CARTER, BRETT A., Ph.D. Faculty Beliefs, Level of Understanding, and
Reported Actions Regarding Academic Integrity. (2008)
Directed by Dr. Gerald Ponder. 195 pp.

Academic integrity within higher education has been extensively studied

nationally and internationally for the past several years (Aaron & Georgia, 1994;

Bower, 1964; Diekhoff, LaBeff, Shinohara, & Yasukawa, 1999; Kibler & Kibler,

1993; Lupton, Chapman, & Weiss, 2000; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001;

McCabe, 1997; McCabe & Trevino, 1996, 1997; Saddlemire, 2005; Selingo, 2004).

Findings from these studies revealed that the seriousness of the problem has

been underestimated by faculty, college administrators, and students for at least

30 years (Alschuler & Blimling, 1995). While it has been difficult to determine if

academic dishonesty in higher education has changed over time, findings in the

literature clearly indicate that students continue to engage in some form of

academic dishonesty at high rates. Ludeman (1998) asserts that the level of

college cheating among students has increased since 1941. Researchers (Higbee &

Thomas, 2002; Kibler, 1994; McCabe, 2005; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; Ruderman,

2004; Saddlemire, 2005; Selingo, 2004) on the topic believe faculty members play

a critical role in reducing incidents of academic dishonesty.

This study focused on characterizing patterns of beliefs, level of understanding, and reported actions of faculty regarding academic integrity at public and private institutions with honor code and academic integrity policies in the southeastern United States. Also, this study focused on faculty beliefs and understanding of academic integrity at various levels (full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructors). Finally, this study included a diverse pool of participants that included faculty from different and varied campuses (small and larger, public and private, historically Black colleges and Universities and historically White colleges and universities).

The descriptive analyses for this study are from a self reported questionnaire of undergraduate teaching faculty at three universities in the southeast. The data revealed a few noteworthy differences in faculty beliefs, levels of understanding, and reported actions regarding academic integrity between institutions with honor codes and those with academic integrity policies. Additional results of the study, implications of these findings, and recommendations for future research are discussed.

Overall, the results of this study indicate very few noticeable differences in faculty perceptions and understanding about academic integrity regardless of institutional type (private verses public with honor code or academic integrity

policy). Whether it is a public or private institution or an institution with an honor code or academic integrity policy, findings in this study show that faculty generally share some common beliefs about academic integrity: (a) academic integrity is a serious concern for faculty who, for the most part, have a general understanding and support for institutional academic integrity policies; (b) faculty reported a desire to be informed of how serious the problem of student cheating is and the frequency of occurrence on campus; (c) faculty could take a more proactive role in educating their colleagues and students about academic integrity; (d) faculty could become more vigilant and committed to following through on addressing cheating behaviors; (e) students could be actively involved in supporting and promoting academic integrity; and (f) administrative support of faculty who report academic integrity violations is critical given this is one of the reasons faculty tend not to report and/or ignore student cheating.

FACULTY BELIEFS, LEVEL OF UNDERSTANDING,

AND REPORTED ACTIONS REGARDING

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

by

Brett A. Carter

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2008

Approved by

_____
Committee Chair

I would like to dedicate this dissertation in memory of
Rev. Paul G. Carter and Ms. Pamela Wilson

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the

Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at

Greensboro.

Committee Chair   _____

Committee Members   _____

_____

_____

_____
Date of Acceptance by Committee

_____
Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I give thanks to my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ

My deepest appreciation and thanks to my doctoral committee: Dr. Gerald Ponder, Dr. David Ayers, Dr. Cherry Callahan, and Dr. Jewell Cooper for your service and patience throughout this project.

To my beloved family: Ms. Claretta Carter (mother), Mr. Thomas Carter Sr. (father), Robbie Carter, Valarie Carter, Paul Carter, Thomas Carter Jr., Patricia Carter, Terry Carter, Brent Carter, and Leslie Carter. Your unconditional love and support made it possible for me to pursue my dream. I love each of you more than words can say.

To my friends and colleagues: Dr. Patrick Haun, David Horney Mary Griffin, Brad Johnson, Linda and Kenneth Gillis, Dr. Holly Hartwig Moorhead, Dr. Patty Von Steen, Julie Atwood, Katie Brown, Dr. Erin Bentrim-Tapio, Amy Jones, Missy Minyard, Mary Culkin, Dr. Allen Goedeke, and Gart Evans. You all have been a great influence and inspiration in my life. Thank you!

Dr. Jen Day Shaw: You have always been so positive and supportive. Thank you for believing in me and finding the right words to keep me motivated while writing this dissertation. I am eternally grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Academic dishonesty (e.g., cheating, plagiarism, purchasing term papers on the Internet, stealing exams, etc.) has become a major problem in higher education (Center for Academic Integrity, 2004; Higbee & Thomas, 2002; Kibler, 1999; McCabe & Pavela, 2005; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; Ruderman, 2004). According to McCabe and Trevino (1995), students on most, if not all, campuses have engaged in some form of academic dishonesty which is a serious issue affecting all segments of higher education. Academic dishonesty impacts how policies are created and implemented in the academic community and has serious implications for the reputation of the institution from the college administration to the faculty to prospective students.

Since 1964, there have been several studies (Bower, 1964; Center for Academic Integrity, 2007; Kibler & Kibler, 1993; McCabe et al., 2001; McCabe & Trevino, 1994, 1996; McCabe, 1997; Saddlemire, 2005; Selingo, 2004; Williams & Janosik, 2007) on undergraduate students' involvement in academic dishonesty in higher education. These studies have reported that on most college and

university campuses, 65-85 % of undergraduate students admit to some form of

cheating during their college career. Lupton et al. (2000), for example, reported in

their academic dishonesty research that between 70% and 82% of U. S. college

undergraduate students reported that they had observed cheating. Researchers

Kibler (1993), McCabe and Trevino (2007), and Pavela (1997) found that students

are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty where it is believed that faculty

members are more likely to look the other way. McCabe (1993a) further noted

similar concerns when he surveyed faculty and found that one out of three

reported that they knew students were cheating in their classrooms and chose

not to report it to the appropriate campus authority because of the emotional

consequences such as stress, worry about teaching evaluations, the amount of

time to investigate and go through the judicial process, perceived lack of

administrative support, and the fear of litigation (Jendrek, 1989;Vandehey,

Diekhoff, & LaBeff, 2007). Clearly these findings present a challenge to the

integrity of the academic community in higher education.

