engaged in sexually harassing behaviors of faculty of either gender (DeSouza& Fansler, 2003). In other words, female students reported engaging in sexually harassing or gender harassing behaviors of both female and male faculty and male students reported engaging in sexually harassing or gender harassing behaviors of both female and male faculty (DeSouza& Fansler, 2003). In summary, DeSouza and Fansler (2003) showed significantly fewer students engaging in sexually harassing behaviors with the reported frequency of male students' acts significantly greater than female, and that both male and female students harassed both same gender

and opposite gender faculty members. Still lacking was a study of contrapower of non-sexual behaviors.

Until 2009, the literature examining contrapower harassment was limited to studies of sexual harassment of faculty by their subordinate students. The focus on contrapower harassment shifted to other harassing behaviors in a study by Lampman et al. (2009). Their study defined contrapower harassment as student incivility, bullying, and sexual attention targeted at faculty members (Lampman et al., 2009). This study surveyed 399 faculty of the University of Alaska (Lampman et al., 2009). Faculty were asked to provide demographic data such as age, gender, minority status, tenure versus nontenure track, years of teaching, and teaching discipline. Additional data gathered concerned faculty experience of student acts of incivility, bullying, and sexual attention. Analysis of results indicated that 99% of male and 96% of female faculty members had been the victim of at least one incidence of student incivility and bullying (Lampman et al., 2009). Although male faculty reported slightly more but insignificant incidences of student incivility and bullying than female faculty, males reported significantly greater levels of sexual attention, and females reported significantly greater negative consequences as well as experienced greater distress because of sexual incidents and incivility/bullying incidents (Lampman et al., 2009). Additional analysis of individual faculty characteristics included tenure status, tenure track, years of experience, and minority status. Contrary to study hypotheses, being a tenured or tenure track faculty predicted higher levels of harassment; it was a stronger predictor for women than men (Lampman et al., 2009). Although the authors found that more women (10.2%) than men

(5.0%) made official reports of incidences of unwanted sexual attention from students, male participants reported more incidences of unwanted sexual attention from students than women participants did. Both men and women participants reported hostile and aggressive student acts bothered them more than acts associated with sexual attention (Lampman et al., 2009). While the study by Lampman et al. (2009) is important to the current study as documentation of student incivility and bullying, the authors reported an impact on the faculty member's decision-making process 10% of faculty reported changing coursework to avoid a harassing student and 7% chose to drop a divisive topic from the course curriculum.

The discussion of contrapower harassment will end with the discussion of three studies examining change in faculty members' behavior, a quantitative study by DeSouza and Vasquez (2011), a mixed quantitative/qualitative study by DeSouza (2011) and lastly a qualitative study by Fontana (2009). DeSouza and Vasquez (2011) researched the frequency of angry or aggressive behavior from their students during the previous year and associated these experiences with the coping strategy of the faculty member. The study reported that 78% of the 367 faculty participants had been the victim of at least one angry or aggressive student during the past year. Racial minority faculty reported a significant effect of more aggressive or angry events than their European-American faculty peers (DeSouza & Vasquez, 2011). In addition, a significant two-way interaction of disability by sexual orientation showed that faculty stigmatized by a disability/non-heterosexual sexual orientation reported significantly more aggressive or angry events than non-stigmatized faculty, defined as non-disabled, heterosexual faculty (DeSouza &

Vasquez, 2011). Regardless of faculty status, faculty reporting at least one act of angry or aggressive behavior directed at them by a student reported developing a dysfunctional coping strategy (DeSouza & Vasquez, 2011). DeSouza and Vasquez (2011) proposed that the dysfunctional coping strategy of a faculty victim of angry and aggressive behavior influences the faculty member to react to these behaviors in an angry manner, which may serve to increase the aggression level involved within the faculty/student interchange. In other words, mirroring the students' act of angry or aggressive behavior served to exacerbate the extent and number of angry or aggressive faculty/student interactions.

DeSouza (2011) completed a study of contrapower harassment in academia. This study reported that 72% of the 184 faculty participants had experienced at least one harassing behavior during the two previous years. Of these participants, the specific types of harassing behaviors included incivility (96%), sexual harassment (31%), and ethnic harassment (21%) (DeSouza, 2011). This study also included qualitative faculty responses. These responses provided information on the types of student's harassing behaviors including, negative end of semester teacher evaluations, occurrences of harassment involving e-mails, voicemail, internet, and listed as the most frequent type of uncivil student behavior, challenging the faculty authority or expertise in the classroom (DeSouza, 2011). Importantly, this study also examined the negative job related outcomes associated with contrapower harassment. Harassed male and female faculty suffered equal negative job-related outcomes (DeSouza, 2011). Both incivility and sexual harassment were associated with increased job dissatisfaction and increased intent to

change jobs. In summary, this study (DeSouza, 2011) served to expand the knowledge of types of harassing behaviors and the impact on harassed faculty.

In a recent study, Lampman (2012) surveyed 524 faculty members from universities throughout the United States. This study reported that 91% of respondents had experienced at least one act of student incivility or bullying, 25% of respondents experienced one sexual behavior from a student, and 1-2% of respondents experienced threatening or violent student behavior (Lampman, 2012). Women, minorities, younger professors with less teaching experience and credentials were more likely to experience incivility/bullying from students (Lampman, 2012). In addition, women were more likely to report all forms of contrapower harassment during their careers (Lampman, 2012).

The final study of contrapower harassment included in this literature review is a qualitative study completed by Fontana (2009). The author designed the study to help understand the experiences of nursing faculty confronting students for acts of academic dishonesty. The study is included in this review and is important to the study of contrapower harassment as the first reported connection between contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty in higher education. The author interviewed twelve faculty members who described their experiences associated with "confronting and reporting students for academic misconduct" (Fontana, 2009, p. 182). The author coded participant responses into three categories: risk, relationships, and responsibility. Concerning the category of risk, participating faculty reported fear of verbal, as well as, physical assault, negative end of semester teacher evaluations, and threats of a lawsuit. One faculty reported a suit filed personally against her and the school for failing a student for

plagiarism, an incident for which she reported made her hesitant to confront future incidents of academic dishonesty for fear of financial ruin (Fontana, 2009). Another study faculty participant mentioned incidence of violence at the University of Arizona in which a student killed three faculty members in retribution for a failing grade (Fontana, 2009). All twelve participants in this study associated significant risks with confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty. The most emotionally painful experience associated with confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty was associated with relationships (Fontana, 2009). Participants reported that the experience of confronting/reporting a student for an act of academic dishonesty not only damaged relationships with the confronted students, but also with other faculty members (Fontana, 2009). Participant faculty members felt that the students had broken bonds of trust between the teacher and student with the result that most of the teachers in the study took steps to distance themselves emotionally from all students (Fontana, 2009). Damage to professional relationships occurred, as the result, of the lack of support from peers with one faculty citing a disagreement concerning the guilt of a student. Moderating the faculty member's desire to avoid future risk and fear of damaged relationships associated with confronting a student with academic dishonesty was the faculty member's responsibility as gatekeeper to the profession of nursing (Fontana, 2009). The fear of damaged reputations caused by student reprisals in the form of negative evaluations, and student defensive behaviors, such as lawsuits and the ensuing damage to their career, as well as, the threat of verbal and physical aggressive behaviors acted to dissuade faculty from confronting and reporting students for future acts of academic dishonesty.

In summary, research has documented the existence of contrapower harassment in higher education. Early studies were limited to contrapower harassment in the form of sexual harassment (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000). These studies reported 47% to 53% of faculty participants had experienced at least one act of sexual harassment by a student (DeSouza& Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000). Several studies included student participants. An early study showed that 63% of students, both male and female reported inflicting at least one behavior of sexual harassment upon a faculty member (Matchen & DeSouza, 2000). Later studies of contrapower sexual harassment documented smaller number of students inflicting sexually aggressive behaviors upon faculty members (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; DeSouza, 2010). DeSouza (2011) suggests the advent of required sexual harassment prevention training on the college campus has helped decrease the incidence of sexual harassment.

Several studies extended earlier research by documenting faculty experiences of student harassment to include not only harassment that is sexual or sexist in nature but also harassment defined as student incivility and bullying (DeSouza, 2011; DeSouza & Vasquez, 2011, Lampman et al., 2009). Student incivility and bullying are the most common form of contrapower harassment, followed by harassment that is sexual in nature (DeSouza, 2011; DeSouza & Vasquez, 2011, Lampman et al., 2009).

In addition, the review of literature included studies that attempted to isolate faculty characteristics that might be predictive of increased student harassment including gender, professional status, ethnicity, disability, and sexual orientation (DeSouza &

Vasquez, 2011; Lampman et al., 2009; Matchen & DeSouza, 2009). In contrast to study hypotheses, the female gender was not associated with increased contrapower harassment with at least one recent study predicting that male faculty members received more sexually related attention from their students (Lampman et al., 2009; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000). Again, in contrast to study hypotheses, several studies reported less harassment of tenured and tenure track faculty in comparison to their lower ranked counterparts (Lampman, 2012). Other studies determined the reverse to be true, that higher ranked tenured and tenure track faculty were more likely to be the victims of student harassment than their lower ranked peers were (Lampman et al., 2009). Other faculty predictors included race, disability status, and sexual orientation (DeSouza& Vasquez, 2011). Of importance to this study, is the idea that harassment of faculty caused faculty to change their plans to decrease the chance of conflict with a harassing student (Lampman et al., 2009) and the harassment experience increased the likelihood that the faculty member developed a dysfunctional coping strategy when communicating with students (DeSouza & Vasquez, 2011). Lastly, a study by Fontana (2009) documented the risk to faculty members associated with contrapower student harassment because of confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty.

Contrapower Harassment and Doctor of Pharmacy Students

Several studies have found that a large percentage of higher education faculty have experienced contrapower harassment (DeSouza & Vasquez, 2011; Lampman, 2010; Lampman et al., 2009). Participants in the existing studies of contrapower harassment represent a large cross section of faculty teaching in a number of disciplines (DeSouza &

Vasquez, 2011; Lampman, 2010; Lampman et al., 2009). No study of contrapower harassment of faculty involved in a doctor of pharmacy curriculum is known to exist. Several studies have reported that academic dishonesty, a form of contrapower harassment (Galbraith & Jones, 2010) is prevalent in schools of pharmacy (Aggarwal et al., 2002; Austin, Collins, Remillard, & Kelcher, 2006; Austin et al., 2005; Rabbi et al., 2006).

The presence of contrapower harassment in pharmacy programs has not been studied, and, as a result, there are no known studies of contrapower harassment in this population. There is an acknowledgement that contrapower harassment is a problem in pharmacy education (Cain, Romanelli, & Smith, 2012; Paik & Broedel-Zaugg, 2006; Singleton-Jackson, et al., 2010). One study examined pharmacy student's knowledge of incivilities, a milder form of contrapower harassment, in the classroom (Paik & Broedel-Zaugg, 2006). Students reported that tardiness was the most incivil behavior followed by cutting class, loud talking in the classroom, rude comments or gestures, cheating, and cell phone or beeper use in the classroom (Paik & Broedel-Zaugg, 2006). The presence of incivilities in the classroom indicates the need of students to express power, conflict concerning seemingly insolvable dilemmas, and the need to obtain the outcome for which they have paid (Feldman, 2001). Student needs listed above combined with student's sense of entitlement contribute to student's aggressive behaviors toward faculty (Cain et al., 2012; Nordstrom et al., 2009). The proposed study will quantify the presence of contrapower harassment within the pharmacy education environment.

Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education

Academic dishonesty is a form of contrapower harassment in which students violate classroom rules set forth by the faculty member (Galbraith & Jones, 2010) and when detected protect themselves by harassing the faculty member and in some instances damaging the faculty member's professional reputation (Fontana, 2009). A large volume of research and literature has been committed to the study of academic dishonesty (Austin et al., 2005; Bowers, 1964; Cole & McCabe, 1996; Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009; Josien & Broderick, 2013; McCabe, 2009; McCabe et al., 2001; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; and others). The most prevalent academic dishonesty research is concerned with how many and how often do students cheat. Secondary to prevalence**,** other areas of study examine student motivations to cheat, the demographics of academically dishonest students, relevant classroom environments, and lastly the response of faculty and higher education organization to the increasing rates of academic dishonesty. This section begins by examining the literature establishing the prevalence of academically dishonest acts. Two important researchers in the area of academic dishonesty are William Bowers and Donald McCabe. The majority of literature reviews begin with a major study of academic dishonesty by William Bowers (1964) followed by a similar later work by Donald McCabe and Lida Trevino (1996). Each of these works represents large multi-campus, multi-variable studies (McCabe & Trevino, 1996). The following review of the prevalence of academic dishonesty also begins with Bowers' (1964) study, followed by McCabe's work and reviews of more recent, usually single college or profession current studies.

Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty

Cheating is not a new phenomenon nor does cheating begin in the university. A series of studies, begun by William Bower in 1964 and replicated in succeeding years, provide a history of the prevalence of academic dishonesty. Bowers (1964) completed the largest early study of academic dishonesty. Over 5,000 student participants returned completed questionnaires. These student participants represented 99 different institutions of higher education. This study reported that as many as 75% of participants engaged in at least one of the study's serious academically dishonest acts (Bowers, 1964). The study isolated a number of behaviors considered serious academic dishonesty. For example, students viewed cheating on an exam as a more serious active act of academic dishonesty than other more passive acts of academic dishonesty (Anitsal, Anitsal, & Elmore, 2011). Bowers (1964) reported that 39% of students had cheated on a test or exam. In addition, the study examined the student's history of cheating behaviors; 64% of students who reported committing an act of academic dishonesty in higher education also cheated in high school (Bowers, 1964). Bower's study is important in its large participant population and multi-organizational design. The study documented that a large number of students (75%) cheated in college while 64% of these students continued cheating behaviors begun in high school and 39% of the study's participants cheated on tests/exams.

Following the large scale, multi-organizational research design used by Bowers (1964), McCabe and Trevino (1993) completed a large survey including 31 academic institutions and 6,000 student participants. In comparison to the earlier Bowers (1964) study, the 1993 study showed that the prevalence of academic dishonesty had increased

by a small amount (McCabe & Trevino, 1993; McCabe et al., 2001). In this study, 82% of student participants reported that they had committed at least one act of serious cheating within the last 15 months, in comparison to the 75% reported by Bowers in 1964 (McCabe & Trevino, 1993; McCabe et al., 2001). Most remarkably, the prevalence of cheating on a test or exam, considered serious cheating, increased from 39% in 1963 to 64% in 1993 (McCabe & Trevino, 1993; McCabe et al., 2001). Even though, the Bowers (1964) study and the McCabe and Trevino (1993) study are similar in design-large multivariable and multi-organizational studies-comparison of data between the two is difficult. Cole and McCabe (1996) discussed the difficulty of making meaningful comparisons of research studies conducted at different times and with different measures of academic misconduct. Over time, studies establishing the prevalence of academic dishonesty have ranged from a low to very high percentage prevalence of student acts of academic dishonesty (Whitley, 1998). The variability relates to a number of issues inherent in measuring academic dishonesty (Cole & McCabe, 1996). To illustrate, McCabe (1990) completed a research study of 6,000 undergraduate participants representing 31 different schools. The survey rendered by McCabe included many of the questions developed by Bowers (1964). Although the two studies may seem similar, the participant sample differed significantly. McCabe included only small to medium size schools that focused on student residency, and were highly selective in admission criteria (Cole & McCabe, 1996). Other recent studies have shown different rates of the prevalence of academic dishonesty dependent upon institutional context (McCabe &Trevino, 1996, 1997). For example, schools with and without honor codes.

McCabe and Trevino (1996, 1997) discovered a significant difference in the prevalence of academic dishonesty between schools with an honor code and schools without an honor code. Students surveyed during the 1990-1991 school year reported 47% of the participants at schools without an honor code had cheated on a test versus 24% of students at schools with an honor code (McCabe et al., 2001). Interestingly, this difference begins to erode as evidenced by the survey administered to students during the 1995-1996 school years (McCabe et al., 2001). In this study, 45% of students at schools without an honor code responded they had cheated on a test whereas 30% of the students from schools with honor codes responded they had cheated on a test. Generally, the presence of an honor code signals lower prevalence rates of academic dishonesty (McCabe & Trevino, 1993).

Several studies have established different prevalence rates of academic dishonesty based on discipline. For example, 72% of undergraduate nursing students reported engaging in at least one of 16 academically dishonest behaviors at least once compared to 69% of undergraduate non-nursing students (McCabe, 2009). Variability in the delivery of a curriculum within the same discipline may also affect the rate of academic dishonesty. For example, nursing students enrolled in an accelerated nursing program reported an academic dishonesty rate of 77% versus traditional nursing program students of 58% (McCabe, 2009). Engineering, 82% (Cole &McCabe, 1996), business, 92% (Jones, 2011), management, 100%, (Brown, Weible, & Olmosk, 2010) and pharmacy, 90% (Austin et al., 2005) showed higher rates of cheating. In general, more academic, intellectual disciplines such as literature and anthropology, report lower percentages of

academic dishonesty than more vocationally related disciplines (Bowers, 1964; Harp & Taietz, 1966; Harding et al., 2004).

In summary, student self-reported levels of academically dishonest acts have increased, and the number of college students engaging in academically dishonest behaviors continues to grow (McCabe et al., 2001). Today, depending on the institution and field of study, 50%-100% of students report engaging in at least one act of academic dishonesty (McCabe, 2009; Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009). The prevalence of academically dishonest acts moderates by institutional contexts including the presence of an honor code or the discipline studied.

Academic Dishonesty, Individual Student Differences, and Contextual Factors

A significant portion of the academic dishonesty research and literature focuses on individual student and contextual factors. The preponderance of these studies have focused on factors personal to each student with the intent of developing a profile of the student consistent with increased levels of academically dishonest behaviors (Eastman, Iyer, & Eastman, 2006; McCabe & Trevino, 1996, 1997). Other studies have focused on developing a profile of different academic settings providing distinct impetus for higher or lower levels of academically dishonest behaviors (Hughes & McCabe, 2006; Jordan, 2001; McCabe & Bowers, 1994; McCabe & Trevino, 1996, 1997; McCabe & Bowers, 2009; Pino & Smith, 2003; Simkin & McLeod, 2009; Williams & Janosik, 2007). The ensuing sections first outline studies devoted to developing a profile of individual student differences, followed by studies devoted to developing a profile of contextual factors, and

ending with a summary of the relevant strength of each to identify the propensity to commit academically dishonest behaviors.

Individual Student Differences. This section focuses on studies completed with the intent to develop a personal profile of the academically dishonest student. Generally, the comparisons of these studies show inconsistent results (Jordan, 2001). Student demographics including gender, age, grade point average, and sorority/fraternity membership have all led to somewhat tenuous results and may be in direct contradiction to other similar studies.

Gender. The literature concerning gender as a factor affecting the student's propensity to commit academic dishonesty presents interesting yet conflicting findings. Studies prior to 1972 on academic dishonesty confirmed that male students engaged in cheating behaviors more than female students (Nash, 1977). Studies of academic dishonesty and gender completed after 1972 have shown mixed results (Crown & Spiller, 1998; Klein et al., 2006). Gender based differences, more males than females reporting cheating, continued to be significant in studies completed prior to 1982 (Crown & Spiller, 1998; Klein et al., 2006). After 1982, the preponderance of studies reversed earlier findings showing little if any difference in rates of cheating between male and female students (Crown & Spiller, 1998; Klein et al., 2006). Recent studies continue to support the erosion of gender differences in academically dishonest behaviors (McCabe, 2008; McCabe & Bowers, 2009). McCabe and Bowers (2009) reported that males and females reported cheating at approximately the same rate. Although male and female students may admit to cheating at the same rate, one study showed a gender difference in the

frequency of cheating. Male students reported cheating significantly more than their female counterparts did (McCabe & Bowers, 2009). In other words, this study suggested that the percentage of male and female students admitting to cheating is approximately the same, but male students who reported cheating tend to cheat much more frequently than female students who reported cheating (McCabe & Bowers, 2009).

Later studies support the erosion of gender differences as female students report greater levels of cheating. For example, McCabe and Bowers (2009) found that the percentage of male students who cheat has remained comparatively stable, reported as 69% in 1963 to 70% in 1993. In contrast, the percentage of female students who cheat has increased from 59% in 1963 to 70% in 1993 (McCabe & Bowers, 2009). Some authors suggest that the erosion of gender difference in the rate of academic dishonesty may mimic the concurrent erosion of the differences in gender role between male and female students as more female students enter traditionally male academic programs (McCabe & Trevino, 1996; Pino & Smith, 2003).

