

Look Ahead: Ethics and Communication Paper

This assignment is due in **Module 5**.

Instructions

Please review the **APA Sample Paper** from Purdue Online Writing Lab regarding APA format for Assignment 3: Ethics and Communication Paper.

When communicating, we make decisions regarding what information to include and what information to exclude from our messages. Communication decisions have legal and ethical dimensions. Business communicators must consider the impact of their messages to ensure that receivers are not misled.

In this assignment, students will write about current news and events that focus on business ethics in communication. There are many examples that students can reflect on and research within local, national, and world news. Students will demonstrate and reflect on the impact and importance of ethics in communication.

Students are required to write a paper that is seven to eight pages in length, including a cover page, abstract, and reference page. The paper must follow APA format, include appropriate headings and sub-headings, and **at least five scholarly citations** (e.g., peer-reviewed articles, textbooks, etc.). See the rubric for grading criteria. **Suggested headings are listed below:**

- Abstract
- Overview, Introduction, or Background
 - Summary of news or articles
- Impact of Ethics in Communication
 - The relevance of the content toward ethics and communication
 - Consequences or impact on the subject, organization, and/or society
- Importance of Ethics in Business
- Discussion or Reflection
 - The implication of the lesson learned
- Conclusion

- References

This assignment is worth 150 points and is due by the end of Module 5. This assignment is graded using the **Research Paper Rubric** ↓ included in the Assignment area in Module 5.

Example Paper

1

Branching Paths: A Novel Teacher Evaluation Model for Faculty Development

James P. Bavis and Ahn G. Nu

Department of English, Purdue University

ENGL 101: First Year Writing

Dr. Richard Teeth

January 30, 2020

Commented [AF1]: At the top of the page you'll see the header, which does not include a running head for student papers (a change from APA 6). Page numbers begin on the first page and follow on every subsequent page without interruption. No other information (e.g., authors' last names) is required.

Note: your instructor may ask for a running head or your last name before the page number. You can look at the APA professional sample paper for guidelines on these.

Commented [AF2]: The paper's title should be centered, bold, and written in title case. It should be three or four lines below the top margin of the page. In this sample paper, we've put four blank lines above the title.

Commented [AF3]: Authors' names are written below the title, with one double-spaced blank line between them. Names should be written as follows:

First name, middle initial(s), last name.

Commented [AF4]: Authors' affiliations follow immediately after their names. For student papers, these should usually be the department containing the course for which the paper is being written.

Commented [AWC5]: Note that student papers in APA do not require author notes, abstracts, or keywords, which would normally fall at the bottom of the title page and on the next page afterwards. Your instructor may ask for them anyway — see the APA professional sample paper on our site for guidelines for these.

Commented [AF6]: Follow authors' affiliations with the number and name of the course, the instructor's name and title, and the assignment's due date.

Branching Paths: A Novel Teacher Evaluation Model for Faculty Development

According to Theall (2017), "Faculty evaluation and development cannot be considered separately... evaluation without development is punitive, and development without evaluation is guesswork" (p.91). As the practices that constitute modern programmatic faculty development have evolved from their humble beginnings to become a commonplace feature of university life (Lewis, 1996), a variety of tactics to evaluate the proficiency of teaching faculty for development purposes have likewise become commonplace. These include measures as diverse as peer observations, the development of teaching portfolios, and student evaluations.

One such measure, the student evaluation of teacher (SET), has been virtually ubiquitous since at least the 1990s (Wilson, 1998). Though records of SET-like instruments can be traced to work at Purdue University in the 1920s (Remmers & Brandenburg, 1927), most modern histories of faculty development suggest that their rise to widespread popularity went hand-in-hand with the birth of modern faculty development programs in the 1970s, when universities began to adopt them in response to student protest movements criticizing mainstream university curricula and approaches to instruction (Gaff & Simpson, 1994; Lewis, 1996; McKeachie, 1996). By the mid-2000s, researchers had begun to characterize SETs in terms like "...the predominant measure of university teacher performance [...] worldwide" (Pounder, 2007, p. 178). Today, SETs play an important role in teacher assessment and faculty development at most universities (Davis, 2009). Recent SET research practically takes the presence of some form of this assessment on most campuses as a given. Spooren et al. (2017), for instance, merely note that that SETs can be found at "almost every institution of higher education throughout the world" (p. 130). Similarly, Darwin (2012) refers to teacher evaluation as an established orthodoxy, labeling it a "venerated," "axiomatic" institutional practice (p. 733).