     A review of the literature finds that most studies on the topic of academic

integrity focused primarily on undergraduate students, their attitudes and

perceptions about academic dishonesty, factors that contribute to cheating, and

what students believe are academic dishonesty violations. Similarly, many of

these studies were conducted on single campuses thus limiting the ability to generalize the findings. We know very little about faculty beliefs, perceptions, and reported actions about academic integrity and how they differ at institutions with honor codes and traditional academic integrity policies. One study that offered some insight into faculty members' views on academic integrity was designed by Saddlemire (2005) who conducted a study at a single, mid-sized public university on "Faculty Perceptions of Undergraduate Academic Dishonesty." The qualitative research study investigated faculty members' perceptions of, personal and professional experiences with, and communication about academic dishonesty. The results of the study found a relationship between faculty perceptions of academic integrity and the learning that occurs during the early stages of faculty socialization. Saddlemire noted in his study that the findings provided only a small piece of the puzzle as it relates to faculty views on academic integrity and recommended that further research be conducted in this area.

While Saddlemire's study is relevant and timely, the researcher believes that gaps still remain in the literature regarding the reported number of students who cheat and frequency of faculty reporting students for engaging in acts of academic dishonesty. Selingo (2004) also reported that

many faculty members simply ignore academic dishonesty and are less likely to report students who engage in acts of academic dishonesty because of their beliefs and perceptions about academic integrity as well as their unfamiliarity with the policies, procedures, and judicial processes. (p. 24)

By investigating faculty members' beliefs, understanding, and reported action regarding academic integrity, we may be able to close the gap in student cheating and infrequency of faculty reporting, employ strategies that will discourage cheating, and communicate the meaning of academic integrity in academia to students. That said, this study focused on characterizing patterns of beliefs, level of understanding, and reported actions of faculty regarding academic integrity and faculty.

A survey methodology was used to collect the data from faculty at four college level institutions (two private and two public research universities) in the southeast. Undergraduate faculties were e-mailed an academic integrity questionnaire developed by Mr. Donald McCabe of Rutgers University who is the founder of the Center for Academic Integrit**y.** Mr. McCabe is considered a preeminent scholar who has received national recognition for his research on academic integrity in higher education. Descriptive analyses of the self-report

questionnaire were conducted to provide a picture of faculty beliefs, level of understanding, and reported actions regarding academic integrity.

Findings from this study may lead to the development of comprehensive training programs for faculty designed to promote academic integrity, develop better ways to communicate academic integrity policies and procedures throughout the campus community, and create strategies for preventing and/or reducing incidents of academic dishonesty.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to characterize patterns of beliefs, level of awareness, and reported actions of faculty members regarding academic integrity at two public and two private post-secondary institutions in the southeast.

Research Questions

The guiding question for this study was: What knowledge, beliefs, and actions characterize faculty responses to academic integrity related to student academic dishonesty? The following are research questions:

1. What beliefs do faculty members express about academic integrity?

2. What source of awareness do faculty members report regarding academic integrity policies?

3. What are the patterns of beliefs and level of awareness among faculty members about violations of academic integrity at two public and two private post-secondary institutions?

4. What are the frequencies and types of reported violations among faculty members at two public and two private post-secondary institutions?

5. What methods do faculty members employ to respond to academic integrity violations?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following operational definitions were used:

<u>Academic Integrity</u> –

A commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, respect, trust, fairness, and responsibility. From these five values evolve principles of behavior that enable academic communities to translate ideals into action. (The Center for Academic Integrity, 1999, p. 4)

For the purpose of this study, a breach of academic integrity is a committed act of academic dishonesty.

<u>Academic Dishonesty</u> – There have been several attempts to define academic dishonesty. For the purpose of this study, the researcher used Gehring

and Pavela's definition presented in a 1994 report to the National Association of

Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA):

> Academic dishonesty is an intentional act of fraud, in which a person
> seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without
> authorization, or uses unauthorized materials or fabricated information in
> an academic exercise. (Gehring & Pavela, 1994, p. 5)

Some forms of academic dishonesty include: plagiarism, copying from others'

exams, purchasing term papers, stealing exams, impeding or damaging the

academic work of another, copying from the Internet, or forging a university

document.

Academic Integrity Policy – A policy that is developed by the entire

community and adopted by the institution. Such policy will include, at a

minimum: a statement in support of integrity and ethical behavior; a list of

actions that are not permissible with clear definitions; procedures for

adjudicating policy violations; and clearly defined penalties assigned to each

action (Lathrop & Foss, 2000).

Belief – Since the term has been defined in many ways, the following

definition represents what the researcher was intending by seeking beliefs.

According to the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2005) retrieved from

http://www.merriam-webster.com, "belief is the conviction of the truth of some

statement or the reality of some being or phenomenon especially when based on

examination of evidence."

Generalization –

Refers to the researcher's ability to generalize the results from the sample
to the population from which it was drawn. The degree of generalization
can be discussed in statistical terms depending on the sampling strategy
the researcher uses. (Mertens, 1998, p. 5)

Honor Code – To be classified as an honor code institution, a school must

meet at least two of the following criteria: unproctored examinations, an honor

pledge, a requirement for student reporting of honor code violations, and/ or the

existence of a student court or peer judicial board (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel,

2002). The study was designed to examine faculty thoughts and feeling about

academic integrity and policies, so the term "honor code" was not mentioned in

the survey so that the respondents' thinking would not be influenced by the

code.

Transferability – When the researcher provides a comprehensive

overview of where, when, and how the research took place so that the readers

are able to make judgment as to the transferability of the study's result to their own situations (Mertens, 1998).

   <u>Understanding</u> – Refers to knowledge regarding how much a respondent knows about a particular subject or topic (Mertens, 1998). Mertens (1998) suggests using knowledge questions in a survey because they are useful in interpreting the meaning of respondents' expressed opinion.