Age. Several studies have examined age as a predictor of student's academically dishonest behavior (Anton & Michael, 1983; Haines et al., 1986; Josien & Broderick, 2013; Jordan, 2001; McCabe et al., 2001; Nazir et al., 2011; Vowell & Chen, 2004). Each of these studies pointed out limitations to the study of age of college students as a predictor of academic dishonesty. The first limitation present in these studies is the narrow age range of study participants. The traditional age range of university students is limited to a five or six year difference (McCabe et al., 2001; Vowell & Chen, 2004). Older nontraditional students represent small percentages of the participant population

(McCabe et al., 2001; Nazir et al., 2011). For example, Nazir et al. (2011) had only one student participant in excess of 25 years of age. Next, differences present between one age and another may relate equally to the students rank in school (McCabe et al., 2001). For example, a freshman student age 19 may exhibit the same behaviors as a freshman student age 24. The results indicate tenuous results for age as a predictor of academic dishonesty. Several studies report that younger students admit to cheating at greater rates (Anton & Michael, 1983; Haines et al., 1986; Jordan, 2001; McCabe et al., 2001; Vowell & Chen, 2004). One study reported an inverted relationship between grade level and age (Vowell & Chen, 2004). Younger students and students at higher-grade levels reported greater levels of cheating suggesting that given the grade level that younger less mature students were more likely to cheat than older more mature students (Vowell & Chen, 2004). In contrast, one study reported that older students reported cheating more than younger students (Tang & Zuo, 1997) did.

The following studies suggest the mixed results of both student age and class standing. Pino and Smith (2003) found contradictory results concerning student age and class standing. In this study, younger students were less likely to cheat while the upper class level students were more likely to cheat (Pino & Smith, 2003). Nazir et al. (2011) found no difference by age level of students' intentions to cheat while finding that upper classmen expressed lesser intentions to cheat than younger classmen. A recent study showed that students closer to completing their undergraduate degree cheated more than freshman students (Josien & Broderick, 2013) did. This study illustrates the reality that over the students' years of college, upper class students have had more opportunities to

cheat than lower class students have (Josien & Broderick, 2013). In summary, the literature review concerning the age of students and their classification status as a predictor of academically dishonest behaviors is inconsistent.

Grade Point Average. Some studies suggest student grade point average (GPA) is a predictor of student academic dishonesty. Crown and Spiller (1998) examined 14 studies of GPA and academic dishonesty. The majority of the 14 studies found that students with a lower GPA committed more academically dishonest behaviors than students with a higher GPA (Crown & Spiller, 1998). Recent studies confirmed these findings, low GPA students had less at stake than high GPA students had and more to gain and were more likely to commit academically dishonest behaviors (McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Nazir et al., 2011; Pino & Smith, 2003; Straw, 2002). Similar to other predictors of academically dishonest behaviors, GPA has been found to provide conflicting results as a predictor of academic dishonesty. For example, one study found that students with a low GPA were more likely to cheat as a way of preventing course failure (Bunn, Caudill, & Gropper, 1992). One other study found that students with a high GPA cheated to remain academically competitive with other high GPA students (McCabe & Trevino, 1996). Hardigan (2004) found that students with higher GPAs held more conservative attitudes toward cheating and generally, students showed less likelihood to cheat as GPA increased.

Contextual Factors. The following research studied differences in academic settings, which provide distinct impetus for students to display higher or lower levels of academically dishonest behaviors. These factors are contextual factors also known as

situational factors (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). The contextual factors presented here include sorority/fraternity membership, the level of peers' academically dishonest behaviors, peer acceptance of academically dishonest behaviors, and the student's perception of the severity of the punishments for academic dishonesty.

Sorority/Fraternity Membership. Several studies reported a relationship between social factors and students' academically dishonest behaviors. These factors are described as "highly cohesive extracurricular activities" (McKendall, Klein, Levenburg, & de la Rosa, 2010, p. 15). Highly cohesive extracurricular activities, such as athletics, sorority, and fraternity membership, correlate with significantly higher levels of academic dishonesty (McCabe & Bowers, 1994; McCabe & Trevino, 1996, 1997; McCabe & Bowers, 2009; Pino & Smith, 2003; Williams & Janosik, 2007). In a comparison of fraternity and nonfraternity members, 84% of the fraternity members versus 67% of nonfraternity members admitted to cheating on a test (McCabe & Bowers, 2009). Increased levels of cheating by fraternity and sorority members may be the result of these organizations attracting students with histories of cheating. A study of women sorority members showed that incoming women students with an interest in sorority admitted the highest rates of academic dishonesty (Williams & Janosik, 2007). This high level of pre-sorority cheating supports other findings concerning students who express interest in joining a sorority/fraternity also enter the university with a history of increased levels of cheating experience (McCabe, 1999). It has been suggested that the high rate of academically dishonest behaviors of sorority and fraternity members, as well as, new students with an interest in membership represent students engaged in high rates of

extracurricular activities devoting little time to academic pursuits (Christensen & McCabe, 2006; Pino & Smith, 2003; Williams & Janosik, 2007). One study related the activity of sorority and fraternity membership as a time consuming activity similar to watching television suggesting that engaging in time-consuming activities outside the realm of academic pursuits increases the likelihood that the student will not have time to complete their academic responsibilities and, as a result, will engage in academically dishonest behaviors (Pino & Smith, 2003).

Peer Level, Acceptance, and Exposure to Academically Dishonest Behaviors. Several studies have focused on the environment of the university including the impact of the level of cheating, acceptance of cheating behaviors, and student exposure to other students cheating (Hughes & McCabe, 2006a, 2006b; Jordan, 2001; Simkin & McLeod, 2009). These studies suggest that the perception of student peer cheating behaviors influences the student's own cheating behaviors by providing a cultural norm of inappropriate behavior and providing an impetus to the honest student to cheat to remain competitive (Hughes & McCabe, 2006a, 2006b; McCabe & Trevino, 1993). The decision to cheat is motivated by the university's increased level of overall cheating and the student's history of exposure to other students cheating (Hughes & McCabe, 2006a, 2006b; Jordan, 2001; Simkin & McLeod, 2009). Jordan (2001) described the role of level and exposure, "The more cheating a cheater sees and the more cheating a cheater believes peers are doing, the more cheating acts the cheater commits (p. 242)." The combination of a high level of cheating, student exposure to peers cheating, and a low risk of being

caught and persecuted contribute to a university culture in which academic dishonesty becomes the norm (Hughes & McCabe, 2006; Jordan, 2001; Simkin & McLeod, 2009).

Students' Perception of Severity of Punishment for Academic Dishonesty.

Similar to other contextual factors, studies of the severity and fear of punishment have produced inconsistent results. McCabe and Trevino (1993) reported that the fear of the severity of punishment for cheating reduced the likelihood of cheating. Two later studies suggested the fear of punishment does not dissuade students from committing academically dishonest behaviors (McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Simkin & McLeod, 2010). The inconsistent results may relate to the size of the colleges studied. Students at smaller universities may have greater knowledge of punishment for acts of academic dishonesty (McCabe &Trevino, 1993, 1997). Additionally, less than 1% of students are ever detected and prosecuted through the university's academic dishonesty process even though a very large percentage of students self-report academically dishonest behaviors and aware that other students cheat (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2008; McCabe et al., 2001). The contrast in the very high rates of cheating compared to the very low rates of detection and prosecution for academically dishonest behaviors may weaken the power of severe penalties to lesson academically dishonest behaviors (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2008; McCabe et al., 2001).

Higher Education's Response to Increased Rates of Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty undermines the primary purpose of higher education, that is to facilitate learning, and serves to thwart the relationship between assessment and learning (DiBartolo &Walsh, 2010; Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009; Kramer et al.,

2011). Universities utilize assessments as a tool to measure the success of learning and as a tool to direct and amend the delivery of instruction to foster its goals (Johnson, 2008; Kramer et al., 2011; Vonderwell et al., 2007). Assessments as diverse as traditional pen and paper tests, online evaluations, and the application of knowledge revealed in unsupervised projects yield valuable insights into the student's learning. Assessments serve as an essential element of the process of improving the curriculum and substantiate the schools' ultimate goal of achieving the desired learning outcomes (Johnson, 2008; Kramer et al., 2011; Vonderwell et al., 2007). Academic dishonesty disrupts this process to the extent that society's faith in the degree awarded by institutions of higher education no longer conveys the promise of achievement once believed (Happel & Jennings, 2008).

The number of college students engaging in academically dishonest behaviors continues to grow (McCabe et al., 2001). Today, depending on the institution and field of study, 50%-85% of students report engaging in at least one act of academic dishonesty (Hollinger& Lanza-Kaduce, 2009; McCabe, 2009). This growth in the frequency of academic dishonesty parallels the growth of technology in the classroom; technology now provides an even broader array of potential academically dishonest behaviors that a student may now engage (Jones, 2011, McCabe, 2009).

Technological advancements in higher education provide interesting challenges to universities attempting to control academic dishonesty. Legislation regulating institutions of higher education requires universities to make efforts to control student's chances to cheat (S. 250--111th Congress, 2009). The advent of technologically advanced online classrooms has been tagged as a rich environment for cheating and is generally believed

to include a larger rate of cheating behaviors than the traditional classroom (Hancock, 2011; Ravasco, 2012; Watson & Sottile, 2010). Despite these beliefs, there is evidence accumulating to determine the environment where most cheating occurs, but the evidence is mounting that both online and face-to-face classrooms have similar rates of cheating (Stuber-McEwen, Wisel, & Hoggatt, 2009; Watson & Sottile, 2010).

Generally, technology makes it easier for students, online or in the traditional classroom, to cheat (Boehm, Justice, & Weeks, 2009; McGee, 2013). Cheating using technology is similar to nontechnology methods of cheating (McGee, 2013). Categories of cheating proposed by Gallant (2008) hold true for technological/nontechnological cheating (McGee, 2013). The five categories include plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, misrepresentation and misbehaviors (Gallant, 2008). Two examples of cheating greatly facilitated by technology are plagiarism and misrepresentation. Plagiarism is predominant in either environment, whereas misrepresentation is an identified concern for the online classroom.

Plagiarism is a form of academic dishonesty using material copied from other sources without appropriate documentation (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009). This form of academic dishonesty existed long before the advent of technology in the classroom. The internet and computer technology make it easier for a dishonest student to plagiarize an entire assignment or pieces of an assignment. The student searches for a topic on the internet and then cuts and pastes from the original document to a new document that they represent as their own without proper documentation. New software, for example, Turnitin™ and Grammarly™, has been developed to help faculty detect

student plagiarism (Grammarly™, 2014; Turnitin™, 2014). Misrepresentation is a concern for the online classroom. In this environment, it is easy for the dishonest student to commission others to complete course work. Similar to other forms of academic dishonesty, plagiarism and dishonesty represent coursework not experienced or mastered by the dishonest student (Johnson, 2008; Kramer et al., 2011; Vonderwell et al., 2007). In addition to research examining differences in rates of academic dishonesty in the online or traditional classroom, researchers have established differences in the rate of academic dishonesty associated with the type of educational program.

The frequency rate at which students cheat varies with the type of educational program, for example, students enrolled in vocationally oriented educational programs self-report higher rates of cheating than students who enroll in intellectually oriented educational programs (Harding et al., 2004; Harp & Taietz, 1966). Several studies have shown a significant relationship between college cheating behavior and a willingness to violate the rules later in professional careers (Harding et al., 2007; Lovett-Hooper et al., 2007; Nonis & Swift, 2001). The concept that an academically dishonest student will commit an act of dishonesty in their professional roles as, for example, a nurse, doctor, or engineer, makes it even more important to detect, prosecute, and remove or re-train the academically dishonest student.

Universities have reacted to the increasing incidents of academic dishonesty by stepping up efforts to detect academic dishonesty and employ traditional confrontational punitive methods to prosecute cheaters (Gallant & Drinan, 2006; Lowery & Dannells, 2004). These efforts have not reduced the frequency of student acts of academic

dishonesty. As stated above, the number of students who have committed at least one act of academic dishonesty continues to rise while the number of students confronted with academic dishonesty remains at 1% (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2008; McCabe et al., 2001).

Academic Dishonesty and Doctor of Pharmacy Students

The prevalence of academic dishonesty of doctor of pharmacy students has not been well studied (Aggarwal et al., 2002; Austin et al., 2006; Austin et al., 2005; Rabbi et al., 2006). Several studies have documented that academic dishonesty is a problem in pharmacy education (Aggarwal et al., 2002; Austin et al., 2006; Austin et al., 2005; Rabbi et al., 2006). These studies report the prevalence of cheating in pharmacy school at 74% to 90% (Aggarwal et al., 2002; Austin et al., 2005; Rabbi et al., 2006). Additionally, 90% of pharmacy students believe their student peers cheat but do not believe that cheating is a problem at their school or other schools of pharmacy (Whitley & Starr, 2010). One study found that not only did 90% of students self-reported cheating, but 90% of pharmacy faculty self-reported cheating during their time as a pharmacy student (Austin et al., 2005). Faculty members reported that they cheated while in pharmacy school and committed an average of 3.31 of the academically dishonest behaviors described by the study while at pharmacy student (Austin et al., 2005). These results indicate that new generations of pharmacy students who cheated in pharmacy school are now faculty members in a position to detect and prosecute pharmacy students for acts of academic dishonesty (Austin et al., 2005). Additionally, pharmacy students honestly believed that

engaging in acts of academic dishonesty were a part of the institutional culture of their pharmacy school (NG, Davies, Bates, & Avellone, 2003).

Theoretical Support

The related problems of contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty (Galbraith & Jones, 2010) present a critical problem to universities to which no one solution or methodology will suffice (Bowers, 2011). Initially, universities served as the pinnacle of moral principles, a place where faculty and students worked together to advance these values and distribute truth (Habermas & Blazek, 1984). Today, the strife between student and teacher caused by contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty has become the accepted norm (DeSouza & Vasquez, 2011; Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009; McCabe, 2009; Lampman, 2010; Lampman et al., 2009).

As suggested earlier in this paper, the university has evolved a culture in which students are treated, seen, as well as, regarded as customers of the university (Cain et al., 2012; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Naidoo et al., 2011; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2011). As consumers, students feel that the university and the faculty owe them a degree for which they are paying. The attitude of academic entitlement describes this belief that students deserve high academic marks and the educational outcome of a degree without investing significant time or effort into the process (Cain et al., 2012; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Naidoo et al., 2011; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2011). In this organizational environment, faculty are primarily responsible for the learning process and students become passive learners waiting for faculty to provide knowledge (Baer & Cheryomukhin, 2011; Chowning & Campbell, 2009; Dubovsky, 1986; Greenberger et al.,

2008; Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010). Each faculty member is solely responsible for student success in the classroom while student failure incites students to confront offending faculty members (Dubovsky, 2006).

Fontana (2009) focused on understanding faculty experiences when student success and the twin beliefs of consumerism and academic entitlement have been thwarted. The author recorded the experiences of nursing faculty in the university process of confronting and reporting nursing students for acts of academic dishonesty (Fontana, 2009). Results indicated that study participants described a perception of increased personal and professional danger associated with the act of confronting and/or reporting acts of academic dishonesty (Fontana, 2009). In reaction, as suggested by Dubovsky (2006), students threatened, belittled, and even sued the offending faculty member (Fontana, 2009). Some faculty participants' fear was so great that they reported no longer willing to confront a student for an act of academic dishonesty and some faculty left academia altogether (Fontana, 2009). These faculty descriptions suggest an environment in which faculty are at risk and in which the organization requires a change to improve.

In order to be effective, this study adopted three theoretical viewpoints, critical systems theory, emancipatory theory, and organizational theory. The study by Fontana (2009) and as extended by the research described in this paper was grounded in the critical systems theories of Habermas and emancipatory theory of Freire and suggests the need to adopt multiple approaches to the solution of contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty to reduce the distress that 96% of faculty have experienced (Fontana, 2009; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009). Taken together, critical systems

and emancipatory theories support the change of organizational policies which are not successful in achieving the stated outcomes and which have the impact of harming members of the organization. The increasing prevalence of academic dishonesty (McCabe, 2009; Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009) and contrapower harassment (DeSouza, 2011; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009) supports the idea that organizational strategies designed to curb incidences of academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment have little or no effect (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2008; McCabe et al., 2001).

Gallant and Drinan (2006b), building on the concept of organizational change, suggest applying the theoretical concept of organizational theory to the problem of academic dishonesty. The authors propose organizational theory as moving away from "piecemeal efforts" (p. 840) designed to combat individual acts of academic dishonesty and focus on the integration of the academic integrity as a core concept of the organization (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Gallant & Drinan, 2006(b). Central to this process is the understanding of the problem and its impact of the organization and the organization's constituency with the ultimate goal of helping the organization move from theory to effective strategy (Gallant & Drinan, 2006(b).

The remainder of the Theoretical Support Section will discuss each of the theories used to support this study. The following section begins with a discussion of the twin concepts of critical systems and emancipatory theories followed by a discussion of organizational theory's application to higher education.

Critical Systems/Emancipatory Theory

The study described in this paper is grounded in the critical systems theories of Habermas (Habermas & Blazek, 1987) and emancipatory theory of Freire (1996). Fontana (2009) suggests the need to adopt multiple approaches to the solution of contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty to reduce the distress that 96% of faculty have experienced. Together critical systems theory and emancipatory theory provides a paradigm to support the understanding of research designed to understand complex social problems similar to the pervasive problems of academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment present in institutions of higher education (Bowers, 2011; Habermas & Blazek, 1996; Jackson, 2010; Ledwith, 2007; Murthy, 2000; Watson & Watson, 2011). First, critical systems theory is discussed.

Critical system theory focuses on humans' development of facts with the realization that facts are a social construction and as such are alterable by humans (Bowers, 2011; Jackson, 2009; Ledwith, 2007; Murthy, 2000; Watson & Watson, 2011). The alterability of facts results from the concept that facts are not impartial and independent but constructed by humans to benefit the interests of one societal group over another societal group (Bowers, 2011; Jackson, 2009; Ledwith, 2007; Murthy, 2000; Watson & Watson, 2011). Critical theory proposes conflicting interests should be studied, and the power relations supporting these conflict be examined to determine their origin (Habermas & Blazek, 1996; Ledwith, 2007). Ledwith (2007) proposes that critical theory is "any practice that has a transformative social justice intention, and which happens in a range of contexts from grassroots activism to more institutionalized setting, such as

hospitals or schools (p. 597).” The application of critical practice theory to the societal problems of contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty proposes that the solution to these problems requires understanding the problem’s facts exist at the root of conflict between groups within the university, and difficult to extinguish due to the power relationships existing within the organization. The goal of critical systems theory is to promote research, which is not limited to defining and describing problems, but exists to provide tools designed to resolve problems and ultimately achieves the goal of emancipatory theory, the emancipation of those members of the organization caught in the conflict (Bowers, 2011; Ledwith, 2007; Murthy, 2000).

In summary, the university problems of contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty are complex social problems. The reaction of the university has been to develop policies geared toward the punishment of the individual student responsible for the prohibited act. The result of these policies is that the rates of academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment continue to increase. Emancipatory and critical systems theories provide a model in which the university moves away from piecemeal efforts to control symptoms of academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment and toward a focus on the relationships between the clashing members and the dynamics of the organization responsible for the destructive interaction. Emancipatory theory as described by Ledwith (2007) “seeks to identify and change the root sources of oppression (p. 599)” with the intent to transform the oppressive reality of the organization and liberate the oppressed (Bowers, 2011; Freire, 1996). Critical systems theory provides a framework for the organization to move away from policies geared toward the individual act of academic

dishonesty to a focus on the organization (Bowers, 2011; Ledwith, 2007; Murthy, 2000). Collectively, emancipatory and critical systems theory provides a focus on the oppression of the members interacting with the university organization while providing a model for the university to research the complex social problems of academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment and institute system wide changes that have the ability to implement effective change.

Organizational Theory

Addressing student problems such as academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment, universities have focused on students as the root of the problem (Gallant & Drinan, 2006 a, 2006 b). The result is the institutionalization of a number of policies designed to change the behavior of the student. These policies include the implementation of honor codes/academic integrity policies and increases in the severity of penalties for acts of academic dishonesty (Gallant & Drinan, 2006 a; McCabe & Pavela, 2005; McCabe et al., 2011). These policies, as witnessed by the increasing rates of contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty, have not resulted in changing student behaviors (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2008; McCabe et al., 2001). The failures of these policies relate to a number of fundamental issues that organizations must address including:

- Inadequate support for academic policies and procedures.
- Inequitable systems to adjudicate suspected violations of policy.
- Few programs that promote academic integrity among all segments of the campus community.

- Lack of awareness of new educational trends affecting academic in integrity on campuses.
- Little guidance about how the implementation of a new technology provides new methods of cheating.
- No regular assessment of the effectiveness of policies and procedures to encourage academic integrity (McCabe & Drinan, 1999, p. 3).

