RACIAL SHIFTING STANDARDS AND EDUCATIONAL PUNISHMENT

Irene Roman
Scripps College

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.claremont.edu/scripps_theses

Part of the Psychology Commons, and the Race and Ethnicity Commons

Recommended Citation
Roman, Irene, "RACIAL SHIFTING STANDARDS AND EDUCATIONAL PUNISHMENT" (2024). Scripps Senior Theses. 2364.
https://scholarship.claremont.edu/scripps_theses/2364

This Open Access Senior Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Scripps Student Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scripps Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@claremont.edu.
RACIAL SHIFTING STANDARDS AND EDUCATIONAL PUNISHMENT

by
IRENE ROMAN

SUBMITTED TO SCRIPPS COLLEGE IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

PROFESSOR GROSCUP
PROFESSOR MA

DECEMBER 8, 2023
Abstract

There is a large gap in research on whether students of different races are reprimanded equally for academic dishonesty. Past research shows that ethnic minority students are often punished more severely and frequently than ethnic majority students (Fix et al., 2023; Girvan et al., 2021; Quinn, 2020; Skiba et al., 2011). This proposed study will examine how student race and teacher race influence the severity of punishment a student experiences for academic dishonesty. A 5 (teacher race: Black, White, Hispanic, Asian, other) x 4 (target student race: Black, White, Hispanic, Asian) between groups factorial design was used. Participants will read a created scenario and then be asked to judge the student objectively and subjectively on severity of punishment. There will be a main effect of student race such that participants are expected to punish Hispanic and Black students more severely than Asian and White students in the context of academic dishonesty. Additionally, if the teacher’s race matches the student race, then they are expected to punish the student less severely. Lastly, it was hypothesized that severity of punishment will be higher with subjective ratings than objective ratings. The findings may be beneficial to educational institutions when developing better policies to deal with punitive disciplinary consequences and for developing a stronger understanding of the effect of teacher’s perceptions on their decisions.
Shifting racial standards and educational punishment

With the rise of racial diversity in schools, teachers must adapt to the needs of a multicultural classroom while also treating all students equally and fairly. The National Center for Education of Statistics finds that between the year 2000 and 2015, the percentage of Hispanics enrolled in public schools increased from 16 to 29% and Asian from 4% to 5% (Brey, Cristobal de et al., 2019). One might believe with the heightened racial equality awareness and preachings from educational diversity committees that there would be an improvement in teachers’ biased beliefs and treatment of minority students. However, a vast body of research literature shows that teachers still maintain stereotypical expectations, which continue to contribute to the many disadvantages that ethnic minority students face in school (Fix et al., 2023; Glock, 2016; Malouff & Thorsteinsson, 2016; Quinn, 2020; Skiba et al., 2011; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007). In addition, studies have found that people who have authority are less likely to severely punish people who match their gender and race (Dee, 2005; Devine & Caughlin, 2014; Ewanation & Maeder, 2023; H Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 2004).

Racial Bias in Education

Within the United States and foreign countries, research has consistently shown that ethnic minority students receive differential treatment by teachers. Tenebuam and Ruck (2007) conducted meta-analyses of experimental and observational studies to determine differences if there were in teacher expectations as well as referral rates for disciplinary reasons and gifted and talented programs among ethnic minority students as compared to European American. The results showed that teachers had more positive expectations for European American students
than minorities and that teachers were more likely to refer African American and Hispanic students for disciplinary reasons than to recommend as a gifted child. Recently, in Australia a meta-analysis on grading bias by Malouff and Thorsteinsson (2016) looked at 23 studies and found an average grading bias of 0.36 within studies that looked at bias due to educational labels, racial groups, poor academic performance, and less attractiveness. The reported grading bias is a small effect size, but in psychology where effect sizes are often smaller, 0.36 would be considered a large effect size. The study by Gerritson (2013) as cited in Tenebuam and Ruck (2007) compared graders who used a rubric with graders who did not when scoring Black student’s work. The results showed a lower level of bias for graders using a rubric than graders who did not use a rubric which suggests that there is a significant racial bias against Black students.