Commented [AF7]: The paper's title is bolded and centered above the first body paragraph. There should be no "Introduction" header.

Commented [AWC8]: Here, we've borrowed a quote from an external source, so we need to provide the location of the quote in the document (in this case, the page number) in the parenthetical.

Commented [AWC9]: By contrast, in this sentence, we've merely paraphrased an idea from the external source. Thus, no location or page number is required. You can cite a page range if it will help your reader find the section of source material you are referring to, but you don't need to, and sometimes it isn't practical (too large of a page range, for instance).

Commented [AWC10]: Spell out abbreviations the first time you use them, except in cases where the abbreviations are very well-known (e.g., "CIA").

Commented [AWC11]: For sources with two authors, use an ampersand (&) between the authors' names rather than the word "and."

Commented [AWC12]: When listing multiple citations in the same parenthetical, list them alphabetically and separate them with semicolons.

Moreover, SETs do not only help universities direct their faculty development efforts. They have also come to occupy a place of considerable institutional importance for their role in personnel considerations, informing important decisions like hiring, firing, tenure, and promotion. Seldin (1993, as cited in Pounder, 2007) finds that 86% of higher educational institutions use SETs as important factors in personnel decisions. A 1991 survey of department chairs found 97% used student evaluations to assess teaching performance (US Department of Education). Since the mid-late 1990s, a general trend towards comprehensive methods of teacher evaluation that include multiple forms of assessment has been observed (Berk, 2005). However, recent research suggests the usage of SETs in personnel decisions is still overwhelmingly common, though hard percentages are hard to come by, perhaps owing to the multifaceted nature of these decisions (Boring et al., 2017; Galbraith et al., 2012). In certain contexts, student evaluations can also have ramifications beyond the level of individual instructors. Particularly as public schools have experienced pressure in recent decades to adopt neoliberal, market-based approaches to self-assessment and adopt a student-as-consumer mindset (Darwin, 2012; Marginson, 2009), information from evaluations can even feature in department- or school-wide funding decisions (see, for instance, the Obama Administration's Race to the Top initiative, which awarded grants to K-12 institutions that adopted value-added models for teacher evaluation).

However, while SETs play a crucial role in faculty development and personnel decisions for many education institutions, current approaches to SET administration are not as well-suited to these purposes as they could be. This paper argues that a formative, empirical approach to teacher evaluation developed in response to the demands of the local context is better-suited for helping institutions improve their teachers. It proposes the Heavilon Evaluation of Teacher, or

Commented [AWC13]: Here, we've made an *indirect* or *secondary* citation (i.e., we've cited a source that we found cited in a different source). Use the phrase "as cited in" in the parenthetical to indicate that the first-listed source was referenced in the second-listed one.

Include an entry in the reference list **only for the secondary source** (Pounder, in this case).

Commented [AWC14]: Here, we've cited a source that has an institution as author rather than one named person. The corresponding reference list entry would begin with "US Department of Education."

Commented [AWC15]: Sources with three authors or more are cited via the first-listed author's name followed by the Latin phrase "et al." Note that the period comes after "al," rather than "et."

HET, a new teacher assessment instrument that can strengthen current approaches to faculty development by making them more responsive to teachers' local contexts. It also proposes a pilot study that will clarify the differences between this new instrument and the Introductory Composition at Purdue (ICaP) SET, a more traditional instrument used for similar purposes. The results of this study will direct future efforts to refine the proposed instrument. Methods section, which follows, will propose a pilot study that compares the results of the proposed instrument to the results of a traditional SET (and will also provide necessary background information on both of these evaluations). The paper will conclude with a discussion of how the results of the pilot study will inform future iterations of the proposed instrument and, more broadly, how universities should argue for local development of assessments.

Literature Review

Effective Teaching: A Contextual Construct

The validity of the instrument this paper proposes is contingent on the idea that it is possible to systematically measure a teacher's ability to teach. Indeed, the same could be said for virtually all teacher evaluations. Yet despite the exceeding commonness of SETs and the faculty development programs that depend on their input, there is little scholarly consensus on precisely what constitutes "good" or "effective" teaching. It would be impossible to review the entire history of the debate surrounding teaching effectiveness, owing to its sheer scope—such a summary might need to begin with, for instance, Cicero and Quintilian. However, a cursory overview of important recent developments (particularly those revealed in meta-analyses of empirical studies of teaching) can help situate the instrument this paper proposes in relevant academic conversations.