These fundamental organizational issues weaken the implementation of penalties designed to reduce deviant behavior with the result that most faculty express reluctance to address issues of academic dishonesty (Keith-Seigel et al., 1998; McCabe & Drinan, 1999; Simon et al., 2003; Staats, Hupp, Wallace, & Gresley, 2009). Research shows less than 1 % of students experience prosecution for academic dishonesty despite the very high rates of academic dishonesty (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2008; McCabe et al., 2011). Similarly, faculty victims of contrapower harassment face significant consequences related to addressing issues of contrapower harassment including appearing weak, not being in control of the classroom environment, inadequately handling the faculty/student relationship and compromising their career (DeSouza, 2011; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009).

Applying organizational theories to the problems of the university suggest moving away from the focus on individual acts of academic dishonesty and students who commit these acts to a focus on organization-wide change and academic integrity (Gallant & Drinan, 2006a, 2006b). Suggested by organizational theory, the new focus of the university is on the integration of academic integrity as a core concept of the organization

(Bolman & Deal, 1997; Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Central to this process is the understanding of the problem and its impact of the organization and the organization's constituency with the ultimate goal of helping the organization move from theory to effective strategy (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Gallant and Drinan (2006b) suggest the implementation of six strategies brought together from Bolman and Deal (1997) and Huntington (1968) to reinforce the university's move to strategies designed to increase academic integrity and decrease the unintentional damage to faculty and students caused by ineffective policies.

Recognize cheating as corruption. This strategy understands that cheating is not simply misbehavior but threatens the core values and mission of the university (DiBartolo &Walsh, 2010; Gallant & Drinan, 2006b; Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009; Kramer et al., 2011).

Embrace vulnerability. This strategy focuses on the university administration's need to focus on the problem of cheating. Focusing on a negative situation places administrative official in a position of vulnerability but is necessary to build a sense of urgency necessary to move the university toward change (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b).

Highlighting expectations and mutual interests. Universities' history of ignoring the problem of academic integrity builds an environment in which both students and faculty develop low expectations for change. This strategy suggests communication of a new vision of academic integrity followed by comprehensive system-wide strategies exceeding a singular focus on students' academic integrity to the integrity of the organization (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Gallant & Drinan, 1996).

Thinking nationally, acting locally. This strategy suggests that the solution to academic integrity requires a national as well as an organizational wide focus (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Gallant & Drinan, 1996). The organization along with those organizations interested in the success of education including political entities, accrediting bodies and national associations should work together to develop an environment in which the continued success of the university is dependent on developing an environment of academic integrity (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Gallant & Drinan, 2006).

Building the presidential platform. Bolman and Deal (1997) suggest university presidents, impassioned by the concept of academic integrity, accept the personal risk associated with focusing upon the institution's history of corruption in order to move the university to embrace system-wide change and a new focus on academic integrity.

Avoiding blind alleys. Bolman and Deal (1997) discuss university policies concerning academic integrity, honor codes, and culture that have not led to a reduction of the problems they were designed to control. Honor codes are not sufficient to create a culture of academic integrity (Bolman & Deal, 1997). To reinforce the effect of the honor code, universities need to implement a university wide focus on developing a culture of academic integrity (Gallant & Drinan, 2006). The concept that an organization as large as the university can easily adopt a new culture provides a blind alley (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Gallant & Drinan, 2006a). The university culture is resistant to change, and not all of the university members are equally committed to achieving necessary changes to restore academic integrity (Gallant & Drinan, 2006).

In summary, organizational theory proposes the problems of contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty plaguing higher education are complex multilevel problems requiring system-wide changes to correct (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Gallant & Drinan, 2006a, 2006b); McCabe & Drinan, 1999). Historically, universities have adopted a piecemeal approach to solve these problems by instituting severe penalties for students committing deviant behaviors and/or the implementation of honor codes (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Gallant & Drinan, 2006a, 2006b; McCabe & Drinan, 1999). As witnessed by the increasing prevalence of harassment of faculty by students and acts of academic dishonesty these policies have been ineffective (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2008; McCabe et al., 2001).

The failure of university policies aimed at curbing incidences of contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty is the result of problems within the organization. First, faculty members hold primary responsibility enforcing actions against student academic dishonesty yet very few faculty process students for academic misconduct (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2008; McCabe et al., 2001). This failure is caused by the reluctance of faculty to enforce policies harmful to them (Fontana, 2009; Keith-Seigel et al., 1998; McCabe & Drinan, 1999; Simon et al., 2003; Staats et al., 2009). Second, the university has developed a culture in which student's believe cheating is necessary to succeed and be competitive and is culturally approved in the university setting (Keith-Seigel et al., 1998; McCabe & Drinan, 1999; NG et al., 2003; Simon et al., 2003; Staats et al., 2009). Lastly, the university's administration is not committed to focusing on the negative attributes of academic dishonesty and contrapower

harassment and the vulnerability brought about by the fallout from making the problems known (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Gallant & Drinan, 2006a, 2006b; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2008; McCabe & Drinan, 1999; McCabe et al., 2001). Organizational theory provides a framework to move the university toward a culture of academic integrity.

Academic Dishonesty, Contrapower Harassment, and the Quantitative Method

The preponderance of research of academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment utilizes the quantitative method. The major studies of academic dishonesty presented in this literature review utilize the quantitative method (Bowers, 1964; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; McCabe et al., 2001). Similarly, the large published studies of contrapower harassment utilize a quantitative methodology (DeSouza, 2010; DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; DeSouza & Vasquez, 2011; Grauerholz, 1989; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009). In contrast, Fontana (2009) utilized a qualitative method to help understand the experience of faculty confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty.

The current proposed study utilizes a quantitative methodology similar to the major studies of academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment. In addition, the study will help to quantify the results of the Fontana (2009) study linking the experience of confronting a student for academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment. In contrast to prior studies, the participant population of this study consists of faculty teaching in a single discipline, the Doctor of Pharmacy curriculum. To date, there is no known study published of pharmacy faculty and contrapower harassment. Similar to the large studies

of contrapower harassment by Lampman (2012), Lampman et al. (2009) and DeSouza & Vasquez (2011), this study will use an internet survey to collect data. Internet surveys include a number of advantages over traditional pen and paper surveys (Lumsden & Morgan, 2005). In comparison to pen and paper surveys, internet surveys provide faster and more reliable delivery of the survey to the participant, participant responses are returned more quickly, and data collection can be fully automated (Lumsden &Morgan, 2005). Research shows that a cross-sectional survey designed as an anonymous online survey may increase participants' willingness to disclose sensitive information (Cook, 2011). The design and anonymous delivery of online surveys increases participants' honesty and promotes honesty of participants greater than the traditional pen and paper questionnaire (Cook, 2011). Internet delivery of surveys provides greater levels of anonymity particularly important when addressing sensitive subjects such as the harassment of a faculty member by a student (Cook, 2011).

Summary

In summary, the preceding review of literature of the major studies of contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty in higher education report that both problems are growing in prevalence and constitute a serious problem for the university and the university's faculty. Academic dishonesty is a problem that has been studied extensively for many years, whereas contrapower harassment is a relatively new concept introduced by Benson in 1984. Studies of academic dishonesty have been focused on building a profile of the academically dishonest student. Generally, these studies produce inconsistent results. The profile developed by these studies provides a snapshot of the

academically dishonest student described as more likely; to be male, although this seems to be changing, a member of a fraternity or engages in a number of activities limiting the amount of time devoted to academia and both younger and classified as a lower classman (freshman), although this too seems to be changing. Studies focused on developing a profile of the student most likely to harass a faculty member are focused on gender. Similar to academic dishonesty men may be more likely to harass a faculty member but, these results are largely inconsistent. Regardless of gender, the harassment of faculty and academic dishonesty constitute a serious problem for the university and one in which faculty are at risk.

Faculty are primarily responsible for detecting and processing academically dishonest students with the result that faculty members are frequent victims of harassment perpetrated by students desperate to avoid charges of academic dishonesty (Fontana, 2009). Some studies have delved to build a profile of a faculty most likely to be harassed. Although somewhat inconsistent, students are more likely to harass a faculty member of either gender, but leaning slightly toward males who are tenure track/tenured, faculty members of color, or stigmatized by a disability or sexual orientation (DeSouza & Vasquez, 2011).

The studies of contrapower harassment presented in this literature review included participants teaching across disciplines and teaching on several different campuses within the United States. The study described in this paper fills a gap in the literature by focusing on faculty teaching in a doctor of pharmacy program in the United States. Currently, there has been no study of contrapower harassment of faculty teaching in

doctor of pharmacy programs. This study also extended a previous qualitative study reporting a relationship between contrapower harassment and a faculty member's experience of confronting a student with charges of academic dishonesty. The study utilized a survey designed by Lampman et al. (2009). It is proposed that the study described in this paper, which is focused on examining contrapower harassment in pharmacy education, will show results similar to a study by Lampman (2012).

Chapter 3: Methodology provides a rationale and description of the research design utilized in this study. Briefly, this description includes identification of the pharmacy faculty target population chosen for this study, a description of the method to collect data from participants, and an extensive review of the study's independent and dependent variables. Following this review, Chapter 3 will wrap-up with a discussion of statistical tests used to analyze the data.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this quantitative nonexperimental study is to examine the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment in a group of faculty employed in pharmacy education. Additionally, the study will examine how individual faculty variables of the gender, racial or ethnic minority group status, the absence or presence of a terminal degree, tenure status, teaching experience, and history of accusing students of acts of academic dishonesty predict the experience of contrapower harassment. The balance of this chapter centers on research design and rationale, methodology, threats to validity, and a summary of the chapter.

Research Design and Rationale

This quantitative nonexperimental study collects data concerning the prevalence of contrapower harassment experienced by faculty teaching in schools of pharmacy located in the United States. The study uses a survey of contrapower harassment developed by Lampman et al. (2009) designed to examine the prevalence of disrespectful, hostile, or student behaviors of a sexual nature. As discussed below, the survey consists of 75 questions. Despite the survey's length and the risk of the length of the survey preventing participant completion, use of this survey in its original form allows comparison between the pharmacy faculty surveyed in this research and earlier research of faculty teaching in many different disciplines, specifically the University of Alaska (Lampman et al., 2009), and in a survey of universities throughout the United States (Lampman, 2012). The survey includes the addition of one question. This question

documents faculty participants' history of confronting students with charges of academic dishonesty.

This study utilized MANOVA and multiple regression. Hypothesis 1: The dependent variables used in performance of the MANOVA include the frequency of contrapower student harassment reported by men and women faculty as measured by dependent variables of (a) rate of incivility/bullying from students, (b) rate of sexual attention from students, (c) rate of negative consequences associated with student incivility/bullying, and (d) rate of distress related to harassing student behaviors. The independent, grouping variables are gender (male and female). Hypotheses 2 utilized two multiple regression analyses to predict the dependent criterion scores of incivility/bullying (hypothesis 2a) and sexual attention (hypothesis 2b) associated with the predictor (independent) variables of faculty characteristics, (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience. Hypothesis 3 utilized multiple regression to determine how well the independent predictor faculty characteristics of (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience predict the dependent criterion score of negative consequences associated with contrapower harassment. Hypothesis 4 utilized a MANOVA. The dependent criterion variables are student incivility/bullying, sexual attention and negative consequences scales and the history of confronting a student for academic dishonesty (yes/no) the independent grouping variable.

Multiple regression and MANOVA rely on specific assumptions concerning the variables used in analysis. Multiple regression assumes four nonrobust assumptions specifically linearity, reliability of measurement, homoscedasticity, and normality (Osborn & Waters, 2002). Similarly, MANOVA relies on specific assumptions concerning the variable used in analysis specifically normal distribution (outliers), linearity, and homogeneity of variances (French et al., 2014). Each of the assumptions of multiple regression and MANOVA will be tested and corrected. For example, to achieve normal distribution, outliers were transformed or eliminated.

This study utilizes a quantitative nonexperimental cross-sectional design. Several factors influenced the choice of research design for this study. Creswell (2009) suggests that qualitative research designs are best when little research exists and the problem is little understood thus preventing researchers from developing significant variables associated with the problem. In contrast, quantitative designs are best for problems in which research exists to recognize significant variables and the study seeks to discover the "best predictors of outcomes" (Creswell, 2009, p. 22). Significant research exists to understand the concept of contrapower harassment in higher education. The research questions in this study seek to examine 1) the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education, 2) the relationship between a faculty member's history of harassment associated with confronting a student with an act of academic dishonesty, and 3) develop an equation predicting faculty characteristics that increase levels of contrapower harassment. The quantitative design of this study extends research

to a previously unstudied population (pharmacy education), as well as, quantify the qualitative study of Fontana (2009).

The web-based online survey data collection method employed by this study was capable of accessing a larger number of participants. Wed-based online surveys can also increase participation and protects the anonymity of the participants (Andrews et al., 2003). The anonymity of a web-based survey allows participants to disclose sensitive information. The impact of harassment of faculty members is a sensitive subject carrying significant emotional and social impact (DeSouza, 2011; Fontana, 2009; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009). Faculty may believe that the act of receiving harassment from a student implies teacher weakness and as a result, hesitate to participate in a study revealing their history of contrapower harassment (Lampman et al., 2012). Studies utilizing a cross-sectional design and an anonymous online survey can increase participants' willingness to disclose sensitive information (Cook, 2011). The design and anonymous delivery of online surveys increases participants' honesty and promotes honesty of participants greater than the traditional pen and paper questionnaire (Cook, 2011; Heerwegh, 2009; Heiervang & Goodman, 2011).

This study utilizes a nonexperimental design. Nonexperimental designs are appropriate when a study does not use a control group, participants are not randomized, and the study variables are not manipulated (Creswell, 2009).

Population

The population studied consists of faculty members of schools/colleges of pharmacy within the United States who are members of pharmacy faculty professional

association. There are 129 U.S. based schools of pharmacy (AACP, 2013). Approximately 6,500 faculty teach in schools of pharmacy in the United States. The population of pharmacy faculty consists of an estimated 3,700-pharmacy faculty who belong to their professional association. Chosen faculty members received an email containing a memo requesting their participation in the study, a brief explanation of the study including the period for completing the study, a consent form, and the link/web address required to access the online study. Additional instructions to complete the survey were presented within the first page of the online survey software.

Sampling and Sampling Procedure. Inclusion criteria of participants were based on their experience of teaching in U.S. pharmacy schools and belonging to the pharmacy educators' professional organization. The sampling frame is an existing list of contact emails purchased from the pharmacy faculty professional association. This list includes pharmacy faculty who are members of this association. Permission to use the list is in Appendix D.

Study participants received an email requesting their participation in the research study. To determine sample size, GPower3 software was used to conduct a power analysis. GPower3 is freeware created at the Institute for Experimental Psychology by the Institute's faculty (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). Sample size calculations used an apriori power analysis. The analysis was performed using a medium effect size (f^2=0.15, α = .05). A sample size of 110 participants is required to achieve adequate statistical power (1-β err prob =.95) and generalize to the population.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection. The email list of pharmacy faculty members provided recruitment of participants. This study assumed a response rate of 33%. To achieve a sample size of 110 participants, 330 participants recruited from the email list by selecting one or two participants randomly from each of the 129 pharmacy schools within the U.S. The researcher chose to remove faculty teaching at pharmacy schools less than 2 years old. New schools, less than 2 years old may not have accepted their first class of students and as a result, faculty may not have experienced the behaviors described in the study. Potential participants received an email explaining the purpose of the study, estimated time to complete the survey, informed consent document (Appendix A), and a link to the online survey. Nonresponding potential participants received two reminder emails, 10 days and 4 weeks after the original email date. The last part of the survey asked participants to provide demographic data. This data includes their sex, race, age, years of teaching experience, tenure status, tenure eligibility, highest degree earned, rank, and experience of accusing a student of academic dishonesty. Participant data collection utilizes software provided by SurveyMonkey™. SurveyMonkey™ is a web survey development tool owned by a private equity consortium (SurveyMonkey™, 2014).

SurveyMonkey™ (2014) collects participants' responses over secured, encrypted SSL/TLS connections. Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) and Transport Layer Security (TLS) technology (the successor technology to SSL) protect participants' responses through server authentication and data encryption ensuring that research data in transit is secure and available only to the researcher. Additionally, SurveyMonkey™ (2014) Privacy

Policy protects the identity of participants as well as maintains the confidentiality of participant contact information. SurveyMonkey™ (2014) Privacy Policy provides "We don't sell these email addresses and we use them only as directed by you and in accordance with this policy. The same goes for any email addresses collected by your survey (Privacy Policy 1, Section 2, and Bullet 2)."

Instrumentation

This research study utilizes a scale developed by Lampman et al. (2009) and as amended by Lampman (2012). Permission to use the scale for this study sought from and approved by the authors. The email containing permission to use the scale appended and labeled Appendix B. The author also provided an electronic copy of the survey attached as Appendix C. The questionnaire contains five sections described below in the Operationalization section.

Research utilizing the scales included the Lampman et al. (2009) study of faculty teaching at the University of Alaska and the Lampman (2012) study of faculty teaching at universities in the United States. Lampman et al. (2009) developed the list. The authors completed a pilot study in which nine tenure track faculty members and one adjunct faculty member listed behaviors believed to be "disrespectful, hostile, harassing, or upsetting" (Lampman et al., 2009, p. 346). Lampman et al. (2009) describes the development of the scales used in the authors' study. A pilot study of nine tenure track and two adjunct faculty was conducted. Items mentioned by at least three of the faculty members that were considered harassment were included in the final list. The final list developed in the pilot study was distributed to faculty at the University of Alaska. To

establish reliable scales the following criteria were used: (1) only retain items with a factor loading greater than or equal to .50, (2) only retain factors with at least three items meeting the first criteria, and (3) only retain factors with a minimum Cronbach's alpha of .60 (Lampman et al, 2009, p. 336). The final sample utilized by Lampman et al. (2009) contained 654 faculty member responses. After removing those items that did not meet the above criteria, a scree plot confirmed two clear factors, incivility and bullying scale with a factor loading of .51 to .67, Cronbach's alpha, .87 and sexual attention scale score with a factor loading of .59 to .66, Cronbach's alpha, .82. Additional factor analysis concluded that one factor labeled negative consequences scale. Factor loading ranged from .51 to .74, Cronbach's alpha, .91. Each of the scales is discussed below and the complete questionnaire is included as Appendix C.

Operationalization

The definition of each variable and measurement of the variable follows.

Incivility and Bullying Scales. Participants estimated the number of times over the course of the last 12 months a student, for example, has "Challenged your authority during class" (Lampman et al., 2009). The participant marks the following (0) times, (1) time, (2) times, (3) times, (4) times, or (5) or more times. The mean, standard deviation, and the percentage of the behavior ever occurring during the participant's teaching career are calculated for each of the 31 behaviors. A mean upset score and standard deviation are calculated for each of the 31 behaviors. Principal component analysis was used to group incivility and bullying behaviors. These scores were calculated for men and women participants. Participants' scores for the behaviors average to create a scale score

labeled incivility and a scale score labeled bullying. The mean upset score and standard deviation were calculated for each of the incivility and bullying scales. The mean upset score asks each participant to rate the level of distress caused by each of the behaviors. Scores were calculated for men and women participants. Participants' scores for the behaviors were averaged to create scale scores labeled incivility scale and bullying scale.

Sexual Attention Scale. Participants estimate the number of times during the last 12 months the student has for example "Commented on your physical appearance." (Lampman et al., 2009) The participant marked the following (0) times, (1) time, (2) times, (3) times, (4) times, or (5 or more) times. The mean and standard deviation calculated for each of the 14 behaviors. The sexual attention upset scale asks each participant to rate the level of distress caused by each of the behaviors. Scores calculated for men and women participants. Principal components analysis eight determined a scale of eight behaviors. Participants' scores for the eight behaviors averaged to create a scale score labeled sexual attention.

Significant Incidents Scale. The significant incidents scale section begins by asking the participant to reflect on their career as a faculty member if they have experienced at least one significant incident of 'student bullying, aggression, incivility, or unwanted sexual attention (Lampman et al., 2009). The response is coded as yes (1) or no (2). The second set of questions focus upon the demographics of the student involved in the significant incident reflected upon in the first question. "What was the student's sex?" is coded as male or female. "Was the student an undergraduate or graduate?" Coded as undergraduate, graduate or do not know. The last question in this section, "What was the

student's approximate age?" is coded as 21 or younger, 22-29, 30-39, 40-49, or 50 or older.

Responses to Student Aggression, Bullying, Incivility, or Sexual Attention Scale. The response to student aggression, bullying, incivility, or sexual attention scale requests the participant to reflect upon the most serious incident of contrapower harassment experienced during their career as a faculty member. This section includes 24 questions. The first 17 questions focus on the impact of the significant incident of the first question. For example, "You felt physically afraid of a student." Each question was coded as yes or no. A scale score was computed by summing across the item responses for the 17 questions. All 17 questions are included in Appendix C. The next seven questions focus upon the action taken by the faculty member. Examples include, "You reported the incident to your department chair" or "You contacted university police". Each of the seven questions is coded as yes (1) or no (2). The next two question focus on reporting the incident to department chair/dean of your department or to the dean of students and the participants' level of satisfaction with the response to their complaint. The responses are coded as "not at all satisfied"(1), "somewhat dissatisfied" (2), "neither satisfied or dissatisfied" (3), "somewhat satisfied" (4), "completely satisfied" (5) or "does not apply" (6). Following an analysis of the variance, a scale score will be created by summing across the items. All of the questions related to this section are available in Appendix C.