Similarly, in the United States, Quinn (2020) investigated the effects of different scoring techniques (more subjective vs less subjective) on the magnitude of teacher grading bias for Black and White students. The subjectiveness of the techniques refers to how much the teacher’s own opinions are allowed to influence the grade. In addition, the study examined the influences of implicit/explicit racial attitudes and teacher demographic characteristics on the grading bias as well. The purpose of this research was to replicate foreign studies (Malouff and Thorsteinsson, 2016; Tenebuam and Ruck, 2007) in the United States and expand on the available experimental literature. Quinn (2020) predicted that racially biased evaluations would occur more with subjective grading scales than objective grading scales and that the bias would be stronger in those who have stronger implicit bias. Partially in line with Quinn’s expectations, racial bias did exist with more subjective grading techniques, but there were no significant findings for grading
bias with more objective criteria. Quinn did not find evidence that racial attitudes moderated teacher’s evaluations, and he attributed this to a lack of power (2020).

Furthermore, in recent quasi-experimental studies, Glock et al. (2019) asked preservice and in service teachers from a German University to imagine teaching in different ethnically diverse communities (60% or 20%) that were randomly assigned. Researchers measured implicit attitudes with an IAT of common German boy names and common Turkish boy names. The first study showed that German preservice teachers imagining a culturally diverse school showed more negative implicit attitudes towards ethnic minority students than participants who imagined a low diverse school. Interestingly, in the second study the results showed that participants who taught in more diverse schools were more enthusiastic towards teaching ethnic minority students than teachers who work at schools with low cultural diversity. The researchers stated that Study 1 participants’ attitudes were likely shaped by negative stereotypes because they have not started teaching yet. While the results of this research are not causal, the research demonstrates a relationship between teacher’s attitudes and exposure to ethnic minority students in which preservice teachers imagining a more culturally diverse school have more negative implicit attitudes and working teachers who have contact with ethnic students were more enthusiastic about teaching.

There is some evidence that demonstrates unequal disciplinary referrals and punishment between students of different races. Fix et al. (2023) investigated the disproportionate amount of suspensions for Black and Hispanics, special education students, and users of free meals or reduced cost meals and the results confirmed their hypothesis. Another correlational study by Girvan et al. (2021) used the School Wide Information dataset to examine how well community level implicit and explicit racial biases predict racial inequalities in Office Discipline Referrals.
(ODR) and Out of School Suspensions (OSS). They also wanted to see whether the racial disparities were still prevalent for Out of School Suspensions when accounting for the relationship with Office Discipline Referrals. One of the results was that regardless of ODR or OSS, the relationship was stronger for explicit than implicit racial biases. According to the researchers, this might mean that people are consciously assigning ethnic minorities to ODR or OSS at a higher rate.

Lastly, Skiba et al.’s (2011) descriptive study explored racial and ethnic disparities through schools' academic punishment system. Using a Web-based School Wide information system for data, they selected 436 schools that met their criteria. The results indicated that in general that African Americans are 4x likely and Hispanics are 2x likely to be expelled/suspended for a minor infraction than White students which matched their predictions. African American students and Hispanic students were also more likely to receive ODR and OSS than White students. Skiba et al. (2011) work aligns with findings from Fix et al. (2023) and shows racial bias through the disproportionate punishment of African American and Hispanic students.

Previous research indicates that when students are from a racial minority group, people’s opinions and actions seem to shift to conform to the stereotypes like with the grading bias and teacher expectations (Malouff & Thorsteinsson, 2016; Quinn, 2020; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007). In this present study, Biernat, Manis, & Nelson’s (1991) shifting standard model of social judgment will be used to explain the tendency to shift race-based standards in the educational sector. As explained by Biernat, Manis, & Nelson’s (1991), the general shifting standard model is that people are not judged relative to everyone in the world, but relative to members of their social group. Their research demonstrates that individuals are evaluated in relation to stereotype-
based standards associated with their respective groups, resulting in stereotype-consistent differences in judgments. For example, people might say that a toddler is tall among his or her peers, but is short in comparison to adults.