Significance of the Study

   The researcher selected this study for several reasons: (a) a review of the literature could not identify academic integrity studies that looked at faculty members' perspectives from historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs); (b) the researcher believed that undergraduate teaching faculty at a HBCUs may hold views different from those of historically White colleges and universities (HWCUs); (c) most studies on the topic were done on a single campus; (d) very few studies looked at academic dishonesty from a faculty member's perspective at institutions with honor codes and academic integrity policies and how their views differed from one another; and (e) studies on academic integrity have focused primarily on the beliefs, attitudes, and understanding of academic dishonesty from students' point of view. Academic integrity is not just a student issue; it is also a faculty and administration issue. A

review of the literature found that students are more likely to engage in

academic dishonesty where it is perceived that faculty do not care or overtly

ignore cheating (Center for Academic Integrity, 2007; Kibler, 1994; McCabe, 2005;

McCabe & Trevino, 1996). It is critically important to investigate the faculty

perspective regarding cheating in an effort to close the gap in the literature

between faculty and student beliefs and level of understanding about academic

dishonesty, faculty perceptions on what constitutes academic dishonesty

behavior, and the role faculty could play in the search for truth and integrity

within the academic community.

Furthermore, findings from this study will greatly benefit college

administrators who are responsible for overseeing and implementing academic

integrity policies and procedures in the academic community, faculty new to the

profession and/or institution, and faculty who continue to struggle with ways to

address academic dishonesty. Also, this study can benefit students who seek to

understand some of the frustrations and challenges faculties, as well as

institutions as a whole, face on a daily basis when dealing with incidents of

academic dishonesty such as plagiarism and peer-to-peer cheating.

Finally, the researcher was concern that faculty were choosing to by-pass

academic integrity policies and procedures and, were instead, taking matters into

their own hands. This decision not only violates students' right to due process, but could create some serious legal implications for both the faculty and the institution. The researcher was also concern that faculty were choosing to ignore student cheating behaviors and were unwilling to initiate proactive measures that may reduce student academic dishonesty within the academic setting. These concerns coupled with the rises in student cheating prompted the researcher to examine faculty attitudes and beliefs about academic integrity in higher education.

"Cheating is a serious threat to the validity of learning . . . to begin to understanding cheating, we must first understand the source of the problem" (Cizek, 1999, p. 8). Likewise, research is needed to learn more about faculty beliefs, level of understanding, and reported actions regarding academic integrity if we are to fully understand the phenomenon to change the campus culture so that colleges and universities can be: educationally *purposeful communities* where faculty and students share academic goals and work together; *open communities* where freedom of expression is protected, *just* communities where honor and diversity is aggressively pursued; *disciplined communities* where individuals accept responsibility for their behavior; *caring communities* where individuals are supported and service to others is encouraged, and *celebrative*

communities where the heritage, values, and traditions are widely shared (Boyer, 1990).

Conceptual Framework

Understanding the faculty members' perspective on academic integrity can significantly assist colleges and universities in their efforts to communicate appropriate norms related to academic integrity. For the purpose of developing a conceptual framework, the researcher conducted a thorough literature review of the prevalence of academic integrity in higher education and faculty perceptions about academic integrity within the academic community. Overwhelmingly, the literature reported a relationship between student academic dishonesty and observed behaviors of faculty regarding the perceptions and reported actions related to academic integrity. Learned behaviors within a social context seemed most fitting in terms of explaining the impact of faculty perception, understanding, and reported action regarding academic integrity. In other words, the social learning theory emerged from the literature as an explanation for how a person's behavior can be influenced by their environment. As was commonly mentioned in the literature, students who perceive the environment as one that does not emphasize the importance of academic integrity are more likely to engage in academically dishonest behavior. For example, faculty has

boasted, "Nobody cheats in my class" (Jendrek, 1989, p. 402). According to

Jendrek (1989), this attitude may contribute to an academic environment that

fosters academic dishonesty.

Social Learning Construct

Several existing theories have served as a framework for an

understanding of academic cheating. "Social learning theory predicts that

cheating varies directly with the level of perceived support from significant

others and the extent of pro-cheating attitudes" (Michaels, 1989, p. 873). Social

learning theory is important to this research because it offers a framework for

explaining how faculty members' behaviors influence academic integrity within

the campus culture.

An extensive amount of research has been conducted on Social Learning

Theory (SLT) over the years. According to Bandura (2006), SLT was officially

launched in publication of *Social Learning and Imitations*. Theorists such as

William James (1890), Kurt Lewin (1890-1947), Julian Rotter (1954) and Robert

Sears (1965) have studied human behavior, the environment, and learning. While

these theorists have presented several versions of SLT, they have commonalities:

(a) response consequences (such as reward or punishment) influence the

likelihood that a person will perform a particular behavior again in a given

situation; (b) humans can learn by observing others; and (c) individuals are most likely to model behaviors observed by others with whom they identify (Bandura, 2006; Ormrod, 1999). Perhaps one of the most preeminent theorists whose work has had a profound impact on the understanding of human behavior is Albert Bandura. Albert Bandura first began his work on SLT in the early 1960s, and since then has focused most of his research on the modeling of behaviors, attitudes, and emotional reactions of others (Bandura, 2006; Grusec, 1992; Ormrond, 1999). According to Bandura (2006), "human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others, one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions, this coded information serves as a guide for action" (p. 22). The theorist references three key principles of the social learning theory: (a) people learn by observing the behavior of others and the outcomes of those behaviors; (b) awareness and expectations of future reinforcements or punishments can have a major effect on the behavior that people exhibit; in other words, people expect certain behaviors to bring reinforcement and others to bring punishment; and (c) the observer's actions are reinforced by modeling which mean that people are attracted to individuals who model certain behaviors (Bandura, 2006). These three principles,

within the social learning theory, have several educational implications in higher education.