Predictors of Contrapower Harassment

This section includes demographic variable as predictors of contrapower harassment. Ten predictors align with the hypotheses. Faculty sex is coded as men (0) and women (1). Faculty race is coded as not a racial/ethnic minority (0) and racial/ethnic minority (1). The number of students is measured by the total number of students taught during the past 12 months. Years' teaching is measured in years of teaching experience. Tenure status is coded as either tenured/non-tenured, tenured (0) or not tenured eligible (1). Highest degree earned is coded as terminal (0) or non-terminal degree (1). Rank is coded as full professor (4), associate professor (3), assistant professor (2), and lecturer/adjunct/instructor (1). Lastly, the experience of accusing students of Academic Dishonesty is coded yes (0), no (1).

Data Analysis Plan

Data was collected by SurveyMonkey™, then transferred, and analyzed using the Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) software (SPSS Inc., Chicago Illinois). Details of the analytic plan for the hypotheses are presented next.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question 1

What is the difference between male and female faculty member's experiences of contrapower student harassment?

H_0: There will be no statistically significant difference in the frequency of contrapower student harassment reported by men and women faculty as measured by dependent variables of (a) rate of incivility/bullying from students, (b) rate of sexual attention from

students, (c) rate of negative consequences associated with student incivility/bullying, (d) rate of distress related to harassing student behaviors, and (e) the rate of formal faculty action taken to confront student behaviors.

$H_{1:}$ There will be statistically significant differences in the frequency of contrapower student harassment reported by men and women with women faculty reporting greater levels of the dependent variables: (a) rate of incivility/bullying from students, (b) rate of sexual attention from students, (c) rate of negative consequences associated with student incivility/bullying, (d) rate of distress related to harassing student behaviors, and (e) the rate of formal faculty action taken to confront student behaviors.

Research Question 1 Discussion. Research question 1 inquired if there is a gender difference in the (1a) rate of incivility/bullying from students, (1b) rate of sexual attention from students, (1c) rate of negative consequences associated with student incivility/bullying, (1d) rate of distress related to harassing student behaviors, and (1e) the rate of formal faculty action taken to confront student behaviors. Two multivariate analyses of variance will be used to answer RQ1. Hypothesis 1(a-c) used multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) to examine whether men or women experience greater rates of (1a) rate of incivility/bullying from students, (1b) rate of sexual attention from students, and (1c) rate of negative consequences associated with student incivility/bullying. Hypothesis (1d) used a second MANOVA to examine differences connected with how upsetting men and women found incivility/bullying and sexual attention from students. Hypothesis (1e) used a chi-square analysis. Hypothesis (1e)

examined whether men or women are more likely to report student behavior of incivility-bullying and/or unwanted sexual attention.

Research Question 2

Do faculty characteristics including ethnic or racial minority status, terminal degree status, tenure status, and years of teaching experience predict the rate of contrapower harassment?

H_0: The independent variables of (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience will not predict the rate of incivility-bullying (hypothesis 2a) or sexual attention (hypothesis 2b).

H_1: The independent variables of (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience will predict the rates of incivility-bullying (hypothesis 2a) and sexual attention (hypothesis 2b).

Research Question 2-Discussion. Research question 2 examined the predictive value for scores of incivility-bullying and sexual attention based on a set of faculty characteristics (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience. A multiple regression will be used to determine how well faculty characteristics predict student incivility-bullying, sexual attention, and negative consequences. Multiple regression isolated faculty characteristics that may put a faculty member at increased risk. As noted by Lampman et al. (2009) and Lampman (2012)

some of these faculty characteristics are likely to be interdependent. Bivariate correlations among the faculty predictive variables will be completed prior to running the multiple regression.

Research Question 3

Do faculty characteristics including ethnic or racial minority status, terminal degree status, tenure status, and years of teaching experience predict the negative consequence associated with the presence of contrapower student harassment?

H_0: The independent variables, (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience will not predict the dependent variable, negative consequences.

H_1: The independent variables (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status, and (d) teaching experience predict the dependent variable, negative consequences.

Research Question 3-Discussion. Research question 3 examined the predictive value for scores of negative consequences based on a set of faculty characteristics (a) racial or ethnic minority group members and majority group members, (b) terminal degrees versus without terminal degrees, (c) tenure status and (d) teaching experience. A multiple regression is used to determine how well faculty characteristics predict student incivility-bullying, sexual attention, and negative consequences. The multiple regression isolated faculty characteristics that may put a faculty member at increased risk.

Research Question 4

Do faculty members with a history of confronting and reporting a student with charges of academic dishonesty experience higher levels of contrapower harassment?

H_1: There will be no statistically significant difference in the level of contrapower student harassment for faculty with experiences of confronting students with acts of academic dishonesty.

H_0: There will be a statistically significant difference in the level of contrapower student harassment for faculty with experiences of confronting students with acts of academic dishonesty.

Research Question 4-Discussion. Research questions 4 examined if there is a difference in rate of incivility/bullying, sexual attention and mean upset scores experienced by faculty members with versus without a history of confronting and reporting a student with charges of academic dishonesty. In this hypothesis, a MANOVA was used. The incivility-bullying, sexual attention and negative consequences scales are the dependent variables and history of confronting a student for academic dishonesty (yes/no) the grouping variable.

Threats to Validity

Online surveys, both convenient and inexpensive, have a number of threats to the validity. The following is a discussion of the threats to the validity to online surveys including the problems of random sampling, low response rates, and controlling access to the study. Other threats to the validity of the study include the reliability of the instrument

and data assumptions. Each threat followed by the researcher's methods of reducing these threats within this study design.

Random Sampling

Random sampling is an important issue to statistical analysis (Lumsden & Morgan, 2005). Random sampling requires a specific population. The population frequently referred to as the frame, allows a specific pool to draw the random sample (Lumsden & Morgan, 2005). No public source exists to acquire a frame list of the target population members including their email addresses. This study utilizes a list of the target population members from a professional association, AACP. Another problem with online surveys is the temptation to access all the names on the list rather than access a random sample. This problem was eliminated by drawing a random sample from the frame of the population.

Low Response Rates

A threat to online surveys is low response rate, which may fall below 30% (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000). A power analysis revealed that this study required 110 responses to be statistically valid and generalizable to the population. In order to generate 110 responses given a response rate of 30%, the invitation to participate in the study emailed to 330 participants. In addition to problems of population access, frame, and low response rates, online surveys pose other risks to validity of online surveys.

Access Control

Access control to the survey is another risk to the validity of the online survey (Lumsden & Morgan, 2005). Email recipients can fill out surveys more than once, send

the link to a forum, or group not a part of the target population. This study assigned a unique number to each recipient of the email invitation restricting access to the survey. Each number allowed a participant to access the survey one and only one time.

Reliability of Instrument

The measure of incivility/bullying, sexual attention, impact, and negative consequences instrument used in this study was developed by Lampman et al. (2009) and Lampman (2012) and used in two large studies of faculty teaching respectively in Alaska and across the United States. To establish the reliability of the instrument, the authors computed Cronbach's alpha. George and Mallery (2009) define Cronbach's alpha as a measure of internal consistency. The closer the Cronbach's alpha is to 1.00 the higher the internal consistency of the instrument used in the study. Lampman et al. (2009) found a Cronbach's alpha of .87 for the incivility-bullying scale, .82 for the sexual attention scale and .92 for the negative consequences scale.

Ethical Procedures

This study researcher protected the rights and anonymity of study participants by adhering to the following study protocols. In addition, the rules and regulations of the Institutional Review Board were adhered, and permission from the Walden University Review Board sought prior to the onset of the study.

Informed Consent

All participants in the study received a description of the study and asked to provide consent. The initial web page of the online study provided participants with an online informed consent form included in Appendix A. Participants implied consent, as well as,

indicate their willingness to participate in the study by entering the code received in the invitation email into the appropriate area.

Data Protection

Access to the study was controlled by requiring each participant to enter a code which allowed the participant one time access to the study. Following completion of the study, participant data encrypts using software provided as part of the SurveyMonkey™ program to protect the data as it moves from the respondents' computer to the SurveyMonkey™ servers. An area of concern for online studies is to protect the anonymity of the online participant. This anonymity breaches if their internet protocol (IP) address is revealed. The IP address provides identification of a specific user device, such as a computer. Users of transmission control protocol/internet protocol (TSP/IP) networks are assigned a unique IP address. In this study, participants IP addresses mask from the researcher by turning off the process that collects IP addresses.

Survey Exit Instructions

The presence of contrapower harassment is a sensitive topic to faculty, as well as, the institutions they represent. Each participant received instructions regarding the voluntary nature of the survey and instructions to end participation in the survey by hitting the 'exit survey' button at the top right of each page. The study report does not identify individual colleges or participants.

Summary

This research study examined the frequency and impact on faculty of student contrapower harassment. Several major quantitative studies have been completed examining contrapower harassment in higher education. One qualitative study was completed associating a faculty member's history of confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty with increased levels of contrapower harassment. This study focused on faculty teaching in schools/colleges of pharmacy based within the United States. The sample was chosen from an electronic email list purchased from AACP, a professional association of pharmacy educators. The study design was quantitative in nature to establish the frequency and nature of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education, a previously unstudied population. The study is similar in nature to studies by Lampman et al. (2009) and Lampman (2012).

Lampman et al. (2009) and Lampman (2012) developed the instrumentation used in this study. These researchers divided contrapower harassment into two subsets, incivility/bullying and unwanted sexual attention. A set of questions designed to elicit the extent of faculty distress caused by the student behavior follows each of the subset of questions. A scale score for incivility-bullying/level of distress and unwanted sexual attention/level of distress is calculated. These scaled scores are examined to determine the frequency of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education, as well as, examine a number of faculty characteristics thought to predict increased levels of contrapower harassment.

Chapter 3 presented the statistical analysis of the hypotheses, threats to validity, and the researcher's efforts to protect the rights of the study participants. Chapter 4 details the results of the statistical analysis of study data and presents descriptive statistics of the study's sample followed by a summary of the data's answer to the research questions. Chapter 5 compares the findings of this study to existing studies. In this case, the presence of contrapower harassment in higher education compared to the presence of contrapower harassment in a single healthcare discipline, pharmacy education. This comparison will be followed by a discussion of the limitations of the study and recommendations for future of contrapower harassment in higher education. Chapter 5 concludes with a discussion of the implications of the study's findings pertinent to social change with the higher education environment, a brief list of recommendations for faculty teaching in higher education and ends with a conclusion statement.

Chapter 4: Results

Prior studies established the prevalence of contrapower harassment in higher education. None, however, of these studies of contrapower harassment focused on the prevalence of student harassment of faculty teaching in healthcare education. Healthcare education represents the possibility of great potential impact on student learning and patient outcomes. The purpose of this study was to examine the prevalence and impact of contrapower harassment in United States among schools of pharmacy faculty. The research endeavored to develop a model to predict levels of contrapower harassment based on faculty characteristics, including ethnicity, tenure status, highest degree, and, teaching experience. Unlike prior studies, the current investigation examined the relationship between a faculty member's history of harassment and specifically, its association with the act of confronting a student for academic dishonesty. To achieve the purpose of this study, a random sample of 330 faculty members teaching in schools of pharmacy located in the U.S. received an electronic invitation to participate in an online survey.

Data Collection

Data collection began following Walden University Institutional Review Board Approval #12-10-14-0123430 and continued for 1 month. Pharmacy faculty from the membership list of a pharmacy professional organization received an email describing the study and a link to access an online survey. A random sample of 330 received emailed invitations. One hundred and thirteen faculty members returned the survey generating a return rate of 34%. Of the respondents, three of the individual surveys were accessed and

either not begun or were substantially incomplete leaving a final sample of 110 completed surveys.

The survey began with a series of questions describing acts of harassment followed by questions of the amount of distress triggered by each act. The first set of questions (k = 30) described acts of incivility, bullying, and aggression behaviors. The next set of questions (k = 14) concerned acts of unwanted sexual attention. Each of these sets of questions were followed by the restatement of the question sets with instructions for the participant to rate how much distress each of the behaviors would cause independent of the faculty member's experience of the behavior. The third set of questions (k = 17) focused on the emotional consequences for the faculty member resulting from student behaviors. These probes were followed by a set of nine questions concerning the corresponding formal actions taken by the faculty member to combat the student behaviors. Nine demographic questions followed. Finally, the survey ended with one question addressing history of confronting and reporting a student for an act of academic dishonesty. The following section presents the descriptive statistics of participant's demographics.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

This survey posed questions to participants concerning demographic information including gender, age, ethnicity, tenure status, and faculty rank. The frequency distribution of participant's demographics is included below in Table 1. The American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP) (2014) compiles gender and demographic

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of Participants' Demographics

(N = 110)

Variable		Frequency	Percent
Gender			
	Male	48	43.6
	Female	58	52.7
	Missing	4	3.6
Age			
	25-30	32	29.1
	31-40	27	24.5
	40-54	20	18.2
	55-65	19	17.9
	66-74	1	0.91
	Missing	11	10
Ethnicity			
	Asian/Pacific Islander	9	8.1
	Black/African American	7	6.4
	Hispanic	6	5.5
	Caucasian	81	73.6
	Missing	7	6.4
Tenure Status			
	Tenured	30	27.3
	Tenure Track	25	22.7
	Not Tenure Track	51	46.4
	Missing	4	3.6
Faculty Rank			
	Full Professor	22	20.0
	Associate Professor	26	23.6
	Assistant Professor	55	50.0
	Instructor	3	2.7
	Missing	4	3.6
Highest Degree			
	Doctoral Degree	104	94.5
	Master's Degree	2	1.8
	Bachelor's Degree	1	0.9
	Missing	3	2.7

data of 6,344 full-time and 292 part-time faculty teaching in United States schools of pharmacy. The percentage of men and women faculty members has been trending toward greater numbers of female faculty. Currently, 53% of faculty are female (AACP, 2014). Similarly, this study's participants are 52.7% female. Nationally, AACP estimates ethnic minorities comprise 20% of pharmacy faculty. This percentage includes 15% Asian, 6% Black/African-American, 3% Hispanic, and less than 0.1% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (AACP, 2014). Similarly, this study's participant ethnicity is 8.1% Asian/Pacific Islander, 6.4% Black/African American, and 5.5% Hispanic. Similarities exist between schools of pharmacy faculty (AACP, 2014) and the study participant's tenure status, faculty rank, and highest degree earned. Nationally, tenured or tenure-track faculty represent 50% of pharmacy faculty (AACP, 2014) compared to 50% of tenured or tenure-track study participants. Comparing rank of faculty, study participants were full professor 20%, associate professor 23.6%, assistant professor 50%, and instructor 2.7%. These rates compare to the national rates of full professor 18.1%, associate professor 27.9%, assistant professor 41%, and instructor 2% (AACP, 2014).

Principal Components Analysis and Scale Composition

In order to determine the total number of predictors accounting for the greatest level of variability in the survey data, an exploratory factor analysis of the survey items related to incivility, bullying, aggression, sexual attention, consequences, and formal report was conducted to group together the related variables (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010).

The reliability of scales in relation to the sample size was established by application of the following criteria to the data (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010): (a) retain survey items with factor loading greater than or equal to .50, (b) retain factors with three or more components, and (c) retain scale components having a Cronbach's alpha greater than or equal to .60. The principal components factor analysis used varimax rotation (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). Table 2 summarizes the impact of the principal components analysis and the reduction of the number of variables. The following sections describe the results of the principal components analysis and the development of the study's scales: incivility, incivility distress, bullying, bullying distress, aggression, aggression distress, sexual attention, and sexual attention distress.

Table 2

Summary of PCA Analysis and Variable Reduction

Scale	# Survey Questions	# Retained
Incivility		6
Bullying	30	6
Aggression		3
Incivility Distress		6
Bullying Distress	30	6
Aggression Distress		3
Sexual Attention Distress	14	8
Report/Formal Action	7	7

Incivility, Bullying, and Aggression. The principal components analysis of the 30 survey items focused on incivility, bullying, and aggression revealed three separate

scales meeting the above criteria. The first scale consists of six survey items representing incivil behaviors. The mean of these six items form the first scale, the Total Incivility Scale Score. The second scale consists of six items representing bullying behaviors. The mean of the six items forms the second scale, the Total Bullying Scale Score. The third scale consisted of three behaviors identified as aggressive behaviors. The mean of the three items forms the Aggression Scale Score.

Incivility, Bullying, and Aggression Distress Scales. The incivility, bullying, and aggression survey questions were immediately followed by a restatement of these survey questions. The participants were asked to rate how much distress, ranging from not at all distressed to extremely distressed, was caused by each of the behaviors regardless of whether the participant had actually experienced the behavior. A distress scale was formed from the mean of the same items identified in the principal components analysis related to incivility, bullying, and aggression. Table 3 summarizes the incivility, bullying, and aggression distress survey items, means, and totals.

Table 3

Faculty Prevalence and Distress Associated with Student Incivility Bullying and Aggression

	Frequency (*N*= 110)			Distress (*N*=110)	
	M[a]	*(SD)*	*%*[b]	*M*[c]	*(SD)*
Incivility Items					
Answered a cell phone or texted during class	2.67	2.27	67.3	2.27	0.88
Used a computer during a class for purposes unrelated	3.34	2.15	77.8	1.73	0.75
Engaged in distracting, non-class conversations during	2.31	1.96	74.8	2.40	0.83
Made a hostile comment during class	2.58	1.97	3.54	3.35	0.93
Engaged in a non-class activity during class	2.31	2.28	58.6	1.86	0.80
Slept during class	1.95	1.99	63.7	1.75	0.86
Total Incivility Scale Score/Mean Distress Score	2.56	1.60	94.3	2.21	0.64
Bullying Items					
Challenged your authority class	0.71	1.26	34.5	2.27	0.85
Continually interrupted you during class	0.57	1.23	22.2	2.42	0.86
Submitted hostile comments on Course Evaluations	1.12	1.65	41.6	2.66	0.97
Made derogatory/sarcastic remarks/gestures in class	0.58	1.16	27.4	2.58	0.89
Questioned your credentials/qualifications to teach	0.25	0.77	12.5	2.31	1.08
Spread rumors or gossip about you	0.11	0.56	5.40	3.40	0.92
Total Bullying Scale Score/Mean Distress Score	0.53	0.74	60.0	2.58	0.73
Aggression Items					
Created tension dominating class discussions	0.07	0.49	3.50	2.17	0.80
Attempted to bribe you for a better grade	1.03	0.16	2.70	3.07	1.01
Made a derogatory comment concerning race, ethnicity,	0.06	0.31	4.50	3.32	0.91
Aggression Score Mean/Mean Distress Score	1.16	0.81	8.80	2.86	0.74

[a]Estimated number of times students in the last 12 months expressed behaviors to faculty [b]Percentage experiencing behavior in the last 12 months [c]Regardless of actual experience, rate how distressed you would feel if a student engaged each behavior using a response scale from 1 (not at all distressed) to 4 (extremely distressed)

Sexual Attention. The study survey included 14 items focused on sexual attention. Principal components analysis identified eight sexual attention questions responsible for the greatest level of participant variation. Individual question analysis

mean and standard deviation and the mean and standard deviation of the sexual attention scale are present in Table 4 for the eight sexual attention questions.

Sexual Attention Distress Score. The sexual attention questions were immediately followed by a restatement of these survey questions. The participants were asked to rate how much distress was caused by each of the sexual attention behaviors regardless of whether the participant had actually experienced the behavior. Principal components analysis identified eight sexual attention questions. The eight questions restated in the sexual attention distress survey were used to form a sexual attention distress scale. The individual questions, standard deviation, and the scale's mean are presented in the right side columns of Table 4.

Table 4

Faculty Prevalence and Distress Associated with Student Sexual Attention

	Frequency			Distress	
	N = 108			*N* = 108	
	M[a]	*SD*	%[b]	*M*[c]	*SD*
Commented on your physical appearance	1.23	1.66	46.30	1.86	0.94
Made a sexual advance or proposition directed at you	0.01	0.10	0.90	3.35	0.94
Made a sexual comment to you	0.10	0.41	6.50	2.97	1.00
Spread rumors of a sexual nature about you	0.04	0.23	2.80	3.53	0.86
Made a sexist comment to you	0.12	0.43	8.30	2.99	1.01
Ogled or looked at you suggestively	0.16	0.67	6.50	2.92	1.00
Flirted with you	0.46	1.15	19.40	2.62	0.96
Asked an inappropriate question about your sex life	0.06	0.31	4.60	3.20	0.97
Mean Sexual Attention/Mean Sexual Attention Distress Scores	0.26	0.38	52.80	2.93	0.81

[a]Estimated number of times students in the last 12 months expressed behaviors to faculty
[b]Percentage experiencing behavior in the last 12 months
[c]Regardless of actual experience, rate how distressed you would feel if a student engaged each behavior using a response scale from 1 (not at all distressed) to 4 (extremely distressed)

Consequences. A principal component analysis was conducted on the 17 survey items focused on the consequences of student harassment. Ten of the 17 survey questions met the established criteria. The mean of the 10 items comprises the Consequences Scale Mean (see Table 5). Distress questions were not posed for consequences. These questions focus on behaviors participants engaged as a result of harassing behavior.