The shifting standard model can be applied to other judgment domains such as racial groups. Biernat et al., (2009) shifting standards refers to how people's objective judgments align more with racial stereotypes than their subjective judgments. In their study, the researchers tested the tendency to shift standards by comparing objective (ACT score unit) and subjective judgments (high-low ability) of Black and White individuals. Biernat et al., (2009) expected to see a difference because an objective judgment does not vary from person to person, but a subjective measure is dependent on the individual making the judgment. Since objective judgments reveal stereotyped expectations, while subjective judgments show reductions in stereotypes suggests that standards shift. They also examined whether shifting standards predicted zero-sum race-related behaviors, assessed by allocating funding to race-related vs. non-race-related student organizations. Zero sum refers to situations where there is the allocation of a limited resource. In addition, Biernat et al., (2009) aimed to investigate whether the tendency to shift standards was related to either implicit or explicit markers of prejudice and stereotypes. The findings across all three studies reveal an overall tendency to shift standards based on race. Objective judgments favored Whites over Blacks in academic ability, but subjective judgments mitigated this effect. Notably, implicit prejudice moderated allocation shifting standards in all three studies.

In this present study, the shifting standards theory will be applied to help conceptualize the processes that contribute to teachers’ different perceptions of students of different racial groups and why teachers punish African American and Hispanic students more severely than
Asian and White students in the context of academic dishonesty. Specifically, the objective unit of judgment will be compared to the subjective unit of judgment to see whether teachers shift standards for different racial groups when punishing students for academic dishonesty.

**Teacher’s perceptions of students of different racial groups**

Every day at school, teachers have frequent interactions with their students whether that be indirectly like grading or directly through conversations and teaching. These interactions can affect the future of student's educational attainment and enjoyment of school as well (Mahatmya et al., 2016). As such, it is important to look at teacher’s perceptions of students of different racial groups.

Some researchers have used different theoretical frameworks to explain teacher’s behaviors and describe stereotypical expectations. For example, Glock’s (2016) research uses a theoretical framework developed by Fiske and Neuberg (2013) called dual process theories of impressions and judgement formation. The theory says that when an individual judges someone, there are two strategies that a person can use when judging someone. The first way is a stereotype-based strategy where a person relies on set stereotypical expectations to save cognitive capacity (Glock, 2016). However, if the stereotype-based strategy fails because someone does not fit into the stereotypical mold or if a person wants a more accurate judgment, then a person would follow the information integrating strategy. By applying this theoretical framework to an educational context, she reasoned that experienced teachers who were assigned stereotype-confirming below average ethnic minority students should elicit stereotype-based judgment strategies, but those who were assigned stereotype-disconfirming above average ethnic minority students should contradict stereotypical expectations thus leading to information integrating processing of the information about the student. Glock (2016) randomly assigned 86
experienced teachers into four groups (below average ethnic minority (confirming), below average ethnic majority, above average ethnic minority (disconfirming), and above average ethnic majority). The results confirmed her hypotheses and indicated that below average ethnic minority students would be judged less favorably than above average ethnic minority students. There was also a significant perceived difference between stereotype confirming ethnic minority and ethnic majority students as well as above average and below average students. Lastly, she found that teacher’s explicit attitudes toward ethnic minority students was dependent on the student’s academic achievement. This research provides a possible explanation of why and how a teacher’s judgment depends on whether or not the student conforms to stereotypes.