As social learning theorists suggest, students learn a great deal by observing the behavior of others such as their peers, parents, and faculty. In addition, social norms contribute to individuals' behavior in a particular situation. For example, extensive research by McCabe (1993a) found that one of the highest predictors of academic dishonesty is when students perceive that cheating is socially accepted. Therefore, faculty who ignore incidents of academic dishonesty could be negatively affect students' attitudes about integrity in the classroom. Students who observe faculty members, as well as the institution, taking a strong stance on academic dishonesty by consistently reinforcing academic integrity in the classroom and punishing those who cheat, report they are less likely to engage in incidents of academic dishonesty (Nonis & Swift, 1998). On the other hand, students who observe faculty members ignoring cheating behaviors or perceive minimal consequences for cheating are more likely to view such misconduct as acceptable at the institution they attend (Gehring & Pavela, 1994; McCabe, 1993b; Nuss, 1984; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel , 2002). Nonis and Swift (2001) and Kibler's (1994) comprehensive review of cheating behaviors supports this argument by asserting that if faculty members

expect honesty and integrity from their students, they could have a clear

understanding of academic integrity policies, clearly articulate them to students

in the classroom, and enforce standards and expectations throughout the

academic term. Ormrod (1999) noted that informing students of the negative

consequences of certain behaviors such as cheating could effectively increase the

appropriate behavior and decrease inappropriate ones. Nonis and Swift (2001)

and Ormrod (1999) assert that from the moment students enter the classroom,

faculty should clearly articulate academic policies as well as clearly define

dishonest behavior on the syllabus.

Another key argument of social learning theory is that people are

attracted to individuals who model certain behavior. A review of the literature

found that faculty members could significantly influence positive ethical

behavior and shape students' moral character by modeling high standards of

ethical conduct themselves. Quoting Don Gehring and Gary Pavela (1994),

> faculty have multiple opportunities to set academic standards, help
> students understand how academic dishonesty is defined, teach students
> ways to avoid unintentional infractions, identify and confront violators of
> community standards, and serve as 'models' of academic integrity. (p. 11)

Rosen (1980) further asserts,

Adults who model appropriate moral behavior teach appropriate behavior to young people who, in turn, model positive behavior to their peers, eventually creating an entire community that holds to a high moral standard, reducing the likelihood of behaviors such as cheating that arise as a consequence of the lack of moral example. (p. 21)

Summary

Collectively, the prevalence of academic dishonesty in higher education, faculty responsibility for maintaining academic integrity, and the social learning theory offer a framework for understanding the gap between student cheating behaviors and observance behaviors of faculty in and outside the classroom. These concepts support the researcher's assertions that: (a) there is not a clear understanding on the part of faculty of the enormous impact academic dishonesty has on high education; (b) students who perceive faculty to be ignoring incidents of academic dishonesty are more likely to engage in academic misconduct behaviors such as cheating because it is believed to be socially acceptable at the institution; and (c) one could continue to investigate faculty members' beliefs, attitudes, and reported actions regarding academic integrity because the implications of such findings could change the campus culture to deter student cheating. Conceptually, the social learning theory offers a framework for investigating patterns of beliefs, level of understanding, and

reported actions of faculty for the purpose of determining if certain behaviors influence academic dishonesty behaviors in a collegial setting.

Limitations of the Study

Clearly, a limitation in this study is low faculty participation. One factor that contributed to this limitation was the fact that two private institutions dropped out of the study post IRB approval. Having recognized this limitation, the researcher spoke to a senior level administrator at the two private institutions and both indicated that they were unwilling to have a researcher from another campus studying the issue on their campus, even though approval had been granted previously from both institutions for this particular study. Another limitation in this study was the low faculty response rate of the institutions that participated in the study. The researcher decided to extend the data collections phase for an additional two weeks and sent e-mail notices to the non-respondents encouraging them to participate in the study. The feedback (post data collection) from the institutions was that faculty members indicated that they were hesitant to answer questions, even when assured of confidentiality, because of the nature of this topic. Despite being particularly concerned about the low response rate from the historically Black university, the researcher felt it was important to include the responses from all members of the faculty willing

to participate in this study. Because of the low numbers, the researcher

recommends being very cautious when making generalizations from the results.

Clearly, academic integrity issues are a much more sensitive topic than the

researcher and those high level administrators from the target schools who

initially agreed to participate anticipated.

Several limitations should be also noted when considering survey

research. Given the quantitative nature of this study, one major drawback is that

the researcher has to rely on the honesty of the individual completing the survey.

The validity of the survey could be compromised if the instructions for

completing the survey are unclear, or if the respondents don't understand or

know how to answer a particular question (Mertens, 1998). Also, concerns have

been raised about the reliability of self-reporting survey research. However, the

researcher believes that the survey method is the most effective way of collecting

data about beliefs and level of understanding in this setting. The researcher may

also encounter non-response error where respondents may refuse to complete

the questionnaire, not have a strong interest in the topic, or elect to ignore the

online questionnaire altogether. The researcher's point of view could influence

the transcription of the open-ended response data of the study. Therefore, the

interpretations made from the open-ended response portion of the study will be

that of the researcher and are open for alternate interpretations. Finally, the

researcher is aware that online response rates tend to be lower than other

methods used to collect data.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Prior research which presents an unwelcome reality that, over the past 30 years, researchers have found college students have engaged, and continue to engage in acts of academic dishonesty at alarming levels (McCabe & Trevino, 1996). Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) noted that "cheating and other forms of academic dishonesty are not new problems . . . for as long as there have been tests, this type of behavior has existed" (p. 3). What is even more sobering is that it seems almost predictable that on any given day, you will find something written about dishonesty, falsification, or fraud in corporate America. Embezzlement, insider trading, price fixing, fabricated news stories, and other forms of dishonesty are widespread in business, industry, and government. Given the fact that some of the boundaries between integrity and dishonesty are often blurred in the "real" world, it is not surprising that today's students are arriving on campus having grown up in a society where ethical wrongdoing is the norm rather than the exception. According to McCabe and Trevino (1996), the

highest predictor of academic dishonesty is when students perceive that cheating is socially acceptable, hence the prevalence of cheating.