Table 5

Faculty Consequences Associated with Harassment

(N=88)

Consequences Items	*M*[a]	*SD*	*%*[b]
You felt like you did not want to go to work	1.85	0.36	14.80
You had difficulty sleeping	1.75	0.43	24.70
You suffered from stress-related illness (e.g., migraines or stomach problems)	1.94	0.23	5.70
You had difficulty concentrating during class or while at work	1.83	0.38	16.90
You felt like quitting your job	1.89	0.32	11.20
Your personal life and relationships suffered	1.93	0.25	6.70
Your productivity at work suffered	1.85	0.36	14.60
You became depressed	1.96	0.21	4.50
You needed medical treatment for stress-related illness	1.97	0.18	3.40
You felt significantly anxious or stressed	1.78	0.42	22.50
Consequences Scale Mean	1.87	0.22	40.20

[a]Faculty respond yes/no. [b]Percentage experiencing behavior in the last 12 months

Formal Faculty Action. Faculty reporting that they had experienced a serious incident of harassment were asked to answer the question, "You reported the incident to the Dean of Students or appropriate person on campus for student disciplinary action." Eighty-six of these faculty responded yes or no to this question. Responses included 20 participants (23.3%) responded yes and 66 participants (76.74%) responded no.

Responses to this question were used to determine the rate of formal faculty action taken in response to a serious incident of contrapower harassment.

Research Questions

Completion of the principal components analysis developed scales created from the full set of survey items with the greatest variability for faculty teaching in U.S. schools of pharmacy. After establishing the properties of the scales and completing the descriptive statistics, research questions were examined.

Research Question 1

What is the difference between male and female faculty member's experiences of contrapower student harassment? A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of gender on faculty members' experience of student incivility, bullying, sexual attention, and the consequences associated with the experience of student harassment as hypothesized in Hypothesis 1(a-d). The results of the overall MANOVA was significant Wilks $\Lambda = .143$, $F(4, 83) = 3.31$, $p < .021$, multivariate $\eta^2_p = .155$. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) as a follow-up to the MANOVA was completed on each of the dependent variables. Incivility was significant for gender, $F(1, 88) = 6.34$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2_p = .08$ with male faculty experiencing greater levels of incivil behavior than female faculty (Hypothesis 1a). Consequence, $F(1, 88) = 2.932$, $p = .090$, $\eta^2_p = .032$ (Hypothesis 1b), Sexual Attention, $F(1, 88) = .058$, $p = .988$, $\eta^2_p = .056$ (Hypothesis 1c) and Bullying, $F(1, 75) = .15$, $p = .697$, $\eta^2_p = .002$ (Hypothesis

Table 6

Dependent Variables by Gender

Dependent Variable	Gender	M	SE	F	p
Bullying	Male	0.64	0.12	0.15	0.697
	Female	0.71	0.11		
Incivility	Male	3.34	0.26	6.34	0.012
	Female	2.47	0.23		
Sexual Attention	Male	2.7	0.67	0.06	0.988
	Female	2.91	0.58		
Consequence	Male	1.91	0.04	1.55	0.09
	Female	1.87	0.03		

A second MANOVA was completed to determine the effect of gender on the amount of distress experienced because of student incivility, bullying, sexual attention, and aggression hypothesized in Hypothesis 1(e-h). The overall MANOVA was significant Wilks $\Lambda = .897$, $F(4, 99) = 2.87$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2_p = .103$. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) as a follow-up to the MANOVA was completed on each of the dependent variables. Distress caused by unwanted sexual attention was significant for gender, $F(1, 103) = 4.01$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2_p = .038$ with female faculty experiencing greater levels of distress associated with student sexual attention than male faculty (Hypothesis 1e). Aggression distress, $F(1, 103) = 1.40$, $p = .31$, $\eta^2_p = .01$ (Hypothesis 1f), Bullying, $F(1, 103) = 1.18$, $p = .280$, $\eta^2_p = .01$ (Hypothesis 1g), and Incivility, $F(1, 103) = 1.66$, $p = .20$, $\eta^2_p = .016$ (Hypothesis 1h) were not significant for gender. Table 7 presents the means and standard error by gender of the four distress scales used in the analysis.

Table 7

Distress Scales Means and Standard Error by Gender

Dependent Variable	Gender	*M*	*SE*	*F*	*p*
Aggression Distress	Male	2.42	0.08	1.40	0.310
	Female	2.53	0.08		
Sexual Attention Distress	Male	2.77	0.12	4.01	0.047
	Female	3.08	0.10		
Incivility Distress	Male	2.33	0.09	1.66	0.200
	Female	2.17	0.08		
Bullying Distress	Male	2.55	0.10	1.18	0.280
	Female	2.70	0.09		

A Chi-Square analysis was completed to determine the effect of gender on the rate of formal faculty action taken to confront student behaviors, hypothesis 1(i) measured by the faculty respondents yes or no answer to the question, "You reported the incident to the Dean of Students or appropriate person on campus." Only faculty experiencing a significant event (N = 86) responded to this question. The Chi-Square test was statistically insignificant, X^2 (1, N = 86) = 0.42, p = .838, failing to confirm gender differences in the rate of formal faculty action taken to confront student behaviors.

Research Question 2

Do faculty characteristics including racial minority status, terminal degree status, tenure status, and years of teaching experience predict the rate of contrapower harassment?

Bivariate Correlations. Bivariate correlations between each of the faculty predictors of contrapower harassment and the scale scores of Sexual Attention, Bullying,

Incivility, and Consequences are presented in Table 8. Prior to analysis, ethnicity, tenure status, and terminal degree status were recoded to form dummy variables. Ethnicity was recoded to not a racial or ethnic minority = 0 and racial or ethnic minority = 1. Tenure status was recoded to tenured = 0 and non-tenured or tenure ineligible = 1. Lastly, terminal degree status was recoded to, does have a doctorate = 0 and does not have a doctorate = 1. A point-biserial correlation was used to show the strength of the relationship between the newly coded dummy variables (ethnicity, tenure status, and terminal degree status) and the continuous variables of the incivility, bully, sexual attention, and negative consequences scale scores. The result of the point-biserial correlation and correlation of teaching experience to the continuous variables of incivility, bullying, sexual attention, and negative consequences is shown in Table 8. None of the predictor variables correlated with the incivility, bullying, sexual attention, or negative consequences scale scores. As expected, years of teaching experience shares a strong negative relationship to tenure status, $r(103) = -.656$, $p = .000$, suggesting that tenure status is achieved after years of teaching. Ethnicity shares a weak and negative association with years of teaching experience, $r(84) = -.19$, $p < .05$, suggesting that faculty reporting minority ethnic membership have taught for fewer years. Lastly, bullying has a moderate relationship with incivility, $r(110) = 0.377$, $p = 0.000$, suggesting faculty reporting incivility also report increased bullying behaviors.

Table 8

Bivariate Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Ethnic Combined								
2.Tenured Not tenured	.218							
3.Terminal Vs. Nonterminal	.367	.250						
4.Years Teaching	.034*	.000***	.320					
5.Mean Incivility Score	.101	.545	.772	.861				
6.Mean Bullying Score	.221	.371	.885	.701	.000***			
7.Mean Sexual Attention Scale	.838	.271	.359	.141	.113	.062		
8.Mean Consequences Scale	.506	.378	.728	.150	.061	.000***	.359	

Point-biserial correlations were computed for dummy-coded variables Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis 2(a) Faculty Characteristics of Increased Bullying. *Simultaneous multiple regression was conducted to ascertain the accuracy of a composite of faculty characteristics to predict the bullying scale score (Hypothesis 2a). Regression results indicated an overall model of three predictors, ethnicity, tenure status and, teaching experience, were a poor fit of the data. The predictor, terminal degree status, was removed for lack of variance. The overall model was not significant,* $R^2 = .024$, $R^2_{adj} = -.006$, $F(397) = .801$, $p = .504$. *Each of the individual predictors were insignificant at 0.05 levels. As a result the null Hypothesis 2a was not rejected. Ethnicity, tenure status, and years of teaching experience failed to predict reported scores on the bullying scale. Table 9 presents the results of the regression analysis.*

Table 9

Coefficients for Model Variables for Bullying

	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig.*
Constant	0.218	0.222		0.982	0.329
Tenured Not tenured	0.176	0.186	0.131	0.945	0.347
Ethnic Combined	-0.171	0.157	-0.112	-1.092	0.278
Years teaching college or graduate school level?	0.002	0.008	0.031	0.222	0.825

Dependent Variable: Mean Bullying Score

Hypothesis 2(b) Faculty Characteristics of Increased Incivility. Simultaneous multiple regression was conducted to ascertain the accuracy of a composite of faculty characteristics to predict the incivility scale score (Hypothesis 2b). Regression results indicated an overall model of three predictors (ethnicity, tenure status and, teaching experience) was a poor fit of the data. Again, one predictor (terminal degree) was removed for lack of variance. The results indicated that the overall model was not significant, $R^2 = 0.018$, $R^2_{adj} = -0.012$, $F\ (3, 97) = 0.591$, $p = 0.622$. Ethnicity, tenure status, and years of teaching experience fail to predict reported scores on the incivility scale; as a result the null Hypothesis 2b was not rejected. Table 10 presents the coefficients for the model variables.

Table 10

Coefficients for Model Variables for Mean Incivility

	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig.*
Constant	1.779	0.426		4.174	0.
Tenured Not tenured	-0.157	0.357	-0.061	-0.439	0.661
Ethnic Combined	-0.374	0.301	-0.128	-1.242	0.217
Years teaching at the college or graduate school level?	-0.004	0.015	-0.036	-0.257	0.798

Dependent Variable: Mean Incivility Score

Hypothesis 2(c) Faculty Characteristics of Increased Sexual Attention.

Simultaneous multiple regression was conducted to ascertain the accuracy of the set of faculty characteristics (ethnicity, tenure status and, teaching experience) to predict the sexual attention score. Again, the predictor terminal degree status was removed for lack of variance. The overall model was a poor fit of the data. Regression results were not significant, $R^2 = 0.024$, $R^2_{adj} = .-0.006$, $F\ (3, 97) = 0.806$, $p = 0.494$. Ethnicity, tenure status, and years of teaching experience failed to predict reported scores on the sexual attention scale; as a result the null Hypothesis 2c was not rejected. Table 11 presents the coefficients for the model variables.

Table 11

Coefficients for Model Variables for Sexual Attention Scale

	B	*Std.*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig.*
Constant	0.160	0.102		1.572	0.119
Tenured Not tenured	0.042	0.086	0.069	0.496	0.621
Ethnic Combined	-0.026	0.072	-0.037	-0.355	0.723
Years teaching college or graduate school level?	-0.003	0.004	-0.103	0.729	0.468

Dependent Variable: Mean Sexual Attention Scale

Research Question 3

Do faculty characteristics including ethnic or racial minority status, terminal degree status, tenure status, and years of teaching experience predict the negative consequence associated with the presence of contrapower student harassment (Hypothesis 3)?

Simultaneous multiple regression was conducted to ascertain the accuracy of the set of faculty characteristics (ethnicity, tenure status and, teaching experience) to predict the negative consequences scale score (Hypothesis 3). Again, the predictor terminal degree status was removed for lack of variance. The overall model was not a good fit of the model. The results were not significant, $R^2 = 0.186$, $R^2_{adj} = .-0.035$ $F(3, 79) = 0.806$, $p = 0.422$. Ethnicity, tenure status, and years of teaching experience failed to predict reported scores on the negative consequences scale; as a result the null Hypothesis 2c was not rejected. Table 12 presents the coefficients for the model variables.

Table 12

Coefficients for Model Variances forConsequences Scale

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	1.167	0.09		12.995	0
Tenured Not tenured	0.013	0.074	0.027	0.172	0.864
Ethnic Combined	-0.063	0.065	-0.111	-0.971	0.334
Years teaching college or graduate school level?	-0.003	0.003	-0.158	-0.984	0.328

Dependent Variable: Mean Consequences Scale

Research Question 4

Do faculty members with a history of confronting and reporting a student with charges of academic dishonesty experience higher levels of contrapower harassment? A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was completed to determine the effect of faculty experiences confronting a student with acts of academic dishonesty on faculty members' experience of student incivility, bullying, and sexual attention as stated in hypothesis 4. Participant faculty were asked to answer, yes = 1, no = 0 to the question "During your career as a faculty member have you confronted or reported a student for an act of academic dishonesty." The result of the overall MANOVA was statistically significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = 0.776$, $F(3, 92) = 8.85$, $p < 0.001$ multivariate $\eta^2_p = 0.224$. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) as a follow-up to the MANOVA was completed on each

of the dependent variables. Incivility, $F(1, 94) = 18.57$, $p < .00$, $\eta^2_p = .17$, and Bullying, $F(1, 94) = 7.73$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2_p = 0.08$), were significant for increased levels of harassment and Sexual Attention, $F(1, 94) = 10.78$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .10$) was significant for reduced levels of sexual attention as a result of confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty. The data supports the alternative hypothesis that history of confronting a student with an act of academic dishonesty increases student harassment of faculty. The means and standard deviations for history of confronting students for academic dishonesty are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations Confront Academic Dishonesty

During your career as a faculty member have you confronted or reported a student for an act of academic dishonesty?					
Dependent Variable	Gender	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Bullying	Yes	0.071	.83	7.73	0.016
	No	0.31	.41		
Incivility	Yes	3.11	.072	18.57	0.001
	No	1.77	1.50		
Sexual Attention	Yes	0.20	0.45	10.78	0.002
	No	0.45	0.16		

Table 14 provides a summary of the study's significant findings for each of the four research questions. The table is followed by a summary of Chapter 4.

Table 14

Summary of Significant Findings

Hypotheses	Dependent Variable	Independent Variable (Significant)
RQ1:Effect of Gender on Levels of Contrapower Harassment	Incivility	Males reported significantly greater levels of incivility
RQ1: Effect of Gender on Levels of Distress Associated with Contrapower Harassment	Sexual Attention	Females reported significantly greater levels of distress
RQ4-Do faculty members with a history of confronting and reporting a student with charges of academic dishonesty experience higher levels of contrapower harassment?	Incivility Bullying Sexual Attention	Faculty with history of confronting a student with academic dishonesty report significantly greater levels of incivility and bullying, and reduced levels of sexual attention

Summary

A series of statistical analyses were completed to understand the relationship between faculty characteristics and increased levels of student harassment. RQ1 asked if gender affected the level of contrapower harassment. A MANOVA found an insignificant relationship between gender and three of the dependent variables (bullying, sexual attention, and negative consequences). Only incivility significantly related to gender. Male faculty reported greater levels of incivility than their female counterparts did in contrast to the hypothesis. A MANOVA conducted to evaluate the relationships between gender and the rates of distress found that distress as a result of sexual attention from student was significant with females reporting more distress than males. A Chi-square conducted to determine the relationship between gender and formal action found insignificant results.

RQ2 (Hypothesis 2) investigated whether a set of faculty characteristics may predict the rate of contrapower harassment. Multiple regression failed to reveal a relationship between increased levels of incivility (Hypothesis 2b), bullying (Hypothesis 2a), and sexual attention (Hypothesis 2c) and faculty demographics of ethnicity, tenure status and, teaching experience.

RQ3 (Hypothesis 3) posed the question; do faculty characteristics predict the negative consequence associated with the presence of contrapower student harassment? The multiple regression failed to show a significant relationship between the faculty characteristic of ethnicity, tenure status, and teaching experience and the dependent variable of negative consequences. Lastly, RQ4 (Hypothesis 4) posed the question does a faculty member's history of confronting students with an act of academic dishonesty predict increased levels of harassment. The overall MANOVA was significant with all three individual ANOVAS, incivility, bullying, and sexual attention reaching significance. These results supported the alternative hypothesis confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty increases faculty members' level of incivility and bullying and reduced the level of sexual attention.

Chapter 5 presents an expanded interpretation and discussion of these results in light of current policies designed to control harassment of faculty and academic dishonesty. The remainder of the chapter presents an interpretation of the limitations of the study, suggestions for future research, and positive social change.

Chapter 5

Chapters 1 and 2 described the impact of students' sense of academic entitlement on the university environment. With this sense of entitlement, students demand high academic achievement without investing significant time or effort into the learning process. They misplace responsibility for their academic achievement on faculty and justify engaging in aggressive, harassing, interactions with faculty when desired outcomes fail. The act of students engaging in faculty harassment to achieve success spawned a new concept termed contrapower harassment. A limited number of studies have focused on contrapower harassment. These studies revealed that up to 96% of faculty at general universities experienced at least one incident of incivility, bullying, physical, or verbal aggression, or undesired sexual attention during the previous 12 months (DeSouza, 2011; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al., 2009). No prior quantitative study has focused on contrapower harassment in healthcare education, which was addressed in the current study.

The purpose of this study was to substantiate the existence and prevalence of contrapower harassment in faculty teaching at schools of pharmacy in the United States. The study investigated the relationship between faculty characteristics (gender, ethnicity, tenure status, terminal degree, and experience) and the likelihood of contrapower harassment. Additionally, in contrast to preceding studies of contrapower harassment, this study established a relationship between a faculty member's history of confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty and increased levels of contrapower harassment.

One hundred and ten participants (34%) returned a completed survey based on work by Lampman (2009). The respondent population reflected similarities in gender, ethnicity, professional status, tenure status, and educational level to a general population of faculty teaching in U. S. schools of pharmacy according to the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. The resultant data was analyzed using principal component analysis, MANOVA, multiple regression analysis, and chi-square.

This study establishes the presence of contrapower harassment in pharmacy education with 94% of faculty experiencing at least one act of contrapower harassment. Hypothesis 1 endeavored to establish gender differences in the rate of contrapower harassment and revealed male faculty reported higher levels of incivility. While female faculty reported higher levels of distress associated with sexual attention, no gender differences were found in the faculty members' propensity to report the act of harassment. Hypothesis 2 and 3 failed to find a relationship between levels of incivility, bullying, sexual attention, or negative consequences and the faculty demographics of ethnicity, tenure status, or teaching experience. One predictor, terminal degree, was removed as a result of providing little variance with almost all faculty participants reporting a terminal degree. Lastly, hypothesis 4 compared the act of confronting a student for academic dishonesty and its association with increased levels of incivility, bully, and sexual attention behaviors. Confronting a student for academic dishonesty was significantly associated with increases in the reported levels of incivility and bullying, and reduced levels of sexual attention.

The remainder of this chapter will present an in depth review of the major findings, interpretations of the results, limitations of the study, and recommendations for additional research. The chapter ends with a discussion of the implication for positive social change and a summary of the chapter and study.

Interpretation of the Findings

The current study examined the overall research question, is contrapower harassment prevalent in U. S. pharmacy schools? Harassing behaviors were grouped as incivil behaviors, bullying behaviors, aggressive behaviors, and sexual attention. Previous studies of contrapower harassment focused on students' sexual harassment of faculty members (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; Grauerholz, 1989; Matchen & DeSouza, 1989, 2000). Lampman et al. (2009) introduced the first study of contrapower harassment focusing on incivility, bullying, aggression, and sexual attention behaviors. Three earlier studies of contrapower harassment found that an average 96% of faculty reported experiencing one of the student behaviors considered harassment during the last year (DeSouza, 2011; Lampman 2012; Lampman et al., 2009). The current study found similar results; 94% of school of pharmacy faculty reported experiencing at least one act of incivility, bullying, aggressive, or sexual behaviors considered contrapower harassment during the last 12 months. Incivil behaviors were the most prevalent student behavior with 94% of the faculty report experiencing at least one of the behaviors during the past 12 months. The three most prevalent incivil behaviors included a student "engaging in computer usage during a class for purposes unrelated to course" (78%), "engaged in distracting, non-class conversations during class" (81%), and "answering a

cell phone or texting during class" (77%). In comparison, Lampman et al. (2009) found 61% of faculty reported students used a cell phone during class and 78% engaged in distracting, nonclass conversations.

Bullying behaviors followed incivil behaviors in prevalence. The current study showed sixty percent of faculty reported experiencing bullying behaviors during the past 12 months. Bullying behaviors tend to be more aggressive and confrontational than incivility. The most predominant bullying behaviors in the current study included students "submitting inappropriate/hostile comments on course evaluations" (42%), "challenged classroom authority" (35%), and "making derogatory/sarcastic remarks/gestures during class" (27%). In comparison, Lampman (2012) found faculty reported students "challenged your authority during class" (30%), "made derogatory or sarcastic remarks or gestures in class" (30%), and "submitted inappropriate or hostile comments on course evaluations" (28%). An earlier study, Lampman et al. (2009) found faculty reported, "You receive inappropriate or hostile comments on course evaluations" (47%) (p. 195).