In addition, Mahatmya et al. (2016) wanted to determine the likelihood that teacher’s perceptions were lower, equal, or higher than low-income Black and Hispanic students’ perception of their own educational attainments. Their experiment incorporated Ogbu’s cultural-ecological theory of minority school performance which identified systematic and community factors that affect minority students’ perceptions of education related outcomes. The results showed that students perceived by their teachers to have higher school connectedness were more likely to have teachers that hold the same or greater perceptions of future educational attainment which confirmed their hypothesis. Furthermore, Mahatmya et al. analysis indicated that Black students were more likely to have teachers who held higher perceptions of educational attainment than Hispanic students who were more likely to have teachers who held the same perceptions of educational attainment. While previous research focuses more on the difference of treatment between minority and majority students, Mahatmya et al. specifically explores how much teacher’s perceptions change between Black and Hispanic students and factors that moderate that relationship.
Similarity leniency bias

This study is interested in addressing how teachers’ behavior changes if they are the same race as students. Despite the current attention given to unequal treatment of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) students in the media, there is a dearth of published work concerning the effects of demographic match and similarity leniency bias. The similarity leniency bias is part of the social identity theory of intergroup behavior that defines the qualifications someone must meet to be part of an out group or in group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Both in group and out group biases and similarity leniency bias fall under the social identity theory which was developed by Tajfel (1978). In-group and out-group biases are psychological tendencies that influence how people perceive and interact with individuals from different social groups. These biases can lead to favoritism toward one’s own group (in-group bias) and prejudice or discrimination against those outside one's group (out-group bias). According to Tajfel & Turner (1986), there are three main parts that lead to social comparison by group differentiation. First, the person must believe that they are part of that group. Second, the social situation needs to allow for comparison. Third, the outgroup needs to qualify as a comparison group. The whole point of differentiation according to these researchers is to maintain superiority over the outgroup. The similarity leniency bias specifically claims that individuals show a preference toward those who are perceived as more similar to themselves because they are assumed to be part of the ingroup (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Applying this theory to an educational context, the similarity leniency bias can be used to predict teacher’s preferences to same raced students.

Although there is sparse work on similarity leniency bias, the concept has been studied through student-teacher demographic match. Dee (2005) demonstrates how student-teacher demographic match affects teacher’s perceptions of students on in terms of frequency of
classroom disruption, homework completion, and inattentiveness. According to Dee, the empirical research completed on demographic interactions between students and teachers is limited and much of it is contradictory. His goal was to fill this information gap by reanalyzing the data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988. The results found that racial/ethnic dynamics within classrooms significantly affected how students are perceived by teachers on disruptiveness, inattentiveness, and homework completion. For example, a student who did not share the same race as the teacher was viewed as being 33% more disruptive and assumed to be 22% more likely to be rarely completing homework. Interestingly, both White and minority students are perceived to be disruptive by a teacher of a different race.

Despite the lack of evidence of similarity leniency bias in the education context, there is a plethora of research within the legal system that shows that the race of jurors affects the outcome of a trial. Ewanation & Maeder (2023) determined the effects of victim (IV), defendant (IV), and juror race (DV) on mock juror’s decision in a trial where the police committed manslaughter. The results indicated the presence of a similarity leniency effect among BIPOC jurors because there was a higher likelihood for them to find Black defendants not guilty compared to White defendants. This effect was also seen in Ugwuegbu (1979) where the researcher found that racial dissimilarity of the defendant to the juror leads to more negative and harsher evaluation.

In a historical account of legal psychological research on White juror bias in American court rooms, Sommers & Ellsworth (2001) research showed that White jurors go out of their way to give differential treatment to Black defendants without fully breaking the law. They conducted an experiment where they looked at conviction rate and sentence recommendations in cases of race salient as compared to non-race salient cases with black and white defendants. The results found that the white participants were more likely to give a severe sentence to and convict black
defendants in a non-race-salient case. This aligns Tajfel & Turner (1986) conceptualization of ingroup and outgroup dynamics because it showed that the White jurors view Black defendants as an outgroup and therefore judge them more harshly.