Within higher education, academic integrity and dishonesty has been the subject of many research studies and are quickly becoming important topics of discussion at professional conferences nationwide as educators (faculty and administrators) struggle to get a handle on what is becoming a disconcerting phenomenon. In order to fully understand the seriousness of academic dishonesty and the lack of integrity in higher education, it is necessary to review the empirical research presented on the topics. The literature review focused on research findings in three areas: (a) how academic integrity is defined in higher education; (b) higher education's response to academic dishonesty; and (c) faculty members' reported perceptions and understanding of academic integrity.

Much has been written in the literature about academic integrity. A majority of the research on academic integrity has focused on student cheating within the context of high school and higher education. Researchers (Bower, 1964; Levy & Rakovski, 2006; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; Passow, Mayhew, Finelli, Harding, & Carpenter, 2006) have measured students' perceptions of cheating, students' perceptions about faculty and their dishonest behavior, students' and faculty understanding of academic integrity, why students cheat, and factors that

influence academic dishonesty in the classroom (Ashworth & Bannister, 1997;

Jendrek, 1989; Levy & Rakovski, 2006; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; McCabe,

Trevino, & Butterfield, 1999). Collectively, findings from Ashworth and

Bannister, 1997; Jendrek, 1989; Levy and Rakovski, 2006; McCabe and Trevino,

1996; and McCabe et al., 1999 have reported consistent findings regarding

academic dishonesty: student frequency of cheating continues to increase; the

campus culture regarding academic integrity may be the most important

determinant of the level of cheating by students; both faculty and students lack a

clear definition of what behaviors are associated with academic dishonesty; and

cheating is generally lower at institutions with honor codes.

Academic Integrity Defined

To understand the seriousness of academic dishonesty in higher

education, one should first understand what constitutes academic integrity

(Coalter, Lim, & Wanorie, 2007). The Center for Academic Integrity defines

academic integrity as

> a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. From these five values emerges ethical behavior that enables academic communities to translate ideals into actions. (Center for Academic Integrity, 1999, p. 4)

The mission of an academic community, therefore, could be one that supports

and holds students accountable for upholding these five values which are the

foundation of higher education and society as a whole (Center for Academic

Integrity, 1999). Furthermore, post-secondary institutions that ignore the five

fundamental values are in essence sending a message that students, faculty,

institutions, and degrees hold little significant value (Center for Academic

Integrity, 1999). In addition to integrating the five fundamental values (honesty,

trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility) into the moral fabric of the academic

community and holding students accountable for upholding these values,

researchers (Coalter et al., 2007; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; McCabe et al., 1999;

Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002) on the topic believe it is equally important to

integrate higher standards of conduct related to academic integrity within the

college community. These researchers further assert that colleges and

universities should respond to issues surrounding the breach of academic

integrity among college students and take appropriate action to ensure that the

moral fabric of any academic community remains intact.

A review of the literature finds that a breach of academic integrity is a

committed act of academic dishonesty (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). William

Kibler, who has done extensive research on academic integrity, defines academic

dishonesty as a "form of cheating and plagiarism that involves students giving or

receiving unauthorized assistance in an academic exercise or receiving credit for

work that is not their own" (as cited in Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004, p. 304).

Gehring and Pavela (as cited in Gehring & Pavela, 1994) expanded upon Kibler's

definition of academic dishonesty by offering the following definition:

> We regard academic dishonesty as an intentional act of fraud, in which a
> student seeks to claim credit for the works or efforts of another without
> authorization, or use 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 others students in acts of dishonest.
> (p. 197)

One of the major problems in discussing academic dishonesty has been

the lack of a clear understanding and/or the diverse meanings of academic

dishonesty. According to the literature, the term takes on many different

meanings, some familiar to all; others less obvious:

- *Plagiarism:* "The unauthorized use of the language and thoughts of

  another author and the representation of them as one's own"

  (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004, p. 204).

- *Cheating:*

Any action that violates the established rules governing the administration of a test or completion of an assignment; a behavior that gives one student an unfair advantage over other students on a test or assignment; or an action that decreases the accuracy of the intended inferences arising from a students' performance on a test or assignment. (Cizek, 2003, p. 122)

- *Fabrication:* "Intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise" (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004, p. 304).

- *Falsification:* "Manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes; changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record" (Decoo, 2002, p. 6).

- *Facilitating academic dishonesty:* "Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help a student to commit an act of academic dishonesty" (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004, p. 304).

Other forms of academic dishonesty cited in the literature include: taking exams for others; doing other's assignments; altering or forging an official university document, unpermitted collaboration, turning in written materials with made up sources, or paying someone to write a paper to submit as one's own work (Decoo, 2002; Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004; Higbee & Thomas 2002; McCabe et al., 2001). Other less obvious forms of academic dishonesty can

include a tutor giving too much assistance; cheating by watching a video rather than reading the book; having a friend sign the attendance roll, or using a teacher's previous exams for test preparation (Higbee & Thomas, 2002).

One of the main issues that has emerged in the literature is the inconsistency in the understanding and definition of academically dishonest behavior among faculty, staff, and students. According to Roberts and Rabinowitz (1992), "Our ability to alter the environment in which cheating takes place will be determined by our understanding of how people (faculty and students) perceive cheating and its seriousness" (p. 189). Statements such as "everyone is doing it," "What's the big deal," or "I didn't intend to cheat" suggest that students may not have a clear understanding of what academic dishonesty is or they may have learned from parents, members of the academic community, and society that academic dishonesty is not a significant issue (Cizek, 2003; Roberts & Rabinowitz, 1992).

Higher Education's Response to Academic Dishonesty

A review of the literature reported some disturbing facts about academic dishonesty in higher education. A number of studies have looked at behaviors that constitute academic dishonesty and the frequency of such behaviors in the college and university setting (Center for Academic Integrity, 2007; Higbee &

Thomas, 2002; Kibler, 1994; McCabe, 2005; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; Ruderman,

2004). According to McCabe et al. (2001), students on most, if not all, campuses

have engaged in some form of academic dishonesty, which is becoming a serious

issue affecting all segments of higher education. The best data on the frequency

of academic dishonesty were first uncovered in landmark research studies

conducted by Bower (1964) and McCabe and Trevino (1997), who looked at

undergraduate students' involvement in academic dishonesty in higher

education on American college campuses. These ground-breaking studies on

academic integrity among college students raised attention in the higher

education community to the seriousness of cheating by presenting evidence that

the frequency of cheating was on the increase as self-reported by students.