The current study, aggressive behaviors emerged as the least socially acceptable behavior for students. with the current study showed only 9% of faculty experiencing at least one episode of aggression during the previous 12 months. The current study indicated the most prevalent acts of aggression are verbal. Items included a student "made a derogatory comment concerning race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation in class" (5%) and "created tensions by dominating class discussions" (4%). In comparison, Lampman (2012) found faculty reported students "made a derogatory comment

concerning race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation in class" (12%) and "created tensions by dominating class discussions" (44%) (p. 195). Although anecdotal in nature, the different frequencies in aggressive behaviors of a verbal nature may be related to the different populations sampled by the studies. Pharmacy faculty reported few derogatory comments made during class or domination of class discussions. Most U.S. pharmacy schools require students to have a laptop computer in the classroom, provide internet connections in the classroom, and expect students to access classroom materials using their laptop and internet. Students may use this platform for contrapower harassment using electronic social media to make derogatory remarks or slander faculty during the class on social media sites without faculty detection. The final measure of contrapower harassment consists of behaviors considered sexual in nature. In the current study, 53% of faculty experienced undesirable sexual attention as an act of contrapower harassment during the past 12 months. In comparison, Lampman et al. (2009) and Lampman (2012) reported 25% of these faculty reported experiencing an act of sexual attention. In the current study, the most prevalent acts of sexual attention, faculty reported students "commented on your physical appearance" (46%), "flirted with you" (19%), and "made a comment of a sexual nature to you" (8%). In comparison, Lampman et al. (2009) reported that students commented on faculty physical appearance (17%), and a student flirted with the faculty member or asked them out (24%). A later study, Lampman (2012) found students "flirted with you" (19%) and "made a sexual comment to you" (8%). Similar to the other measures of contrapower harassment, the acts of sexual attention ranged from mild behaviors such as commenting on physical appearance to more aggressive sexual

behaviors such as asking an inappropriate personal question of a sexual nature. Like the other scales, the percentage of faculty reporting sexual attention behaviors decreases as the level of aggression in sexual attention increases.

At the end of the query , the survey broached the question, "Would you say that you have experienced at least one significant incident of student bullying, aggression, incivility, or unwanted sexual attention during your time as a faculty member?" and provided a space to describe the event. Forty-one percent of the participants responded affirmatively, and 58 participants entered a description of the significant incident. Before statistical analysis of results in the final section, I share three of these descriptions verbatim. These three were chosen because of the inclusion of common themes and interesting descriptions of students' extreme behaviors. The remaining anecdotal reports of participants' significant incidents are presented in Appendix 9.

1. significant (sic) incivility, threatening language, significant aggression, invasion of personal space. I required security in the classroom and escorts across campus and to my car.
2. The student seemed to have an underlying psychiatric disorder. He used the in class problem solving exercise as an example on how I should/could improve my teaching.
3. Inappropriate comments on evaluation. Explaining what type of treatment I need for my mental instability and that I need to quit & go back to a mental hospital as well as receive an enema.

Following the release of the survey, a number of participants called the contact number listed on the survey to express interest in receiving a copy of the study results. They were particularly interested in reading the descriptions of significant incidents entered by the participants. The following sections describe the support or rejection of the study's four hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 sought to determine gender differences in the rate and distress levels of contrapower harassment as measured by the incivility, bullying, and sexual attention scales. The first analysis focused on gender differences in the level of incivility, bullying, aggression, sexual attention, and consequences reported. The current study provided partial support for Hypotheses 1 finding that men reported significantly more incivil behaviors than women did. No other significant differences in the levels of reported bullying, sexual attention, or negative consequences were found. In comparison, the results of previous studies were inconsistent (Lampman, et al., 2009, Lampman, 2012). Lampman et al. (2009) found that men reported significantly more sexual attention from students and women reported significantly more negative consequences. In contrast, Lampman (2012) found that women reported significantly more incivility and bullying than men did. No other significant gender differences in the level of contrapower harassment were found.

The second part of Hypothesis 1 focused on gender differences in the level of distress associated with incivility, bullying, aggression, and sexual attention. The current study found high levels of distress reported by both genders associated with all forms of

harassment. The results provide partial support for the hypothesis with only distress associated with sexual attention significant for gender. Female participants reported experiencing significantly more distress associated with student sexual attention. Previous studies found that women reported significantly more distress caused by incivility, bullying, and sexual attention (Lampman, 2009, Lampman 2012).

The third part of hypothesis 1 focused on gender differences in the level of formal faculty action taken to report student behaviors. Faculty reported student behaviors to the department chair (34%), to the dean of students (23%), and to the dean of the college (21%). A chi-square analysis was completed to detect gender differences in the rate of formal faculty action. No significant gender differences were found between rates of formal faculty action taken to report student behaviors. In contrast, a previous study by Lampman et al. (2009) discovered female faculty significantly more likely to report student behaviors than male faculty.

In summary of hypothesis 1, male faculty reported greater levels of incivility. Female faculty reported greater levels of distress associated with sexual attention. No gender differences in the level of formal faculty actions taken to report harassing student behavior were found.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 used multiple regression to examine the association among incivility, bullying, and sexual attention scales from a set of faculty characteristics (ethnicity, tenure status, and teaching experience). All three analyses failed to show significance. In comparison, Lampman (2012) found four faculty characteristics

associated with increased reports of incivility and bullying behaviors: being a female, racial, or ethnic minority, lesser age, and not having a doctoral degree. The same study found age as a predictor of increased levels of sexual attention. Younger faculty received greater levels of sexual attention (Lampman, 2012). Comparison to Lampman et al. (2009) is made more difficult by this study's focus on gender. Lampman et al. (2009) found that tenure-track and greater experience predicted increased levels of incivility and bullying for female faculty . Lampman et al. also reported that tenure-track male faculty reported more incivility and bullying. Lampman et al. found no significant relationship for sexual attention .

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 used multiple regression analysis to examine the association between reported levels of negative consequences and faculty characteristics of ethnic or racial minority status, tenure status, and years of teaching experience. The results were insignificant. In contrast, Lampman et al. (2009) found that tenure-track status was significant for reported increased levels of negative consequences.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 used MANOVA to determine the effect of faculty experiences of confronting a student with acts of academic dishonesty on faculty members' experience of student incivility, bullying, and sexual attention. Hypothesis 4 was supported. A faculty members' history of confronting a student for academic dishonesty was significant for increased levels of incivility, bullying, and decreased levels of sexual attention. Although no quantitative comparison data exists, Fontana (2009) completed a

qualitative study of nursing faculty's experience of confronting students for academic dishonesty. Interviews of 12 faculty members revealed that confronting a student for academic dishonesty incited students to defend themselves by threatening faculty with lawsuits, damage to personal property, and violent aggression (Fontana, 2009). Students' harassment of the confronting faculty member suggests that the student anticipates that the faculty member will succumb to pressure and recant the report of academic dishonesty in order to avoid further harassment and the potential possibility/expense of a lawsuit. Fontana's (2009) qualitative study brought to light the connection between contrapower harassment and confronting a student with academic dishonesty; in contrast to Fontana's (2009) qualitative study this study quantified the connection between the process of confronting a student for academic dishonesty and increased levels of contrapower harassment. The current study suggests a relationship between the two but cannot definitively identify the act of confronting students for academic dishonesty with heightened levels of contrapower harassment. Faculty who confront students for academic dishonesty may also have heightened awareness of acts of incivility, bullying, and sexual attention. Further, as indicated by Fontana (2009) pharmacy faculty, similar to nursing faculty, may feel an increased responsibility as the gatekeepers of their professions. Further discussion of the implications of contrapower harassment and confronting a student for academic dishonesty, as well as, the effect of contrapower harassment on faculty in general are discussed in the implications section. The following section interprets this study's findings in relationship to the theoretical framework of the study.

Theoretical Support

This study was grounded in the critical systems theories of Habermas (Habermas & Blazek, 1984), organizational theory (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b) and the emancipatory theory of Freire (1996). Both critical systems and emancipatory theories support changing organizational policies that fail to achieve outcomes and harm members of the organization. An earlier qualitative study of nursing faculty by Fontana (2009) revealed that faculty who confronted a student for an act of academic dishonesty faced increased levels of contrapower harassment by students making an attempt to defend themselves from these charges. The current study provides quantitative evidence of high levels of contrapower harassment in another healthcare discipline, pharmacy education. Additionally, the current study provides evidence that a large number of faculty who participated are suffering at the hands of their students. Students' harassment of faculty is both supported by the written organizational policies of the university and the university's unwritten goals of treating the student as a consumer of the university's product. For example, student evaluations of courses are used by school administration to judge courses and faculty teaching performance. Administrative decisions to support faculty advancement and salary increases are based on these evaluations. The current study showed that 42% of faculty reported that their students retaliated by submitting inappropriate hostile remarks on course evaluations. As a result of student harassment, the current study showed, 25% of faculty had difficulty sleeping, 23% suffered significantly increased anxiety and stress, and 6% suffered stress related illness. Findings support the idea that faculty suffer, both personally and professionally, at the hands of

their students. In the current study, pharmacy faculty members described a work environment in which their authority in the classroom is challenged (38%) and students make derogatory sarcastic remarks and gestures in class (27%). Emancipatory theory suggests that universities need to eliminate policies which use student evaluations of courses to evaluate teacher performance and develop policies which have the effect of emancipating and protecting faculty from a punishing environment (Freire, 1996). Student evaluations have been shown to be both biased based on faculty characteristics other than teaching and the requirements of the course (Kramer & Alextich, 2000).

The rising prevalence of academic dishonesty (McCabe, 2009; Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009) reinforces the notion that current organizational strategies designed to curb academic dishonesty are flawed (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Jones, 2011; McCabe, 2009; McCabe et al., 2011). This study exposes one of these flaws. As stated in Chapter 2, up to 90% of students admit to cheating but only 1% are ever confronted with formal charges of academic dishonesty. In the current study, a majority (61%) of the participants of the survey confirmed they had confronted a student for an act of academic dishonesty. As a result, these faculty participants revealed they were significantly more likely to report increased levels of incivility and bullying and less sexual attention for confronting a student for academic dishonesty. In other words, when a student feels threatened by a faculty member confronting the student with a charge of academic dishonesty, the student protects themselves by assaulting the faculty member with incivil and bullying behavior. Current organizational policies fail to recognize the reaction of students to confrontation for academic dishonesty and the potential consequences for

faculty. The study findings suggest that universities must realize the complications presented by contrapower harassment and academic dishonesty while staying mindful of the constituency of higher education.

Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations are associated with this study. The survey instrument used in the study was originally developed by Lampman et al. (2009) to be used on a general university campus. However, participants were not selected randomly; the sample was primarily Caucasian, and non-pharmacy faculty. Thus, some of the survey questions may have limited application to pharmacy. Pharmacy curriculums, along with faculty and students differ from their counterparts in traditional four-year general university programs. For example, most pharmacy programs are lockstep requiring all students to matriculate at the same time and pace. Student failures or punishment for dishonest or unprofessional behavior causes the student to drop behind one year. The result is an increase in time prior to graduation and a number of financial issues tied to the extended time and repayment of student loans. Students' reaction may be more extreme than traditional students who may continue to take classes, repeat a failing class the next semester, or take summer school. Additionally, to avoid failures, the motivation to cheat may be more inflated than for traditional students. The result is that the study's results may not be generalizable to other populations

The current study did not consider the personality traits of the study participants. The awareness of harassment behaviors and its effect on the behavior on the faculty member may be a direct result of personality characteristics. Each faculty member may

interpret student behaviors differently. There is also the possibility that the faculty member may somehow elicit the action of the student. Not all faculty members model perfect behavior. In other words, the faculty member's behavior may warrant the behavior of the student (Lampman, 2009).

The participants were randomly selected from a database of the membership of a national association of pharmacy faculty. The faculty membership of this association may not be reflective of all pharmacy faculty teaching in the U.S. Pharmacy faculty are composed of members with a doctorate of pharmacy and others with a Ph.D. in basic science. Many of the basic science faculty may not be truly represented in the association membership. Instead, they may belong to the association, but choose instead to be active in associations reflective of their research and their Ph.D. concentration. Further, data may not be generalizable to faculty teaching in other healthcare disciplines or at nonhealthcare universities. Without data concerning contrapower harassment of other healthcare disciplines, the results should not be interpreted as indicative of contrapower harassment of faculty in all healthcare disciplines.

The final limitations of the study include non-response error and cross-sectional study design. Faculty participants completing the survey may be those with existing interest in contrapower harassment due to knowledge of or personal experiences with contrapower harassment. Nonrespondents may have not experienced contrapower harassment and have no interest in completing a survey of contrapower harassment. The survey was a cross-sectional survey drawn at one juncture in time. So, it is unclear if the

results would be stable over time or if levels of harassment may be expected to trend upward or downward.

Recommendations

This is the first known study to quantify the prevalence of contrapower harassment in healthcare education. Future survey studies of contrapower harassment in healthcare education should be completed to include healthcare disciplines of nursing, medicine, and physical therapy and compare if rates are equivalent.

The validation of the survey instrument used in this study suggested future areas of research. The current survey instrument was created and validated by a group of Caucasian faculty teaching at a general university. It is unknown if the survey is appropriate for faculty teaching in healthcare education. A pilot study of the existing survey developed by Lampman et al. (2009) is needed to insure existing survey questions apply to healthcare education. This could broaden knowledge of the prevalence of contrapower harassment in healthcare education. Similarly, additional studies of the harassment of healthcare faculty precipitated by confronting a student for academic dishonesty are needed.

Future studies designed to understand the relationship between academic dishonesty and contrapower harassment are needed. Academic dishonesty of students in healthcare education has been estimated at levels exceeding 96% yet less than 1% of these are confirmed and reported by faculty. This study showed a significant relationship between confronting a student with an act of academic dishonesty and increased levels of contrapower harassment. It is unclear if the act of confrontation was the precipitating

event or if the faculty members confronting students for academic dishonesty are the faculty most prone to identify and report acts of incivility, bullying, and sexual attention. A quantitative study designed to clearly identify the relationship between confronting a student for academic dishonesty and the student's reaction to confrontation is needed. In addition to future studies examining the relationship between academic dishonesty and student harassment of faculty, future studies revealing additional faculty characteristics and classroom environments that may increase levels of contrapower harassment need to be identified.

Additional research is needed to understand the university environments which may foster contrapower harassment. Research should endeavor to understand both the personality traits of student and faculty most likely to engage in or be a victim of contrapower harassment. Students' motivation to harass faculty is not well understood. Anecdotally, student harassment of faculty is assumed to be students' way of controlling the classroom. This study revealed that as a result of a significant incident of contrapower harassment, only 2.3% of faculty reported making a change to an assignment or test. A better understanding of student's motivation to harass faculty would predicate policies for effective organizational change.

Implications

The findings from this study have the potential to benefit society. Faculty participants expressed gratitude that the problem of contrapower harassment was confirmed as a reality in pharmacy education. They were optimistic that acknowledging and quantifying the issue of contrapower harassment might instigate an institution-wide

discussion on the problems it causes for pharmacy faculty. The reality of contrapower harassment and its impact on pharmacy educators should initiate discussions challenging administrators to search for remedies to this issue.

In addition, the current study provides new knowledge in an area of contrapower harassment. The study contributes to the overall body of literature encompassing academic dishonesty. As a result, significant social change might evolve from understanding the relationship between contrapower harassment of faculty and its impact on academic dishonesty.

Organizational change may occur through the adoption of programs designed to educate students and faculty to the problem of contrapower harassment and provide a new process to reprimand students found guilty of the behavior. Reducing the harassment of faculty members for confronting students for academic dishonesty, may increase faculty willingness to confront students for cheating. Inversely, students will evolve to become reluctant to commit an act of academic dishonesty within institutions that have established protocols and zero tolerance for academic dishonesty and harassment resulting in the positive outcome of extinguishing, or greatly reducing, the prevalence of both. Understanding faculty characteristics that may contribute to increased levels of student harassment will help university administration both identify at risk faculty and develop training programs tailored to protecting faculty at higher risk.

Conclusion

The harassment of faculty by their students, contrapower harassment, continues to impact faculty teaching in the United States. Benson (1984) introduced Contrapower

harassment. Since then, the prevalence of contrapower harassment has been well documented and shown to be prevalent amongst United States universities. Prior studies reported that up to 96% of faculty in higher education reported experiencing at least one of the study's behaviors during the last 12 months. The prevalence of contrapower harassment in higher education continues to exist. This environment manifests an attitude of entitlement by students who demand high academic achievement without investing significant time or effort into the learning process. Students misplace responsibility for their academic success on faculty and justify behaviors considered aggressive, harassing, interactions with faculty when desired outcomes fail. The impact of contrapower harassment yields a substantial toll on faculty. Confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty, a form of contrapower harassment, inflates levels of harassment resulting in greater consequences for faculty members.

Prior research of contrapower harassment in higher education was limited to general universities. No known study associates increased levels of contrapower harassment with the act of confronting a student for an act of academic dishonesty. No studies addressed the problem of contrapower harassment of faculty teaching in healthcare education. The current study helps to fill these gaps in the research literature.

The current online study surveyed faculty teaching in pharmacy schools throughout the United States. Surveyed faculty (n=110) self-reported their experiences and impact of contrapower harassment during the last twelve months. The results indicate that 94% of pharmacy faculty experienced at least one of the surveyed behaviors. Additionally, 41% reported experiencing a significant contrapower event during their

tenure as a faculty member. Faculty reported negative consequences including difficulty sleeping (25%), work productivity decreases (15%), felt like quitting their job (11%), and depression (4%) as a result of contrapower harassment.

In summary, this study establishes the presence of contrapower in pharmacy education as occurring for almost all respondents. Male faculty reported higher levels of incivility while female faculty reported higher levels of distress associated with sexual attention. The act of confronting a student for academic dishonesty is associated with increased levels of bullying and incivility and decreased levels of sexual attention.

Contrapower harassment is emerging as a major problem in higher education. The knowledge gained by studies of contrapower harassment should be used to develop university environments which redirects students from harassing neither faculty or cheating to get ahead. These changes may result in a work environment in which faculty can facilitate learning without fear of reprisal in the form of mental and physical abuse.

References

AACP, (2014).American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. From http://www.aacp.org/Pages/Default.aspx

Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (2013). Standards. Retrieved from https://www.acpe-accredit.org/standards/

Aggarwal, R., Bates, I., Davies, J., & Khan, I. (2002). A study of academic dishonesty among students at two pharmacy schools, *Pharmaceutical Journal, 269*(7219) 529 - 533.

Aiken, L. R. (1991). Detecting, understanding, and controlling for cheating on tests. *Research in Higher Education, 32*, 725-736. doi:10.1007/BF00974740

Allenye, P., & Phillips, K. (2011). Exploring dishonesty among university students Barbados: An extension to the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 9*, 323-338. doi: 10.1007/s10805-011-9144-1

Andrews, D., Nonnecke, B., Preece, J. (2003). Electronic survey methodology: A case study in reaching hard to involve internet users. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 16*(2), 185-210. doi: 10.1207/S15327590IJHC1602_04

Anitsal, M., Anitsal, I., & Elmore, R. (2011). Active versus passive academic dishonesty: Comparative perceptions of accounting versus non-accounting majors. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues, 14*(2). Retrieved from http://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-2439570771/active-versus-passive-academic-dishonesty-comparative

Anton, D. L., & Michael, W. B. (1983). Short-term predictive validity of demographic, affective, personal, and cognitive variables in relation to 2 criterion measures of cheating behaviors. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 43*, 467-483. doi: 10.1177/001316448304300216

Austin, Z., Collins, A., Remillard, S., & Kelcher, S. (2006).Influences of attitudes toward curriculum on dishonest behavior. *American Journal of Pharmacy Education, 70*(3), 1-9. doi: 10.5688/aj700350

Austin, Z., Simpson, S., & Reynen, E. (2005). The fault relies not in our students, but in ourselves: academic honesty and moral development in health professions education-results of a pilot study in Canadian pharmacy. *Teaching in Higher Education, 10*(2) 143-156.doi: 10.1080/1356251042000337918

Baer, J. & Cheryomukhin, A. (2011).Students' distress over grades: Entitlement or a coping response. *Journal of Social Work Education 47*(3), 565-577. doi:10.5175/JSWE.2011.200900127

Baird, J. S. (1980). Current trends in college cheating. *Psychology in the Schools, 17*, 515-522. doi: 10.1002/1520-6807(198010)17:4<515::AID-PITS2310170417>3.0.CO;2-3

Bates, I. P., Davies, J. G., Murphy, C., & Bone, A. (2005). A multi-faculty exploration of academic dishonesty. *Pharmacy Education (5)*1, 69-76. doi: 10.1080/15602210500086264

Benson, K. A. (1984). Comments on Crocker's 'An Analysis of University Definitions of Sexual Harassment.' *Signs, 9,* 516-519.