However, not all previous research has found that race is a prevalent factor in determining punishment. Devine & Caughlin’s (2014) meta-analysis found out the extent to which personal attributes affect trial outcomes in the courtroom. Although there was a total of 11 characteristics, some notable personal attributes the researchers analyzed included race, socioeconomic status and defendant's previous criminal history. Interestingly, Devine & Caughlin (2014) found on average juror characteristics had a bigger impact than defendant characteristics with defendant race having little to no effect with an overall magnitude of 0.3. Yet, when looking at the statistics for when both juror and defendant are black the effect size was significant and strongly correlated to guilt judgments. Defendant socioeconomic status and previous criminal history both had strong effect of -.11 and .12 respectively. Devine & Caughlin (2014) does not align with previous research on the prevalence of race on punishment, but it does match other work on the similarity leniency bias as well as racial demographic match.

**Academic Dishonesty**

There was no existing literature found on how race affects teachers' perceptions of whether or not students committed academic dishonesty, specifically plagiarism. There is partially related research on the frequency in which students of different races commit acts of academic dishonesty (Pino & Smith, 2003) and recommended level of punishment for Black and White students who were caught cheating on an exam (Woolridge and Richman, 1985), but these studies do not look at teacher’s perceptions.

**Present Study**
Previous research has focused on how teacher behavioral patterns reflect stereotypes or could be predicted by stereotypes, but no articles to my knowledge looked at severity of punishment for academic dishonesty using the shifting standards theory and testing for the effects of racial similarity bias. The research shows that minority students, usually African American and Hispanic students, are more likely to be referred to the office for disciplinary reasons (Girvan et al., 2021; Skiba et al., 2011; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007) and that similarity leniency bias can predict the severity of punishment an individual may receive (Ewanation & Maeder, 2023; Sommers & Ellsworth, 2001; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Ugwuegbu, 1979).

There has been no research on similarity leniency bias in the context of teachers’ decision making involving academic dishonesty and consequence punishment. Although there is some research on the application of the shifting standard model to school environments (Biernat et al. 2009), it did not examine how teacher’s behaviors shift when punishing students for academic dishonesty. Previous research on shifting standards only looked at Black and White students as well. Given the lack of research on academic dishonesty, the current study will examine the effects of race within that context.

This present study will examine the following research questions (RQ):

RQ 1: (a) Will the race of a student and teacher impact a teacher’s decision to severely punish a student? (b) Will the severity of punishment decrease if the teacher and student are of the same race?

RQ 2: Will the severity of punishment vary on subjective and objective scales?

RQ 3: Will teachers' perceptions of student intelligence and success vary across different racial groups?
Proposed Method

Participants

United States public and private high school teachers will be selected to represent high school teachers in the United States. Eligibility will be limited to teachers who have been teaching for a minimum of 2 years and are over the age of 18, US citizens, and only working at a public or private school. A priori power analysis indicates that 400 participants would be required to observe medium effect sizes with a desired power of .80 with alpha = .05 using factorial ANOVAs (Glock, 2016). Since participants will be excluded if they do not pass attention checks and if they fail to meet the requirements for participation, the target sample size is 600 to account for any exclusions. The expected sample size should be equal across racial groups, with a minimum of 80, but ideally 120 participants per group. The predicted mean age of participants is 42.4 years of age based on the national average data from 2017-2018 (National Center for Education Statistics). Given the gender imbalance of teachers in the United States (76.5 female: 23.5 male), gender will be controlled for so that half of the sample is male, and half of the sample is female.