> Three out of four students in the Bower's study admitted to engaging in at
> least one of thirteen questionable academic dishonesty behaviors. The
> McCabe and Trevino study reported that two out of three students
> admitted to having engaged in at least one of the fourteen questionable
> academic behaviors, ten of which were identical to the behaviors studied
> by Bower. (McCabe & Trevino, 1996, p. 30)

Collectively, the studies found that students admitted to copying from other

students during tests, using crib notes, helping others cheat, plagiarizing,

falsifying information, using dishonest methods to complete assignments, and

keeping silent about their classmates who were cheating (McCabe & Trevino, 1996). The researchers' findings confirmed what has become a growing phenomenon today: cheating is significantly and grossly underestimated by members of the academic community. Faculty may be creating environments that are conducive to cheating. For example, faculty who use the same testing instrument year after year, or observe incidents of cheating and do nothing about it because they do not share the views of their colleagues about what is considered cheating may create an environment that supports cheating and hinder efforts by student affairs administrators to enforcing academic integrity policies.

In spite of efforts to educate college students about academic dishonesty, a majority of all students surveyed admitted to engaging in cheating behaviors despite efforts by some faculty members and college administrators at enforcing academic integrity policies (Harding, Carpenter, Montgomery, & Steneck, 2001; Center for Academic Integrity, 1999; McCabe et al., 2001). In a 1999 meta-analysis on academic dishonesty, Hendershott and Drinan found that 70% of college students admitted to one or more forms of academic misconduct on a test or examination. The Center for Academic Integrity conducted a study at Duke University in 2000 and found that 45% of students self reported that they

engaged in some form of unauthorized collaboration and 37% reported that they had falsified lab reports since coming to Duke (Ruderman, 2004). According to Noah and Eckstein (2001), some estimates of academic dishonesty go as high as 80%. In a 1990 survey of 232 students at Rutgers University in New Jersey, 45% of students reported that they had cheated in one or two courses and 33% of students admitted to cheating in at least eight courses. In a similar study two years later, 81% of the students responding reported that they had cheated during their college career. Similar studies also found that 50% of faculty never reported student cheating and more than 30% were aware of the cheating and did not report it to the appropriate authorities (p. 8). Researchers also found that faculty did not adhere to academic integrity procedures nor did students get involved in the development and enforcement of academic integrity policies (Gallant & Drinan, 2006).

From what is already known about students and academic dishonesty, it appears that the problem does not begin in college. In a study conducted by the Josephson Institute of Ethics, 74% of high school students responded that they had cheated on a test at least once (Levy & Rakovski, 2006). The same study found that middle and high school students were willing to cheat on a test if it would help them get into college. According to the literature, high school seniors

are encountering exceptionally fierce competition for admissions into some of the

most prestigious colleges and universities. This pressure to achieve "top scores"

is a motivating factor for many high school students to do whatever it takes to

get into the "top schools even if it means resorting to cheating" (Noah &

Eckstein, 2001). In a 1998 survey of 3,000 high-achieving 16 to 18-year-olds who

plan to attend college, Noah and Ecktsein (2001) found the following:

- 80 percent of the country's best high school students cheated to get into the top of their classes;
- more than half of the high school students surveyed said that they did not think cheating was a big deal;
- 95 percent of cheaters said they were not caught;
- 40 percent cheated on a quiz or a test;
- and 67 percent copied someone else's homework. (p. 29)

Noah and Ecktsein (2001) further assert that this competitive pressure creates an

environment for students, their parents and in some cases, college officials to cut

corners, misrepresent results, and behave dishonestly.

Empirical research reports that 72% of high school students admitted to

cheating on written assignments while 98% let someone else copy their work.

Moreover, the percentage of students who report using a cheat sheet doubled

from 34% in 1969 to 68% in 1989 (Center for Academic Integrity, 2007). Other

studies have also found a link between cheating in high school and college and

misconduct in the workplace (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004; Lupton et al., 2000; Selingo, 2000). For example, in a survey of 130 engineering students at two private institutions, 6 in 10 reported they frequently cheated in high school, and college and later violated workplace policies by falsifying records and ignoring quality policies (Selingo, 2004).

Why Students Engage in Academic Dishonesty

Even though students have an understanding that cheating is wrong as well as the possible consequences of engaging in such behaviors, their motivation to cheat far outweighs their values and the fear of getting caught (Alschuler & Blimling, 1995; McCabe & Trevino, 1997). Increasingly, students are doing whatever is necessary to get ahead. This factor, coupled with the social pressures of getting a college degree, often leads to unethical behaviors such as cheating for the purpose of achieving academic success. While college students report that a college degree is important to have, many believe that it is the ticket to a high paying job regardless of what and how they learn. Therefore, in the minds of students it is acceptable to resort to shortcuts even if it involves cheating. Such belief often manifests itself in the broader culture. Integrity research of top executives found that they tend to foster a "do whatever it takes" mentality which has led to many unethical behaviors in the corporate

mainstream (i.e., ENRON, political leaders, sports figures, and media officials).

This "do whatever it takes" attitude can be traced back to higher education as

more college-age students engage in acts of academic dishonesty, believing such

acts are necessary to get into the top schools, achieve financial success, or please

their parents. Furthermore, 75% of college students believe that cheating is a

normal part of life (Sims, 1995). Other reasons student engage in academic

dishonesty cited in the literature include: (a) pressure to make the grade, (b)

because others are cheating too, (c) access to technology, (d) faculty don't care,

and (e) it is socially acceptable.

