**Student Focus Groups**

**Faculty Focus Groups**

**Administrator Interviews**

**Verbatim Transcription**

**Open Coding**

**Non-institutional Factors**

**Institutional Factors**

- Obstacles and Barriers
- 40+ Themes

**Axial Coding**

**Data Analysis**

1. Curriculum is full, with little room for additional topics such as ethics
2. Bureaucracy around modifying curriculum
3. Lack of resources and training on how to teach ethics
4. Inconsistent, unenforceable, or unclear policies about academic dishonesty

**Faculty** are not rewarded for [talking about ethical behavior] and they should be. It should be part of the reward system for faculty, to help students be good people as well as just be good scholars... The promotion and tenure guidelines for the teaching component is weighted heavily, and I think almost primarily by student evaluations. So [faculty] believe that they can’t really go out on a limb and push students because they’ll get negative teaching evaluations.

~ Administrator

**Recommendations**

1. Offer incentives to faculty for training or curricular innovation
2. Create consistent policies among faculty and staff regarding academic integrity
3. Integrate curricular and co-curricular activities to promote ethical development

**Data Collection**

- Visits with institutions of various locations, sizes, and Carnegie classifications over a 2 year period (n= 14)
- Focus groups with students (n= 90)
- Focus groups with faculty (n= 84)
- Interviews with academic affairs and student services administrators (n= 29)

**Research Questions**

1. What institutional barriers do faculty and administrators perceive in incorporating ethics into undergraduate engineering education?
2. How can these barriers be overcome?
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