Participants will be recruited by emailing teachers through K12 Prospects and asking them to fill out a survey about administering punishment for academic dishonesty. K12 Prospects is an online platform with school personnel email lists from across the United States. Only teachers who are interested in participating in data collection are listed. These teachers were selected by using non-probabilistic accidental sampling method because there needs to be relatively balanced gender and race breakdown for proper analysis. All participants who complete the study will be compensated 20 dollars for their time automatically through the survey platform.
Materials

Materials will include a mock academic trial case. The mock trial will be presented as a written summary that will be approximately 1 page long double spaced. In this case, the high school student will be accused of plagiarism on a final paper for American Literature. The student claimed that it was not clear in the prompt if Chat GPT, an AI platform, could be used for grammatically checking and rephrasing clunky sentences. The application “Turnitin” was used by the teacher and they found that 75% of the paper had been plagiarized from Chat GPT. The teacher argued that even if it was only used for touching up the paper it still counts as plagiarism because the Turnitin percentage was over 25% which is the known cut-off. It was decided that the student was guilty of plagiarism. Within the summary, the race of the student in the scenario (Black, White, Asian, or Latinx) will be randomly assigned to participants. The participant will be told the race of the student in the case through casual mention and will be given a name that likely identifies the student as Black, White, Asian, Latinx to make the participant more aware of the student’s race. The names were chosen by pairing the most common surnames female names by race from a U.S Census in 2010 (NameCensus), past research on stereotypical racially associated names (Garcia & Abascal, 2016), and a top google source (Haimom, 2018) – Black student (Muzaana Williams), White student (Margaret Smith), Asian student (Mai Nguyen), and Hispanic student (Margaritta Garcia) and a pilot study will be conducted to make sure that the racial identities match the intended group. The student will be an 18 year old female who is a senior high school student which will be kept constant across all the conditions. All other aspects of the case were held constant across conditions. Please see Appendix A for a full text of case summary.

Measures
After reading the case, participants will be asked to complete several dependent measures. They will first determine the severity of punishment for the student on a 10 point Likert type scale (1 -- no punishment and 10 -- severe punishment) as the subjective measure. Next, the participants will read that the student will be suspended and will be asked to specify how many days they should be suspended in a text box. This will be the objective measure.

Then they will answer a 14 item self developed scale that measures teacher’s racial stereotypes towards their assigned student race in terms of future academic success. The scale is comprised of questions such as “Is this student more likely to graduate than other students?” and “Is this student more likely to be intelligent than other students?” These questions will be measured on a 9 point Likert Type Scale. The full scale is provided in Appendix B. Since this is a newly created scale, reliability will be calculated during analysis. The scale exhibits high face validity as its questions effectively measure the intended constructs. Participants will be asked to report what the student’s race was in the scenario and what the name of the student was as the manipulation checks.

Lastly, for the demographics, participants were asked to select which ethnicity/race they best identified as out of the following options: Black, Asian, Hispanic, White, and Other. They did the same for gender identity: male, female, non-binary, prefer not to say, and other. For age (recorded in years), participants were asked “how old are you” with an open-ended format.

Procedure

The study used a 5 (race of the participant) x 4 (race of student in the scenario) fully crossed between groups factorial design. The race of the participant will be Black, White, Latinx, Asian, or Other. The race of the student in the scenario will be Black, White, Latinx, and Asian. Participants will be randomly assigned to one of the four conditions that vary in terms of student
race. At the beginning of the questionnaire, participants will be asked to complete the informed consent procedure. Then they will be given the case summary to read as if they were someone on the academic committee. After reading the summary, they will determine the proper severity of punishment objectively and subjectively. Then they will complete the scale assessing future academic success and manipulation checks. The scale will be averaged into a single score. Participants will be debriefed, thanked for their time, and paid accordingly. Data will be collected through Qualtrics, a cloud-based survey platform.

**Ethical Considerations**

Almost all students attend school in some form whether that be online, public, private, or even boarding school. Those students are all affected by the teacher’s behaviors and perceptions. By studying what affects those perceptions, this project may be able to help guide schools in developing disciplinary systems that are not as biased as the current ones. It may add to the scholarly knowledge base by providing more information about the effect of demographic match in schools and the potential differential judgments by teachers based on students' races. However, there is no direct benefit to the participants.

