

We continue a series recounting what a number of readers have characterized as misconduct and stupidity of past and current University of Southern Mississippi faculty and administrators. The facts underlying these conclusions have been fully documented. When one reader suggested this series, he opined “before someone comes to Southern Miss as a student or puts a career on the line as faculty member, “Ethics, Power and Academic Corruption” should be required reading.” The twenty third installment follows. (See, the [first](#), [second](#), [third](#), [fourth](#), [fifth](#), [sixth](#), [seventh](#), [eighth](#), [ninth](#), [tenth](#), [eleventh](#), [twelfth](#), [thirteenth](#), [fourteenth](#), [fifteenth](#), [sixteenth](#), [seventeenth](#), [eighteenth](#), [nineteenth](#), [twentieth](#), [twenty first](#) and [twenty second](#) installments here.)

Race and Gender Implications

USM’s President is [was] a white woman [Martha Saunders]; [then] Interim Dean Alvin Williams is African American male; Dean Harold Doty is a white male; Executive Vice President AACSB is a white male; and involved faculty included white and African American males and females from all disciplines in the College of Business. Diversity of race, gender, and background, therefore, does not imply tolerance of different ideas. USM and AACSB proclamations of diversity of ideas is diametrically opposed to their practice. Although omerta, deception, and punishment for speech may be commonplace among gangsters and criminals, should we expect better from universities?

Then-Interim Dean Alvin Williams Either Lied or Was Incompetent

The facts presented in 1. – 9. were provided to USM administrators and involved faculty. The documents and evidence were offered first to USM’s administrators and involved faculty then to AACSB for its consideration. Therefore, then-Interim Dean Alvin Williams’s assertion that Researcher DePree “made allegations about USM’s programs and processes that were not based on facts” is demonstrable false. That USM and its College of Business refused to entertain a discussion of an idea, plagiarism in this case, demonstrates a failure of diversity of ideas. That University administrators chose to punish Researcher DePree for his speech clearly demonstrates failure to protect speech. After all is said and done, plagiarism is a complex issue and all could have benefited from a discussion.

What seemed to be called for was a dialogue so that the interlocutors could discuss differences and learn from each other. The College of Business’ and USM’s administrators did not allow any dialogue with regard to the documentation and evidence presented to them, and provided in this research. Furthermore, they not only did not protect different views and evidence, they punished the speakers. AACSB was fully apprised of the documents supporting USM’s failure of its diversity standard and its actions to punish faculty for their speech. (Several professors were punished for their speech related to the discovery of plagiarism reported in this research.) Alas, AACSB also refused to entertain a discussion of ideas and supporting documentation.

The Relevance and Reliability of Case Research

Cooper and Morgan remind us of a useful method of research when they advise that “[c]ase research can...help articulate and explore the conflicts about values, interests, and the operation of power.” How else can we inform each other of powerful influences in our environment if not with the details of scientific based case research? Are we destined to promote continued misrepresentations and misconduct of powerful administrators and colleagues by our silence and inaction?

This case research offers a vehicle to explore ideas and influence the direction of our institutions and its leaders. It demonstrated that case research satisfies rigorous standards of science. The publication of case research also advances efforts to inform colleagues and students at other colleges and universities of problems common to all.

Antecedents of Hypotheses Refuted

As hypothesized in this case research, if AACSB applies its diversity standard, then its accredited members “must show that within this (educational) context its business programs include diverse viewpoints among participants...Accredited programs must demonstrate commitment and actions in support of diversity in educational experience.” Also as hypothesized in this research, if the University puts into practice its diversity standard, then its administrators and faculty must “cherish the free exchange of ideas, diversity of thought, joint decision making, and individuals’ assumption of responsibility” ... and ... “protect freedom of inquiry and speech. Faculty and students must be able to study, learn, speak, teach, research, and publish, without fear of intimidation or reprisal, free from political interference, in an environment of tolerance for and engagement with divergent opinions.”

USM, its College of Business, and School of Accountancy was and is an accredited member of the AACSB and it not only did not demonstrate a tolerance for diverse ideas, it punished different ideas. Researcher DePree was suspended from teaching and service. He is [was] not permitted to enter the business building and is not permitted to participate in research seminars or in governance of the College of Business or USM among other activities of all full professors. Furthermore, the AACSB was not the least concerned that USM failed to “demonstrate commitment and actions in support of diversity.” **Therefore, neither involved Universities nor AACSB abide by their diversity principles and standards and are not to be depended on to support diversity.**

Advise Caution and Silence

Since USM and participating universities enforced silence and punished speech about important internal failings and misconduct, insiders at less free, more controlling organizations cannot be expected to protect those who might “speak truth to power.” Society should not expect its citizens to break silence for the betterment of its institutions or its other citizens. In the current environment, professors should advise their students

and professional accountants to be cautious and even silent until effective protections are guaranteed.

AACSB AFFIRMS COPYING OTHER MEMBERS' SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS "WITHOUT PROPER CITATION"

The AACSB—its leaders, representatives, visitation deans, and personnel—and member universities and business colleges were fully informed of “copying without proper citation” reported in this research. They supported and rationalized “copying without proper citation.” In other words, AACSB officials and USM and other university administrators were resolved to protect and advance the right of USM faculty and administrators to plagiarize documents submitted to the AACSB in support of USM’s reaccreditation. Since a premier accreditor, AACSB, affirms plagiarism for its member universities and their faculty, it offers support for business students who choose to “copy without proper citation.”

References

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). 2004. *Ethics Education in Business Schools*. June 25. St. Louis, MO: AACSB.

_____. 2009. Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation. <http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/BUSINESS-STANDARDS-2009-Final.pdf>. July 1.

_____. August 24, 2004. Accreditation Process, Accreditation Guidelines, Complaint Procedures. <http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/process/guidelines/ComplaintProcedures.pdf>

Argyris, C., R. Putnam, and D. Smith. 1985. *Action Science*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cooper, D.J., and W. Morgan. 2008. “Case study research in accounting.” *Accounting Horizons* 22 (2): 159-178.

DePree, C.M. 2008. “Does Accreditation Provide a Reliable Authority on Academic Quality?” National Meeting of the American Accounting Association.

_____. 2009 “A General Theory to Test Social Reality.” Decision Science Institute National Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Flyvbjerg, B. 2006. Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*. Volume 12 Number 2. April. 219-245, © 2006 Sage Publications. <http://qix.sagepub.com> hosted at <http://online.sagepub.com>.

Holmstrom, J., M. Ketokivi, and A. Hameri. 2009. "Bridging Practice and Theory: A Design Science Approach." *Decision Sciences*, 40 (1).

Jeffrey, R. (1981) *Formal logic, its scope and limits*, 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Morrison, E.W., and F.J. Milliken. 2000. "Organizational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World." *Academy of Management Review*. 25(4), 706-725.

Surowiecki, J. 2004. *The Wisdom of Crowds*. New York: Random House, Inc.

Sperber, D., and D. Wilson. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

The University Faculty Handbook. August 2009.

http://www.xxx.edu/provost/faculty_handbook.pdf

A complete set of documentation and appendices are available at Amazon:

http://www.amazon.com/Academic-Corruption-Reality-Plagiarizing-Documents-ebook/dp/B00957AZ3G/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1449710169&sr=8-1&keywords=Ethics%2C+Power%2C+and+Academic+Corruption