Commented [AF16]: Common paper sections (literature review, methods, results, discussion) typically use Level 1 headings, like this one does. Level 1 headings are centered, bolded, and use title case. Text begins after them as a new paragraph.

Commented [AF17]: This is a Level 2 heading: left aligned, bolded, title case. Text begins as a new paragraph after this kind of heading.

Meta-analysis 1

One core assumption that undergirds many of these conversations is the notion that good teaching has effects that can be observed in terms of student achievement. A meta-analysis of 167 empirical studies that investigated the effects of various teaching factors on student achievement (Kyriakides et al., 2013) supported the effectiveness of a set of teaching factors that the authors group together under the label of the “dynamic model” of teaching. Seven of the eight factors (Orientation, Structuring, Modeling, Questioning, Assessment, Time Management, and Classroom as Learning Environment) corresponded to moderate average effect sizes (of between 0.34–0.41 standard deviations) in measures of student achievement. The eighth factor, Application (defined as seatwork and small-group tasks oriented toward practice of course concepts), corresponded to only a small yet still significant effect size of 0.18. The lack of any single decisive factor in the meta-analysis supports the idea that effective teaching is likely a multivariate construct. However, the authors also note the context-dependent nature of effective teaching. Application, the least-important teaching factor overall, proved more important in studies examining young students (p. 148). Modeling, by contrast, was especially important for older students.

Meta-analysis 2

A different meta-analysis that argues for the importance of factors like clarity and setting challenging goals (Hattie, 2009) nevertheless also finds that the effect sizes of various teaching factors can be highly context-dependent. For example, effect sizes for homework range from 0.15 (a small effect) to 0.64 (a moderately large effect) based on the level of education examined. Similar ranges are observed for differences in academic subject (e.g., math vs. English) and student ability level. As Snook et al. (2009) note in their critical response to Hattie, while it is

Commented [AF18]: This is an example of a Level 3 heading: left aligned, bolded and italicized, and using title case. Text starts as a new paragraph after this. Most papers only use these three levels of headings; a fourth and fifth level are listed on the OWL in the event that you need them. Many student papers, however, don't need more than a title and possibly Level 1 headings if they are short. If you're not sure about how you should use headings in your paper, you can talk with your teacher about it and get advice for your specific case.

Commented [AWC19]: When presenting decimal fractions, put a zero in front of the decimal if the quantity is something that can exceed one (like the number of standard deviations here). Do not put a zero if the quantity cannot exceed one (e.g., if the number is a proportion).

possible to produce a figure for the average effect size of a particular teaching factor, such averages obscure the importance of context.

Meta-analysis 3

A final meta-analysis (Seidel & Shavelson, 2007) found generally small average effect sizes for most teaching factors—organization and academic domain- specific learning activities showed the biggest cognitive effects (0.33 and 0.25, respectively). Here, again, however, effectiveness varied considerably due to contextual factors like domain of study and level of education in ways that average effect sizes do not indicate.

These pieces of evidence suggest that there are multiple teaching factors that produce measurable gains in student achievement and that the relative importance of individual factors can be highly dependent on contextual factors like student identity. This is in line with a well-documented phenomenon in educational research that complicates attempts to measure teaching effectiveness purely in terms of student achievement. This is that “the largest source of variation in student learning is attributable to differences in what students bring to school - their abilities and attitudes, and family and community” (McKenzie et al., 2005, p. 2). Student achievement varies greatly due to non-teacher factors like socio-economic status and home life (Snook et al., 2009). This means that, even to the extent that it is possible to observe the effectiveness of certain teaching behaviors in terms of student achievement, it is difficult to set generalizable benchmarks or standards for student achievement. Thus is it also difficult to make true apples-to-apples comparisons about teaching effectiveness between different educational contexts: due to vast differences between different kinds of students, a notion of what constitutes highly effective teaching in one context may not in another. This difficulty has featured in criticism of certain meta-analyses that have purported to make generalizable claims about what teaching factors