This is a minimal risk study because it is a completely anonymous questionnaire about a possible everyday non-stress-inducing situation. For teachers, academic dishonesty should be something that they are already familiar with because it is part of their role.

In addition, this project does not target protected or vulnerable populations and does not ask about participant’s sensitive information or sensitive issues. All data will be stored on a password protected device that only the researcher will have access to. No identifiable personal information will be collected; consequently, the data will be anonymous. Furthermore, there will
be no deception in this study, but hypotheses will not be reported to avoid priming prior to completing the study. Also, participants will make an informed decision about whether to participate after reading the informed consent information online. The recruitment of participants is also entirely non-coercive as the study will be sent to teachers through an email from the principal investigator who is not related to the participants, and they have the autonomy to decide whether or not to participate. By sending the email from the principal investigator, it will ensure that the participants are not taking the survey because of undue influence. After the study, participants will be debriefed, and the purpose of the study and hypotheses will be revealed.

Anticipated Results

This study will have two dependent variables: severity of punishment, measured objectively and subjectively, and perceived academic capability. There will be one question that measures severity of punishment objectively and subjectively, respectively. Perceived academic capability will be a composite variable that looks at perceived educational attainment and perceived intelligence. To conduct the analysis, a new variable will be created called “demographic match” that will indicate whether or not the participant’s race matches the student’s race.

This study is interested in determining the interaction between teacher’s race and student race on the severity of punishment for academic dishonesty and the main effects of student race. There will be a main effect of student race such that participants are expected to punish Hispanic and Black students more severely than Asian and White students. This is supported by past evidence that has indicated that teachers have more bias against Black and Hispanic students and Black and Hispanic students have more documented disciplinary actions against them (Girvan et al., 2021; Fix et al., 2023; Quinn, 2020). Research such as Skiba et al. (2011) and Fix et al.
(2023) provides support for my hypotheses that African American and Hispanic students are punished more severely, and the racial bias is not as simplistic as minorities versus majority.

In addition, the effect of demographic match will be dependent on student race as they relate to participants ratings of the severity of punishment on the student. Specifically, if the teacher’s race matches the student race, then they are expected to punish the student less severely. This prediction is backed up by the similarity leniency bias developed by Tajfel & Turner (1986). Supporting educational evidence on student-teacher demographic match found that students who had teachers of different races were viewed as more disruptive and less likely to be complementing homework (Dee, 2005). There was legal research that further reinforces my prediction that teachers who are of the same race as students will render a less severe punishment (Ewanation & Maeder, 2023; Sommers & Ellsworth, 2001; Ugwuegbu, 1979)

Additionally, I predict that these effects will be more noticeable with subjective ratings than objective ratings which follows the shifting standards model. The way to measure shifting standards is to compare people’s objective and subjective judgments using different techniques (Biernat, Manis, & Nelson’s, 1991). Biernat et al. (2009) found that people tend to shift standards based on race and Quinn (2020) work on grading scales found that when teachers use subjective grading techniques there was significant racial bias. There should be stereotyping effects with the objective measure because it does not vary from person to person, but the subjective measure is dependent on an individual's interpretation.

To examine the previous hypotheses, four separate simple ANOVAs will be conducted where the dependent variable is either subjectively or objectively measured severity of punishment, and the predictors are either student race and demographic match.
Lastly, I hypothesize that educators perceive Hispanic and Black students as less likely to succeed and less intelligent than Asian and White students. This hypothesis is supported by research from Mahatmya et al. (2016) and Glock (2016) that examined how teacher’s perceptions of educational attainment and language proficiency varied by race. Likewise, Tenebuam and Ruck’s (2007) research finds that teachers had more positive expectations for White students than minorities. For this hypothesis, another simple 1 way ANOVA will be conducted where the dependent variable is perceived academic capability, and the independent variable is student race.

Table 1. Anticipated Mean Severity of Punishment Scores by Student Race and Demographic Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Race</th>
<th>Demographic Match</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. > and >> are inequality symbols. >> means that the effect is greater than >. The parentheses mean that the associated categories are groups together i.e Black and Latinx is one group.