Pressure to Make the Grade

While the reasons presented in the literature vary from campus to campus

as to why students engage in academic dishonesty, most of the research

consistently reported some common causes of academic dishonesty among

college students. Academic dishonesty research (Alschuler & Blimling, 1995;

Kibler & Kibler, 1993; McCabe, 2005) found that high incidents of cheating in

college can be attributed to the intense pressure on the part of high school

students to make good grades because of competitive admissions requirements

and the perception of college students that nothing happens to students who

cheat. Kibler and Kibler (1993) assert, "College students face intense and

competitive environmental pressures on many campuses as academic excellence

grows" (p. 1), which is why many may resort to cheating. In the words of one

student,

> I think the cutthroat competition of getting good grades and getting into a good grad school are the two most important factors in what drives students to cheat. Also, pressure from parents, family, and professors makes you think about cheating. It really is a shame that society has turned us into such deceitful people. (McCabe & Trevino, 2007, p. 1)

Other studies report that competitive degree programs such as nursing,

engineering, and highly ranked business schools tend to have high incidents of

cheating (Passow et al., 2006).

Others are Cheating

McCabe (2005) found that regardless of the campus academic integrity

policy, if students see others cheating, and faculty fail to see it or choose to ignore

it, they are likely to conclude that cheating is necessary to remain competitive.

According to one student, "if faculty members aren't concerned about cheating,

why should we" (p. 28). McCabe and Trevino (1993) assert that "the perception

of peers' behavior was the most influential contextual variable" (p. 533) in the

rate of cheating. In other words, students who observe their peers cheating create

a sense that the behavior is okay. The researchers also mentioned that students

who choose not to cheat see themselves at an unfair disadvantage to those who cheat and get away with it or are not dealt with in a serious manner. For this reason, many students believe that everyone cheats or that cheating is a normal part of life. According to Pavela (1997), there is a strong relationship between faculty attitudes about cheating and students' feelings about how faculty members will handle violations of academic integrity. "Students believe that many faculty members would not pursue a cheating incident unless the matter was severe and the proof unequivocal" (p. 642). For this reason, many students target these faculty members and thus their courses become frequent targets for cheating.

Technology in Higher Education

The Internet has also contributed to students cheating. McCabe and Pavela (2004) reported that student misuse of the Internet is a rapidly growing phenomenon. Faculty in particular feel "under siege" from what they believe is rampant Internet cheating among college students. The explosion of technology (Internet and wireless messaging devices such as cell phones, and recordable iPods) has made it easy for students to plagiarize. Advances in technology have allowed students to become savvy with the Internet using it to access information without going to the library. Unfortunately, as colleges and

universities continue to seek out ways to increase access to the Internet for

distance learners, more and more computer savvy students are taking advantage

of the abundance of information the Web has to offer which is likely to result in

students stealing the ideas of others and using them as their own (Dichti, 2003;

Higbee & Thomas, 2002; Lupton et al., 2000; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Selingo,

2004). Selingo (2004) also mentioned that technology has changed the way

students cheat. A simple click of the mouse and within seconds a Google search

can instantly produce hundreds of Web sites with uncited information, paper

mills, and cheating handbooks (Cizek, 2003). Harris (2001) found that many

students resort to cheating because they feel that their writing abilities are

inadequate causing them to resort to paper mills on the Internet. Similarly,

students don't believe professors actually read the research papers. According to

one student, "A paper simply due at the end of the semester and returned

without comments will provide for a temptation to plagiarism" (Harris, 2001, p.

9). More recently, a 2001 survey by McCabe found that 41% of students have

engaged in "cut-and-paste" plagiarism from online sources (Sterngold, 2004).In a

2003 study conducted by the National Survey of Student Engagement, "87% of

college students said their peers copied data from the Internet without citing

sources at least some of the time"(Cruikshank, 2004, p. 132).

While technology has made cheating easy, it has also proven to be an effective tool to catch cheaters. Faculty and college administrators are using the same system to catch the violators by plugging in two or three phrases from a student's paper into Google to see if the student has plagiarized his or her work. Some faculty members have designed homemade computer programs to detect cheating. For example, in 2001 a professor at Georgia Tech used a homemade computer program to catch 187 students cheating on their homework assignments (Selingo, 2004).

Faculties Don't Care

Several other factors contributing to student cheating have been reported in the literature such as poor teaching, the belief that faculty don't care, unreasonable workloads, stress, low self-esteem, lack of enforcement, and confusion on the part of students about what is considered academically dishonest behavior. Kibler and Kibler (1993), for example, found a relationship between low self-esteem among college students and academically dishonest behavior. The researchers found that students with low self-esteem tend to cheat because they lack self confidence, their circumstances, and the fear of failure. Furthermore, researchers also found that students are more likely to justify cheating if they perceive their teachers as being unfair, exams are too difficult, or

that academic integrity policies are unclear (Pulvers & Diekhoff, 1999). McCabe

and Trevino (2007) reported that many colleges and universities' academic

integrity policies are poorly defined, often outdated, and rarely discussed by

faculty. It is no wonder a vast majority of undergraduate students surveyed

about academic dishonesty revealed widespread cheating because of the

uncertainty about what exactly constitutes academic dishonesty (McCabe, 2001).

According to Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002),

> Some students may unintentionally engage in what faculty members
> consider to be academically dishonest behaviors (such as collaboration on
> assignments without explicit instructions on the part of the faculty
> member not to) because they may not know that the behavior is
> prohibited. (p. 27)

It is Socially Accepted

A plethora of information has been written about the unethical business

practices of financial giants in cooperate America. Acts of mistrust have created a

society plagued with corruption and endless scandals that have infiltrated the

political system, mass media, and higher education. Higher education, for many,

is viewed as a critical entity in the moral and ethical development of citizens.

Unfortunately, some researchers believe that "higher education in the United

States has failed to teach and nurture ethical behavior in its students" (Coalter et

al., 2007, p. 1). A review of the literature describes higher education as a system

constantly expanding, growing in its scope and complexity, and plagued with

academic misconduct by students, faculty, and administrators. This assertion is

supported by Noah and Eckstein (2001) who believe that academic dishonesty

has become a global phenomenon. In their book, *Fraud and Higher Education: The*

Worm in the Apple, the authors present an unwelcome reality about academic

dishonesty in higher education. Noah and Eckstein (2001) write,

> While we are not inclined to think of serious misconduct in connection
> with education and research, fraud [academic dishonesty] exists (some
> would even say flourishes) there too, and is certainly not new. Nor is
> misconduct in education limited to one country. Wherever there are
> exams, there is cheating. (p. 6)

This comment confirms what many educators and administrators have

known for quite some time: that academic dishonesty is a widespread problem in

higher education. Concerns about academic integrity within higher education

have been extensively studied and researched for the past 50 years (Center for

Academic Integrity, 2007). While it has been difficult to determine if academic

dishonesty has changed over time, findings from several studies clearly tell us

that students have and continue to engage in some form of academic dishonesty

at alarming levels (Center for Academic Integrity, 2004; Higbee & Thomas, 2002;

Kibler, 1994; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; Ruderman, 2004; McCabe, 2005).