Boehm, P.J., Justice, M., & Weeks, S. (2009). Promoting academic integrity in higher education. The Community College Experience (spring) 45-61

Bolman, L. G., Deal, T. E. (1991). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management, 30*(4), 509-534**. d**oi: 10.1002/hrm.3930300406

Bowers, W. J. (1964). Student dishonesty and its control in college. New York: Bureau of Applied Research, Columbia University

Bowers, T. D. (2011). Towards a framework for multiparadigm multimethodologies. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science Systems Research, 28*, 537-552. doi: 10.1002/sres.1120

Bunn, D., Caudill, S., & Gropper, D. (1992). Crime in the classroom: an economic analysis of undergraduate student cheating behavior. *Journal of Economic Education 23*(3), 197-207. doi:10.1080/00220485.1992.10844753

Brown, R., Tamorski, M., Xiaoqian, W., Barnes, C., Mumford, M., Connelly, S., & Devenport, L. (2011). Moral credentialing and the rationalization of misconduct. *Ethics & Behavior, 2*(1), 1-12. doi: 10.1080/10508422.2011.537566

Brown, B. S., Weible, B. J., &Olmosk, K. (2010). Business school deans on student academic dishonesty: A survey. *College Student Journal, 44*(2), 299-308.

Cain, J., Romanelli, F., & Smith, K. (2012). Academic entitlement in pharmacy education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 76*(10), 1-8. doi:10.5688/ajpe7610189

Chowning, K, & N. C. Campbell (2009). Development and validation of a measure of academic entitlement: Individual differences in student's externalized responsibility and entitled expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology 101*(4), 982-987. doi:10.1037/a0016351.

Christakis, E., & Christakis, N. (2012, September 4). Harvard cheating scandal: Is academic dishonesty on the rise? *Time.* Retrieved from http://ideas.time.com/2012/09/04/harvard-cheating-scandal-is-academic-dishonesty-on-the-rise/

Christensen-Hughes, J., M. (2006a). Understanding academic misconduct. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 36*(1), 49-63.

Christensen-Hughes, J. M., & McCabe, D. L. (2006b). Understanding academic misconduct. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 36*(1), 49-63.

Cole, S. & McCabe, D. L. (1996). Issues in academic integrity. *New Directions for Student Services, (73),* 67-77. doi: 10.1002/ss.37119967307.

Colnerud, G., & Rosander, M. (2009). Academic dishonesty, ethical norms and learning, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 34*(5), 505-517. doi:1 0.1080/02602930802155263

Cook, C. (2011). Email interviewing: generating data with a vulnerable population. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 68*(6), 1330-1339, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2011.0584

Cook, C., Heath, F., & Thompson, R. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of response rates in web- or internet-based surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60*, 821-836. doi: 10.1177/00131640021970934

Creswell, J.W. (2009). Research design: *Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi:10.1016/j.math.2010.09.003

Crocker, P. L. (1983). An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8*(4), 696-707. DOI: 10.1086/494004

Crown, D. F. & Spiller, M. S. (1998). Learning from the literature on collegiate cheating: A review of empirical research. *Journal of Business Ethics, 17*, 683-700. doi: 10.1023/A:1017903001888

Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H., McGregor, L. N. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. *Teaching of Psychology, 19*, 16-20. doi: 10.1207/s15328023top1901_3

Delucchi, M., & Korgen, K. (2002). "We're the Customer-We Pay the Tuition": Student Consumerism among Undergraduate Sociology Majors. Teaching Sociology, 30(1), 100–107. Retrieved from doi/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.95

DeSouza, E. R. (2011). Frequency rates and correlates of contrapower harassment in higher education. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(1), 158-188. doi: 10.1177/0886260510362878

DeSouza, E. R., & Fansler, G. (2003). Contrapower sexual harassment: A survey of students and faculty members. *Sex roles, 48*(11/12), 529-542. doi: 10.1023/A:1023527329364

DeSouza, E. R., & Ribeiro, J. (2005). Bullying and sexual harassment among Brazilian high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20,* 1018-1038. doi: 10.1177/0886260505277731

DeSouza, E. R., & Vasquez, J. (2011). Student aggression in higher education: Frequency rates, psychological outcomes, and coping strategies among faculty members. 2011 Convention Presentation, *American Psychological Association.* doi: 10.1023/A:1023527329364

DiBartolo, M. C., & Walsh, C. M., (2010). Desperate times call for desperate measures: Where are we in addressing academic dishonesty? *Journal of Nursing Education, 49*(10), 543-546. doi: 10.3928/01484834-20100921-01

Dubovsky, S, L. (1986). Coping with entitlement in medical education. *New England Journal of Medicine, 315*(25), 1672-1674. doi: 10.1056/NEJM198612253152609

Eastman, J. K., Iyer, R., & Eastman, K. L. (2006). Addressing academic dishonesty: The *implications* for business schools, professors, and students. *Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education, 9*, 1-8. doi: 10.1007/s10734-007-9065-5

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*, 175-191. doi: 10.3758/BF03193146

Fontana, J. (2009). Nursing faculty experiences of students' academic dishonesty. *Journal of Nursing Education, 48*(4), 181-185. doi: 10.3928/01484834-20090401-05

Freed, J. (2001, April 19) Wealthy Kansas City pharmacist dilutes cancer patients IV chemo drugs. (Associated Press) Retrieved from http://allnurses.com/nursing-activism-healthcare/wealthy-kansas-city-9205.html

Freire, P. (1986). New York: Continuum.

French, A., Macedo, M., Poulsen, J., Waterson, T., & Yu, A. (2014). Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). *San Francisco State University*. Downloaded from http://userwww.sfsu.edu/efc/classes/biol710/manova/MANOVAnewest.pdf

Galbraith, M. W., & Jones, M. S. (2010). Understanding incivility in online teaching. *Journal of Adult Education, 39*, 1-10. Retrieved from https://www.mpaea.org/?page=publications

Gallant, T. B. (2008). Moral panic: The contemporary context of academic integrity. ASHE Higher Education Report, 33(5), 1-12. doi: 10.1002/aehe.3305

Gallant, T. & Drinan, P. (2006a) Institutionalizing academic integrity: Administrator perceptions and institutional actions. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 43*(4), p. 61-81. http://dx.doi.org/10.2202/0027-6014.1723

Gallant, T. & Drinan, P. (2006b). Organizational theory and student cheating: Explanation, responses, and strategies. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(5), 839-860. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2006.0041Gehrin, D. & Pavela, G. (1994). Issues and perspectives on academic integrity. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

George, D. & Mallery, P. (2009). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 16.0 update* (9th Ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Grammarly (2014). Accessed on January 14, 2014 at http://ed.grammarly.com/editor/view

Grauerholz, E. (1989). Sexual harassment of women professors by students: Exploring the *dynamics* of power, authority and gender in a university setting. *Sex Roles, 21*(11-12), 789-801. doi: 10.1007/BF00289809

Greenberger, E., Lessard, J., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. (2008). Self-entitled college students: Contributions of personality, parenting, and motivational factors. *Journal Youth Adolescence, 37*, 1193-1204. doi: 10.1007/s10964-008-9284-9

Habermas, J.& Blazek, J. (1984).The idea of the university learning process. *New German Critique, 41*, 3-23. doi: 10.2307/488273

Haines, V. J., Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., & Clark, R. E. (1986).College cheating: immaturity, lack of commitment and the neutralizing attitude. *Research in Higher Education, 25*, 342-354. doi: 10.1007/BF00992130

Hancock, Darryl J. (2011) "Faculty Beliefs Regarding Online Academic Dishonesty and the Measures Taken to Address Academic Dishonesty in Georgia" (2011). ***Electronic Theses & Dissertations.*** Paper 343. http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/343 Happel, S. & Jennings, M. (2008). An economic analysis of academic dishonesty and its deterrence in higher education. *Journal of Legal Studies Education, 25*(2), 183-214. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-1722.2008.00051.x

Hardigan, P. C. (2004). First and third year pharmacy students' attitudes toward cheating behaviors. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 68* (5), 1-5.

Harding, T., Passow, H., Carpenter, D., & Finelli, C. (2004). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and professional behavior. *IEEE Antennas and Propagation Magazine, 46*(5), 133-138. doi: 10.1109/FIE.2003.1265933

Harp, J. & Taietz, P. (1966). Academic integrity and social structure: A study of cheating among college students. *Social Problems, 13*, 365-373. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/798585

Heerwegh, D. (2009). Mode differences between face-to-face and web surveys: An experimental investigation of data quality and social desirability effects. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research 21*(1), 111-121. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/edno54.

Heiervang, E. & Goodman, R. (2011). Advantages and limitations of web-surveys: evidence from a child mental health survey. *Social Psychiatry and Epidemiology, 46,* 69-76. doi: 10.1007/s00127-009-0171-9.

Hilbert, G. A., (1988). Moral development and unethical behavior among nursing students. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 3*, 163-167. doi:10.1016/S8755-7223(88)80133-9

Hollinger, R. C. & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (2009). Academic dishonesty and the perceived effectiveness of countermeasures: An empirical survey of cheating at a major

university. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators' Journal,* 46(4), 587-602. doi: 10.2202/1949-6605.5033

Hughes, J.M. & McCabe, D.L. (2006a). Academic misconduct within higher education in Canada, *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 36*(2), 1-21.

Hughes, J.M. & McCabe, D.L. (2006b). Understanding academic misconduct. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education: 36*(1), 49-63.

Jackson, M. (2010). Reflections on the development and contribution of critical systems thinking and practice. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science, 27,* 133-139. doi: 10.1002/sres.1020.

Johnson, D.C. (2008). Thinking critically about assessing online learning. *International Journal of Learning, 14*(12), 125-130.

Jones, D. (2011). Academic dishonesty: Are more students cheating? *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(2), 141-150. doi: 10.1177/1080569911404059

Jordan, A. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics and Behavior, 11*(3), 233-247. doi:10.1207/S15327019EB1103_3

Josien, L. & Broderick, B. (2013). Cheating in higher education: The case of multi-methods cheaters. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 17*(3), 93-105.

Keith-Seigel, P., Tabachnick, B., Whitley, B., & Washburn, J. (1998). Why professors ignore cheating: Opinions of a national sample of psychology instructors. *Ethics and Behavior, 8*(3), 215-227. doi: 10.1207/s15327019eb0803_3

Klein, H., Levenburg, N., McKendall, M., &Mothersell, W. (2007). Cheating During the College Years: How do Business School Students Compare? *Journal Of Business Ethics*, *72*(2), 197-206. doi: 10.1007/s10551-006-9165-7

Knudsen , P., Herborg, H., Mortensen, A. R., Knudsen, M., Helebek, A.(2007). *Quality and Safety in Health Care,16*(6),291-296. doi: 10.1136/qshc.2006.018770

Kolanko, K. M., Clark, C., Heinrich, D. O., Serembus, J. F., & Sifford, K. S. (2006). Academic dishonesty, bullying, incivility, and violence: Difficult challenges facing nurse educators. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, *27*(1), 34-43. http://dx.doi.org/10.1043/1094-2831(2006)027[0034:ADBIAV]2.0.CO;2

Kramer, G. L., Hanson, C. M., & Olsen, D. (2011). The pursuit of increased learning: Coalescing assessment strategies at a large university. *I R Application*, 30, 2-24.

Lampman, C. (2012). Women faculty at risk: U.S. professors report on their experiences with student incivility, bullying, aggression, and sexual attention. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 5*(2), 184-208. doi: 10.1515/njawhe-2012-1108

Lampman, C., Phelps, A., Bancroft, S., & Beneke, M. (2009). Contrapower harassment in academia: A survey of faculty experience with student incivility, bullying, and sexual attention. *Sex Roles, 60,* 331-346. doi: 10.1007/s1199-008-9560-x.

Ledwith, M. (2007). On being critical: uniting theory and practice through emancipatory action research. Educational Action Research, 15(4), 597-611. doi: 10.1080/09650790701664021.

Lim, S. Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 95-107. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.95

Long, G. & Lake, E. (1996). A precondition for ethical teaching: Clarity about role and inequality. *Teaching Sociology, 24*(1), 111-113. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1318906

Lovett-Hooper, G., Komarraju, M., Weston, R., & Dollinger, S. (2007). Is plagiarism a forerunner of other deviance? Imagined futures of academically dishonest students. *Ethics and Behavior, 17*(3), 323-336. doi: 10.1080/10508420701519387

Lowery, J. W. & Dannells, M. (2004). Contemporary practice in student judicial affairs: Strengths and weaknesses. In D.R. Karp & T. Allena (Eds.), *Restorative justice on the college campus: Promoting student growth and responsibility, and reawakening the spirit of campus community.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Lumsden, J. & Morgan, W. (2005). Online-questionnaire design: Establishing guidelines and evaluating existing support, *Managing Modern Organizations Through Information Technology*. doi: 10.4018/978-1-59140-822-2.ch098

Matchen, J. & DeSouza (2000). The sexual harassment of faculty members by students. *Sex Roles, 42*(3/4), 295-306. doi: 10.1023/A:1007099408885

McCabe, D. L. (2009). Academic dishonesty in nursing schools: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Nursing Education, 48*(11), 614-607. doi: 10.3928/01484834-20090716-07

McCabe, D. L., & Bowers, W. J. (1994). Academic dishonesty among males in college: A thirty year perspective. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35, 5–10.

McCabe, D. L. & Bowers, W., J. (2009). The relationship between student cheating and college fraternity or sorority membership. *NASPA Journal, 46*(4), 573-586. doi: 10.2202/1949-6605.5032

McCabe, D. L. & Drinan, P. (1999). Toward a culture of academic integrity. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*(8), p7.

McCabe, D. L. & Pavela, G. (2005). New honor codes for a new generation. *Inside Higher Education.* Retrieved from: http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2005/03/11/pavela1

McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. T. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *The Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 522-538. doi: 10.2307/2959991

McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multi-campus investigation. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(3), 370-396. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40196302

McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college. *Change, 28*(1), 29-33. doi: 10.1080/00091383.1996

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L.D., & Butterfield, K.D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics and Behavior, 11,* 219. doi: 10.1207/S15327019EB1103_2

McGee, P. (2013). Supporting academic honesty in online courses. *The Journal of Educators Online, 10*(1). Retrieved on January 1, 2014 from http://www.thejeo.com/Archives/Volume10Number1/McGee.pdf

McKendall, M., Klein, H., Levenburg, N., & de la Rosa, D. (2010). College student cheating and perceived instructor fairness. *Journal of the Academy of Business Education, 11*, 14-32.

Mertler, C. A. & Vannatta, R. A. (2010). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation* (4th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak.

Michaels, J. W. & Miethe, T. D. (2011). Applying theories of deviance to academic cheating. *Social Science Quarterly, 70*(4), 870-885.

Muhney, K., Gutmann, M., Schneiderman, E., Dewald, J., McCann, A., & Campbell, P. (2008). Prevalence of academic dishonesty in Texas dental hygiene programs. *Journal of Dental Hygiene,* 82*(5), 52.*

Murthy, P. N. (2000). Complex societal problem solving: A possible set of methodological criteria. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science System Research, 17*, 73-101. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1743(200001/02)17:13.0.CO;2-I.

Naidoo, R., Shankar, A., & Veer, E. (2011). The consumerist turn in higher education: Policy aspirations and outcomes. *Journal of Marketing Management, 27*(11/12), 1142-1162. doi: 10.1080/0267257X.2011.609135

Nazir, M. S., Aslam, M. S., Nawaz, M. M. (2011). Can demography predict academic dishonest behaviors of students? A case of Pakistan. *International Education Studies, 4*(2), 208-217. doi: 10.5539/ies.v4n2p208

NG, H. W., Davies, G., Bates, I., & Avellone, M. (2003). Academic dishonesty among pharmacy students: Investigating academic dishonesty behaviours in undergraduates. *Pharmacy Education, 3*(4), 261-269. doi: 10.1080/15602210310001643375

Nonis, S., & Swift, C., (2001). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multi-campus investigation. *Journal of Education for Business, 77*(2), 69-76. doi: 10.1080/08832320109599052

Nordstrom, C. R., Bartels, L. K., & Bucy, J. (2009). Predicting and curbing classroom incivility in higher education. *College Student Journal, 43*(1), 74-85

Osborne, J., & Waters, E. (2002). Four assumption of multiple regression that researchers should always test. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation, 8*(2). doi: 10.1.1.463.508&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Paik, C., & Broedel-Zaugg, K. (2006). Pharmacy students' opinions on civility and preferences regarding professors. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education 70*(4):88. doi: 10.5688/aj700488

Passow, H. J., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., Harding, T. S., & Carpenter D. D. (2006). Factors influencing engineering students' decision to cheat by type of assessment. *Research in Higher Education, 47*, 643-684. doi: 10.1007/s11162-006-9010-y

Pharmacists play key role in reducing medication errors among hospitalized patients. *Penn Medicine.* Retrieved from: http://news.pennmedicine.org/blog/2012/06/pharmacists-reduce-medication-errors.html

Pino, N. W. & Smith, W. L. (2003). College students and academic dishonesty. *College Student Journal, 37*(4), 490-500.

Rabbi, S. M., Patton, L. R., Fjortoft, N., & Azarrick, D. P. (2006).Characteristics, prevalence, attitudes, and perceptions of academic dishonesty among pharmacy students. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *70*(4), 1-8. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbq078

Ravasco, G. G. (2012). Technology-aided cheating in open and distance e-learning. *Asian Journal of Distance Education, 10*(2), 71-77. doi: 10.1007/s10734-006-9047-z

Rennie, S. C., Crosby, J. R. (2001). Are "tomorrow's doctors" honest? Questionnaire study exploring medical students' attitudes and reported behavior on academic misconduct. *British Medical Journal, 322*(7281), 274-275. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.322.7281.274

Ryan, G., Bonanno, H., & Krass, I. (2009). Undergraduate and postgraduate pharmacy students' perceptions of plagiarism and academic honesty. American Journal of Pharmacy Education, 73(6), doi: 10.5688/aj7306105

S. 250--111th Congress: Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2009. (2009). In www.GovTrack.us. Retrieved January 1, 2014, from http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/111/s250

Schmelkin, L., Gilbert, K., Spencer, K., Pincus, H., & Silva, R. (2008). A multidimensional scaling of college students' perceptions of academic dishonesty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 79*(5), 587-607. doi: 10.1353/jhe.0.0021

Schneider, M. (2002). Do school facilities affect educational outcomes? *Educational Resources Education Center.* Retrieved from: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED470979.pdf

Simkin, M.G. & McLeod, A. (2009). Why Do College Students Cheat? *Journal of Business Ethics, 94*, 441-453. doi: 10.1007/sl0551-009-0275-x

Singleton-Jackson J, Jackson D, Reinhardt J. (2010). Students as consumers of knowledge: are they buying what we're selling? *Innovations High Educ*ation 35,343–358. doi 10.1007/s10755-010-9151-y

Singleton-Jackson, J., Jackson, D., & Reinhardt, J. (2011). Academic entitlement: Exploring definitions and dimensions of entitled students. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 5*(9), 229-236. doi: 10.1007/s10755-010-9151-y

SurveyMonkey (2014). Retrieved from https://www.surveymonkey.com

Staats, S., Hupp, J. M., Wallace, & Gresley, J. (2009). Heroes don't cheat: An examination of academic dishonesty and students' views on why professors don't report cheating. *Ethics and Behavior, 19*(3). 171-183. doi:10.105088420802623716.

Straw, D. (2002). The plagiarism of generation 'why not'?. *Community College Week, 14*, 4-7.

Stuber-McEwen, D., Wiseley, P., & Hoggatt, S.(2010). Point, click, and cheat: Frequency and type of academic dishonesty in the virtual classroom. Online Journal of

Distance Learning Administration. Retrieved January 1, 2014 fromhttp://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall123/stuber123.html

Tang, S. & Zuo, J. (1997). Profile of college examination cheaters. *College Student Journal, 31,* 340-346.