**Scholarly Merit & Broader Impacts**

This study holds significant potential scholarly merit by addressing a gap in existing educational and social psychology research. Previous experiments have explored the disproportionate punishment rates for minority students, how treatment varies when teachers judge objectively and subjectively, and whether racial similarity affects judgment, but this present study specifically addresses how student and teacher race influence punitive measures in response to academic dishonesty which has not been studied before. By examining the objective
and subjective aspects of punishment severity, the issues of the academic disciplinary process with come into light. Most of the time on academic committees, people will use their subjective judgments to determine the proper consequence. Demographic match is vital to understanding this topic because teachers may change their opinions if their race matches the student's race. This would lead to a stronger understanding of the nuanced racial dynamics at play and changes in the school’s punishment system.

This study's outcomes could inform and guide academic committees in their review of disciplinary cases at high school and college levels. The research may prompt a reevaluation of existing policies and procedures related to academic integrity. By conducting research on student and teacher race in the context of academic dishonesty, the findings will help create a more unbiased educational environment and therefore improve the wellbeing of individuals in society. Delaying this research would lead to the continuation of subconscious discrimination by teachers on minority students. Given the lack of research on AI based academic dishonesty, this study would help address teacher’s perceptions of academic dishonesty using Chat GPT.

This type of research is beneficial to racially underrepresented groups, particularly Black and Hispanic individuals that have been found in prior research to be more severely punished than other minority groups. As such, this research could be used to improve the lives of Black and Hispanic student in an area where they are significantly more present. It would increase the knowledge and understanding of the experiences of underrepresented racial groups. On a national and global level, the results will help us understand the psychological factors such as teacher’s implicit biases and racial demographic match that influence educational systems.
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Appendix A

Case Summary

[*STUDENT NAME] is a 18 year old [STUDENT RACE] senior female student enrolled in American Literature. This individual submitted a final paper that was 75% plagiarized according to Turnitin, a plagiarism software. This student has no record of past academic integrity involvements. She attends class on a regular basis and is considered an average student academically. According to [STUDENT NAME], the directions on the prompt did not specify whether or not Chat GPT could be used for grammar and sentence clarity purposes. She argued that she wrote the paper completely based on her own ideas and the use of Chat GPT for fixing grammar and clarity should be allowed given the directions.

The professor of the class feels like the student should be punished for their actions because the Turnitin percentage was higher than 25%. According to their class policy, any paper that receives higher than a 25% are grounds for failing the class and will be submitted to the academic committee for plagiarism. Turnitin simply detects AI language, but the algorithm is not able to determine whether the language was originally written by a person or if it was created by the AI.

The Academic Committee reviewed the case and concluded that the student was guilty of plagiarism. They have not decided what severity of punishment the student should receive and have reached out for help.
This questionnaire is designed to help us gain an understanding of how student characteristics influence teacher’s perceptions of them. Please indicate your opinions about each of the statements below. The questions are about the student in the scenario. Your answers are confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>A little likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Mostly likely</th>
<th>Extremely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this student more likely to graduate than other students? *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this student more likely to finish high school than other students? *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this student more likely to get into college than other students? *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this student more likely to work harder than other students toward their career goals? *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this student more likely to consistently show up to class than other students? *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this student more likely to take more classes than other students? *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this student more likely to get an A in a class than other students? *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Is this student more likely to have a higher IQ than other students? **

9. Is this student more likely to be smarter than other students? **

10. Is this student more likely to complete a test with a perfect score than other students? **

11. Is this student more likely to be intelligent than other students? **

12. Is this student more likely to know more vocabulary words than other students? **

13. Is this student more likely to attend a gifted school than a nongifted school? **

14. Is this student more likely to solve puzzles faster than other students? **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Educational Attainment **Intelligence
Note: All questions will be randomized in order.