Tippitt, M. , Ard, N., & Kline, J. (2009). Creating environments that foster academic integrity. *Nursing Education Perspective, 30*(4), 239-244. http://dx.doi.org/10.1043/1536-5026-030.004.0239

Turnitin (2014).Accessed on January 15, 2014 at http://turnitin.com/en_us/features/overview

Vonderwell, S., Xin, L., & Alderman, K. (2007). Asynchronous discussions and assessment in online learning. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education,* 39(3), 309-328. doi: 10.1080/15391523.2007.10782485

Vowell, P. R. & Chen, J. (2004). Predicting academic misconduct: A comparative test of four sociological explanations. *Sociological Inquiry, 74,* (2), 226-249. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-682X.2004.00088.x

Ward, D. A. & Beck, W. L. (1990). Self-esteem and dishonesty behavior revisited. *Journal of Social Psychology, 126,* 709-713. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1986.9713652

Watson, G. & Sottile, J. (2010). Cheating in the digital age: Do students cheat more in online courses? *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 8*(1). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring131/watson131.html

Watson, S. & Watson, W. R. (2011). Critical, Emancipatory, and Pluralistic Research for Education: A Review of Critical Systems Theory. *Journal Of Thought*, *46*(3/4), 63-77. doi: c5ed4eb4e60c57002212d7f8c681d01f

Whitley, B. E. (1998). Factors Associated with Cheating Among College Students: A Review. *Research in Higher Education, 39* (3), 235-274. doi: 10.1023/A:1018724900565

Whitley, H. & Starr, J. (2010). Academic dishonesty among pharmacy students: does portable technology play a role? *Current Pharmacy Learning,* 2(2), 94-99. doi:10.1016/j.cptl.2010.01.009

Williams, A., E. & Janosik, S. M. (2007).An examination of academic dishonesty among sorority and nonsorority women. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(6), 706-714. doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2010.01.009

Appendix A: Informed Consent

Study Title: Determining the Level and Impact of Student Harassment of Faculty Teaching In U. S. Schools of Pharmacy

Principal Investigator: Joel M. Epps

Walden University

joel.epps@waldenu.edu or [redacted]

Description of the Study:

This study concerns school of pharmacy faculty experiences of harassment perpetrated by their students including acts of aggression, bullying, incivility, and sexual attention. You were selected randomly from a list of faculty teaching at U.S. pharmacy schools. This study hopes to document prevalence of such student behaviors at schools of pharmacy, and determine the impact on faculty members' lives. In this 15 minute online survey you will be asked to indicate whether or not you have experienced various student behaviors during the past 12 months (ranging from minor incivility such as texting in class to requests for dates and threats of harm or actual violence). You will be asked questions about the most serious incident experienced, including (1) how you handled the experience, (2) the impact it had on your physical and emotional health and/or work life, and (3) details about the student and incident itself. Finally, you are asked some questions about your rank, tenure status, teaching load and personal characteristics.

Risks/Benefits:

There are no direct benefits to you related to participation in this study. The information provided in this study may benefit university's understanding of student harassment of faculty leading to policies designed to eliminate harmful behavior and protect at-risk faculty.

It is possible that answering questions about your experience with student incivility, bullying, aggression, and unwanted sexual attention could be upsetting to you. In the event that participating in this survey produces emotional distress please contact:

National Emotional Distress/Suicide Hotline 1-800-273-TALK (8255) free 24/7

Other online resources concerning adult bullying can be found at:
http://www.washingtonea.org/index.php?option=com_content&id=470:adult-to-adult-bullying&Itemid=86

Many student behaviors described herein may violate your institution's policies or are criminal in nature. Please follow institutional policies or make a report to local law enforcement.

To insure confidentiality and anonymity, no link (IP address) between the participant and their survey responses is maintained or made known to the researcher.

Compensation:

There is no compensation for completing this survey.

Contact Information:If you have questions, contact Joel Epps at the email listed above. Questions about your rights as a participant please contact a representative of Walden University I.R.B. at (612) 312-1210. Reference: I.R.B. 12-10-14-0123430 Expiration Date: 12/9/2015

Appendix B: Consent to Use Instrumentation

Claudia

Dr. Claudia Lampman
Professor and Chair
Department of Psychology
University of Alaska Anchorage
(

From: Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2013 2:21 PM
To:
Subject: RE: Contrapower Harassment in Academia: A Survey of Faculty Experience with Student Incivility, Bullying, and Sexual Attention

Hello Claudia,
Thank you! Yes I would like to talk to you as I get a little more into the study.
Joel

From:
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2013 4:54 PM
To: Epps, Joel
Subject: RE: Contrapower Harassment in Academia: A Survey of Faculty Experience with Student Incivility, Bullying, and Sexual Attention

Hi Joel,
I am attaching the survey from my most recent study and a copy of that article. You have my permission to use the instrument. Feel free to give me a call if you would like to discuss this.

Good luck with your research!

Claudia

From: Epps, **Sent:** Wednesday, February 13, 2013 1:50 PM
To: Claudia B Lampman
Subject: Contrapower Harassment in Academia: A Survey of Faculty Experience with Student Incivility, Bullying, and Sexual Attention

Hello,
My name is Joel Epps. I teach at Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center School of Pharmacy located in Amarillo, Texas. I am interested in researching the impact of contrapower harassment as described in your article within the pharmacy school environment. I am fascinated by your study's results, particularly that 1 in 10 faculty members reported changing their behavior or rather classroom plans due to experiences with a harassing student. I would like to gain permission to use the survey instrument you developed with a population of faculty members teaching within the pharmacy curriculum.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Joel M. Epps

Appendix C: Survey

Please indicate the approximate number of times during the past 12 months a student:

	0 times	1 time	2 times	3 times	4 times	5 or more times
Challenged your authority during class	○	○	○	○	○	○
Continually interrupted you during class	○	○	○	○	○	○
Questioned your credentials or qualifications to teach a course	○	○	○	○	○	○
Showed disdain or disapproval during class (e.g., groaning, rolling eyes, frowning)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Made derogatory or sarcastic remarks or gestures in class	○	○	○	○	○	○
Requested that you make your exams or assignments easier	○	○	○	○	○	○
Demanded make-up exams or extensions not usually offered	○	○	○	○	○	○
Engaged in a non-class activity (e.g., knitting or reading newspaper) during class	○	○	○	○	○	○
Slept during your class	○	○	○	○	○	○
Answered a cell phone or texted during class	○	○	○	○	○	○
Engaged in distracting, non-class conversations during class	○	○	○	○	○	○
Used a computer during a class for purposes unrelated to course (e.g., on Myspace)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Made a hostile or threatening comment during a class	○	○	○	○	○	○
Arrived very late or departed very early	○	○	○	○	○	○

3. Frequency of Uncivil, Bullying, and Aggressive Student Behaviors, continued

Please indicate the approximate number of times during the past 12 months a student:

	0 times	1 time	2 times	3 times	4 times	5 or more times
Violated your personal space during a disagreement	○	○	○	○	○	○
Hit something or threw an object at you in anger	○	○	○	○	○	○
Made a threatening or intimidating communication (e.g., lawsuits or grievances)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Yelled or screamed at you	○	○	○	○	○	○
Submitted inappropriate or hostile comments on course evaluations	○	○	○	○	○	○
Made a death threat to you or one of your colleagues	○	○	○	○	○	○
Threatened physical harm to you	○	○	○	○	○	○
Spread rumors or gossip about you (e.g., about drug use or sexual behavior)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Contacted you outside of school without your permission	○	○	○	○	○	○
Accused you of racism, sexism, or discrimination in response to an undesired grade	○	○	○	○	○	○
Attacked you physically	○	○	○	○	○	○
Damaged your personal or university property	○	○	○	○	○	○
Attempted to bribe you (with money or goods) for a better grade	○	○	○	○	○	○

4. How Distressing You Find Uncivil, Bullying, and Aggressive Student Behavior

Regardless of your actual experience, please rate how distressed you would feel if a student:

	Not at all distressed	A little bit distressed	Moderately distressed	Extremely distressed
Challenged your authority during class	○	○	○	○
Continually interrupted you during class	○	○	○	○
Questioned your credentials or qualifications to teach a course	○	○	○	○
Showed disdain or disapproval during class (e.g., groaning, rolling eyes, frowning)	○	○	○	○
Made derogatory or sarcastic remarks or gestures in class	○	○	○	○
Requested that you make your exams or assignments easier	○	○	○	○
Demanded make-up exams or extensions not usually offered	○	○	○	○
Engaged in a non-class activity (e.g., knitting or reading newspaper) during class)	○	○	○	○
Slept during your class	○	○	○	○
Answered a cell phone or texted during class	○	○	○	○
Engaged in distracting, non-class conversations during class	○	○	○	○
Used a computer during a class for purposes unrelated to course (e.g., on Myspace)	○	○	○	○
Created tension by dominating classroom discussions	○	○	○	○

	Not at all distressed	A little bit distressed	Moderately distressed	Extremely distressed
Made a hostile or threating comment during a class	○	○	○	○
Arrived very late or departed very early	○	○	○	○

5. How Distressing You Find Uncivil, Bullying, and Aggressive Student Behavior

Regardless of your actual experience, please rate how distressed you would feel if a student:

	Not at all distressd	A little bit distressed	Moderately distressed	Extremely distressed
Violated your personal space during a disagreement	○	○	○	○
Hit something or threw an object at you in anger	○	○	○	○
Made a threatening or intimidating communication (e.g., lawsuits or grievances)	○	○	○	○
Yelled or screamed at you	○	○	○	○
Submitted inappropriate or hostile comments on course evaluations	○	○	○	○
Made a death threat to you or one of your colleagues	○	○	○	○
Threatened physical harm to you	○	○	○	○
Spread rumors or gossip about you (e.g., about drug use or sexual behavior)	○	○	○	○
Contacted you outside of school without your permission	○	○	○	○
Accused you of racism, sexism, or discrimination in response to an undesired grade	○	○	○	○
Attacked you physically	○	○	○	○
Damaged your personal or university property	○	○	○	○
Attempted to bribe you (with money or goods) for a better grade	○	○	○	○

	Not at all distressd	A little bit distressed	Moderately distressed	Extremely distressed
Made a derogatory comment concerning race, ethnicity, sex, or sexual orientation during a class	○	○	○	○
Stalked or followed you	○	○	○	○
Used or threatened to use a weapon against you	○	○	○	○

6. Frequency of Sexual Student Behaviors

Please indicate the approximate number of times during the past 12 months a student:

	0 times	1 time	2 times	3 times	4 times	5 or more times
Commented on your physical appearance	○	○	○	○	○	○
Made a sexual comment to you	○	○	○	○	○	○
Flirted with you	○	○	○	○	○	○
Asked you out on a date	○	○	○	○	○	○
Made a sexual advance or proposition directed at you	○	○	○	○	○	○
Offered sexual favors in exchange for grades	○	○	○	○	○	○
Touched you or made unwanted physical contact with you	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ogled or looked at you suggestively	○	○	○	○	○	○
Displayed sexual body language	○	○	○	○	○	○
Misinterpreted your behavior as sexual interest	○	○	○	○	○	○
Asked an inappropriate question about your sex life	○	○	○	○	○	○
Spread rumors of a sexual nature about you	○	○	○	○	○	○
Alleged improper sexual behavior	○	○	○	○	○	○
Made a sexist comment to you	○	○	○	○	○	○

7. How Distressing you Find Sexual Student Behaviors

Regardless of your actual experience, please rate how distressed you would feel if a student:

	Not at all distressed	A little bit distressed	Moderately distressed	Extremely distressed
Commented on your physical appearance	○	○	○	○
Made a sexual comment to you	○	○	○	○
Flirted with you	○	○	○	○
Asked you out on a date	○	○	○	○
Made a sexual advance or proposition directed at you	○	○	○	○
Offered sexual favors in exchange for grades	○	○	○	○
Touched you or made unwanted physical contact with you	○	○	○	○
Ogled or looked at you suggestively	○	○	○	○
Displayed sexual body language	○	○	○	○
Misinterpreted your behavior as sexual interest	○	○	○	○
Asked an inappropriate question about your sex life	○	○	○	○
Spread rumors of a sexual nature about you	○	○	○	○
Alleged improper sexual behavior	○	○	○	○
Made a sexist comment to you	○	○	○	○

8. Significant Incident of Student Aggression, Bullying, Incivility or Sexual Behavior

Would you say that you have experienced at least one significant incident of student bullying, aggression, incivility, or unwanted sexual attention during your time as a faculty member?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

9. Most Serious Incident of Student Aggression, Bullying, Incivility or Sexual Behavior

For this set of questions, please think about the most serious incident of student bullying, incivility, aggression, or unwanted sexual attention that you have experienced during your teaching career.

What was the student's sex?

- ◯ Male
- ◯ Female

Was the student an undergraduate or graduate student?

- ◯ undergraduate
- ◯ graduate
- ◯ Don't know

What was the student's approximate age?

- ◯ 21 or younger
- ◯ 22-29
- ◯ 30-39
- ◯ 40-49
- ◯ 50 or older

In a few sentences, can you describe the troubling student behavior

[ ]

10. Impact of Student Aggression, Bullying, Incivility, and Sexual Attention

For this set of questions, please think about the most serious incident of student bullying, aggression, incivility, or unwanted sexual attention that you have experienced during your teaching career. Please indicate whether or not each of the following occurred as a consequence of that incident:

	Yes	No
You felt physically afraid of a student	○	○
You had difficulty sleeping	○	○
You let a class out early or cancelled a class because you were distraught by the student	○	○
You avoided makig eye contact with the student during class	○	○
You tried to avoid the student outside of class	○	○
You had difficulty concentrating during class or while at work	○	○
Your productivity at work suffered	○	○
Your personal life and relationships suffered	○	○
You felt like quitting your job	○	○
You were afraid to be in the classroom alone with the student	○	○
You felt like you did not want to go to work	○	○
You became depressed	○	○
You felt significantly anxious or stressed	○	○
You suffered from stress-related illness (e.g., migraines or stomach problems)	○	○

	Yes	No
You needed medical treatment for stress-related illness	○	○
You went to see a mental health professional for help related to the incident	○	○
You felt embarrassed to talk to colleagues about the incident	○	○

11. Responses to Student Aggression, Bullying, Incivility, or Sexual Attention

For this set of questions, please think about the most serious incident of student bullying, aggression, incivility, or unwanted sexual attention that you have experienced during your teaching career. Please indicate which of the following things you did in response to this stuent's behavior.

	Yes	No
You reported the incident to your Department Chair	○	○
You reported the incident to the Dean of your college	○	○
You reported the incident to the Dean of Students or appropriate person on campus for student disciplinary action	○	○
You contacted university police	○	○
You contacted local law enforcement	○	○
You sought the social support of your colleagues	○	○
You changed or dropped assignments/tests because of the incident	○	○

If you did report the incident to your Department Chair or the Dean of your college, how satisfied were you with the way the situation was handled?

Not at all satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatified	Somewhat satisfied	Completely satisfied	Does Not Apply
○	○	○	○	○	○

If you did report the incident to the Dean of Students (or other student disciplinary body) how satisfied were you with the way the situation was handled?

Not at all satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Completely satisfied	Does Not Apply
○	○	○	○	○	○

12. Finally, a few questions about you

What is your sex?

- ◯ Male
- ◯ Female

What is your age?

[ ]

How would you describe your race/ethnicity (please check all that apply)?

- ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ Hispanic or Latino/a
- ☐ White or Caucasian
- ☐ Other Please Specify

[ ]

Are you elgible for tenure in your current position?

- ◯ Yes, I am in a tenure-track position and have tenure
- ◯ Yes, I am in a tenure-track position but have not yet earned tenure
- ◯ No, I am not eligible for tenure in my current position

What is your current faculty rank or position?

- ◯ Full Professor
- ◯ Associate Professor
- ◯ Assistant Professor
- ◯ Instructor
- ◯ Other (please specify)

[ ]

13. A Few More Questions About You

What is the highest degree you have earned?

- ○ Doctoral Degree
- ○ Master's Degree
- ○ Bachelor's Degree
- ○ High School Diploma
- ○ Other (please specify)

Do you teach at a public or private institution?

- ○ Public
- ○ Private

What level of students do you primarily teach?

- ○ Undergraduate students (working toward a bachelor's degree)
- ○ Graduate or professional students
- ○ A mix of undergraduate and graduate/professional students

In which discipline/department do you teach primarily?

- ○ Pharmacy Practice
- ○ Pharmaceutical Sciences
- ○ Practice Management
- ○ Other (please specify)

How many years have you been teaching at the college or graduate school level?

Approximately how many students in total were enrolled in all classes you taught during the past 12 months?

During your career as a faculty member have you confronted or reported a student for an act of academic dishonesty?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Appendix D: Respondent Responses to the question, "In a few sentences, can you describe the troubling student behavior?"

Responses to the question: In a few sentences, can you describe the troubling student behavior?

1. The student constantly harassed me via email about her grade. My mistake was engaging her via email. Her emails grew increasingly hostile. Without my knowledge, she was contacting the associate dean for student affairs then she involved my department chair. My department chair did not support me. I was so angry that my blood pressure went up 170/95 and got severe migraines and was hospitalized for 2 days.
2. he failed my course for the 3rd time, came across desk, tried to grab me, a passing student intervened
3. Brought me a gift
4. When confronted with an unprofessional response on an exam, she was agitated and oblivious to any error made on her part.
5. Stalking, would show up randomly in my office to dispute his grade. Made comments that his life was ruined due to my failing him, even though he failed multiple courses in the curriculum. He did not seem to be thinking rational.
6. A student brought me a bottle of wine to thank me for precepting him. A distressing note was attached to the bottle
7. Student said in my office that I made him feel like a caged and cornered animal ready to kill.

8. Threatening legal action because of alleged cheating.
9. Student did not get the answer he wanted so he kept asking over and over with increasing agitation. I had to ask him to leave my office.
10. Spending inappropriate amounts of time outside of class with me, asking for help with concepts they knew to spend more time with me, overt flirting, covert flirting, following me out to my car
11. I have not had any incidents like this
12. She kissed me and told me she loved me.
13. Expecting missed exams/quizzes to be made up without an excused absence
14. Aggressive lobbying for credit on an exam question
15. Aggressive communication through email in regards to exam questions
16. Student made an indirect verbal threat to hit me in the face with a cell phone. He didn't say straight out that he would do it, but put it in a hypothetical setting - ""IF I were to...
17. A student e-mailed complaining they had completed an online quiz and hadn't and the e-mail communication was not threatening but was impolite and unprofessional when I said he couldn't just get the points he claimed he earned.
18. The student questioned my ability to teach the course and my knowledge of the subject.
19. Facebook post re personal promiscuity, visible to entire students class
20. Yelled at me for a poor grade he didn't think he deserved. Showed hostile body language. Sent me an e-mail in all caps. Continually arrived late to class and was disengaged (texting).
21. Incivil aggressive behavior and rumor spreading about my personal life and sexual behavior in retaliation for an unfavorable evaluation.

22. student had difficulty controlling emotions and became very upset with me when i explained it was inappropriate in my class
23. very subtle advances
24. student was aggressively defending their behavior
25. When teaching a graduate nursing pharmacology course, a nursing student felt that I was treating her unfairly and visited my office, attacking me verbally.
26. I have not experienced any of these
27. Insulted a guest lecturer by complaining about handout
28. The student put her arms around my shoulders and leaned into my personal space. It was more unexpected than troubling; the environment of our COP is one where hugging is not completely uncommon among peers, but typically is not a common faculty-student activity.
29. Challenged a question on a quiz
30. Aggressive, bullying
31. threatened lawsuit if grade not changed
32. Would not accept failures in courses and subsequent dismissal from program. He was very aggressive in seeking out faculty members to convince them to change his grades
33. accuse of racism
34. Female student asking questions about my dating life.
35. Overly aggressive arguing a point
36. Uncivil disrespectful when discussing the students performance
37. A student made threats to me regarding another faculty member.

38. Student made several inappropriate sexual comments/allusions toward myself and other students during a topic discussion over a medical condition involving male genitalia.
39. Would not stop talking during class about a particular assignment and how it was graded. It was very disruptive to the class.
40. Aggression to another student in a case based course.
41. None in the 2.5 years as a faculty member
42. Inappropriate comments on evaluation. Explaining what type of treatment I need for my mental instability and that I need to quit & go back to a mental hospital as well as receive an enema
43. persistent, loud non-classroom-based conversations during class
44. Over 20 years ago, when I was a young faculty member, I had a student come to my office to ask a question. She sat/leaned against my desk with a skirt on (on my side of the desk), smiled at me.
45. Animated questioning
46. The student seemed to have an underlying psychiatric disorder. He used the in class problem solving exercise as an example on how I should/could improve my teaching.
47. significant incivility, threatening language, significant aggression, invasion of personal space,. I required security in the classroom and escorts across campus and to car.
48. Came to my office to show upset over a failing grade but closed the door and was aggresive first then cried

49. this was several years ago, when I was a very new faculty member. I had actually worked as an intern as the same pharmacy with this student. She simply challenged my authority because she had known me before I became a faculty person.
50. accused me of being unfair/predudiced in grading
51. ?
52. Rudeness toward me and an apparent dislike of being taught by a woman.
53. None
54. Never has happened.
55. Student made statement that exam questions were unfair when they were not.
56. Incivility, never sexual, it was disruptive talking during classroom activities. The students talked persistently throughout a 50 min lecture and active learning exercise.
57. I have not had any serious incidents. The incident I am referring to in the above questions seemed like flirtation.
58. student submitted an assignment with a filename that was personally derogatory
59. When I asked the class to participate in game of disease state jeopardy, the student asked what was in it for him. Luckily I had a quick come back and de-fused the issue
60. Threatened a colleague of social media
61. challenged the answer on a exam question in front of other students