While the research on academic integrity has taken the position that

cheating is on the increase, there seem to be varied opinions on the frequency of

academic misconduct within higher education. A review of the literature found

that estimates vary widely from study to study. However, within the past ten

years, studies have reported that anywhere from 60 to 90% of college-age

students have engaged in some form of cheating (Center for Academic Integrity,

2007; Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992; & Dichtl, 2006). According to

Davis et al. (1992), cheating has become one of the major problems in higher

education today. For example, Haines, Diekhoff, Labeff, and Clark (1986) stated

that "student dishonesty on college campuses throughout the nation has been

widely recognized as epidemic" (p. 324). Furthermore, many of the students

surveyed by McCabe's research on academic misconduct often cited concerns by

the failure of colleges and universities and their faculty for not addressing

academic misconduct. "Students believe that weak institutional policies and

unobservant or unconcerned faculty are 'allowing' others to cheat and, thereby,

to gain an unfair advantage" (McCabe, 2005, p. 27).

Empirical research on academic dishonesty presents a convincing argument that academic integrity is eroding the values of the academic community. While it is clear that cheating is wrong, one question that remains unanswered is: what is blocking the solutions to restoring academic integrity within higher education? The answer to this question may lie in the hands of the campus culture. In other words, how are colleges and universities responding to academic dishonesty within the learning environment?

Higher Education's Efforts to Reduce Academic Dishonesty

Those working in the area of academic integrity have consistently reported that the culture on campus regarding academic dishonesty plays a significant role in determining the volume of cheating by students. Aaron and Georgia (1994) surveyed high-level university administrators to get their perspectives on post-secondary institutions' response to academic dishonesty and found that 60% of faculty were likely to "take decisions regarding student academic integrity into their own hands without utilizing established procedural guidelines" (Aaron & Georgia, 1994, p. 85). In a more recent study that looked at institutionalization of academic integrity, Gallant and Drinan (2006) found that colleges and universities tend to focus most of their attention on policing and punishing academic dishonesty and less on promoting, educating, and

developing values of academic integrity. Both McCabe (2005) and Gallant and

Drinan (2006) believe that academic dishonesty will continue to rise as long as

students perceive that institutions and faculty lack the ability to create a strong

culture of integrity, and the gap between policy and practice continues to widen.

The researchers further assert that the institutional response must be one that

values academic integrity and encourages all campus constituencies to take

responsibility for violations of academic integrity on campus. "Anything less

than the commitment to mutual responsibility can make an academic integrity

policy powerless and ineffective" (Lathrop & Foss, 2000, p. 100). McCabe and

Pavela (1998), further assert, "Those who refrain from discussing the importance

of academic integrity, or look the other way when students engage in academic

dishonesty, alienate honest students and foster a climate of moral cynicism on

campus" (p. 101). These findings suggest that further research is needed in the

understanding of faculty and administrators' attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions

about academic integrity if it is to have a strong presence in higher education.

McCabe (1993b) asserts, "The highest predictor we have for academic

dishonesty is when students perceive that cheating is socially acceptable at the

institutions they're attending" (p. 342). Faculty who ignore incidents of academic

dishonesty could be negatively affecting students' attitudes about integrity in the

classroom. Students, who observe faculty members, as well as the institution,

taking a strong stance on academic dishonesty by consistently reinforcing

academic integrity in the classroom and punishing those who cheat, report they

are less likely to engage in incidents of academic dishonesty (Nonis & Swift,

1998). On the other hand, students who observe faculty members ignoring

cheating behaviors or perceive the minimal consequences for cheating are more

likely to view such misconduct as acceptable at the institution they attend

(Gehring & Pavela, 1994; McCabe, 1993b; Nuss, 1984; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel,

2002). "I highly resent cheating and cheaters, but I even more strongly resent a

campus which does little to prevent or punish these offenders" (McCabe &

Pavela, 2004, p. 16).

Honor Codes

Institutions with an academic integrity policy have received very little

mention in the academic integrity literature, making it difficult to report on its

effectiveness in reducing academic dishonesty. However, one approach to

reducing student academic dishonesty which is frequently mentioned as well as

studied extensively in the literature has been the establishment of an honor code.

For many colleges and universities, honor codes have been their response to

reducing academic misconduct. According to McCabe and Trevino (2007), honor

codes have received broad support from faculty and students. Honor codes, by

design, seek to create a campus culture that values integrity; one [honor code]

with clearly defined academic integrity policies and procedures and consistent

enforcement of sanctions for integrity violations (McCabe & Pavela, 2004;

McCabe et al., 1999). Researchers have studied the influence of academic

integrity policies and honor codes on the reduction of academic dishonesty and

the strategies used to enforce integrity in the classroom and found a relationship

in the frequency of cheating among college students in honor code and non-

honor code environments (Crown & Spiller, 1998; McCabe & Pavela, 2004;

McCabe et al., 1999). Honor codes typically include at least two of the following

elements: a written honor pledge, peer reporting, unproctored examinations,

student run honor councils, and some degree of obligation on students to report

cheating. (McCabe et al., 1999; McCabe & Trevino, 2007). The primary purpose of

honor codes is to develop a sense of community responsibility for academic

integrity enforcement, particularly among students. On the other hand, non-

honor code (traditional academic integrity policies) institutions place the

responsibility of reporting incidents of academic dishonest on the faculty

member who in turn typically reports the violation to student affairs

administrators. On most non-honor code campuses, it is usually the

responsibility of the student affairs administrator to enforce such policies and to

educate the academic community about academic integrity (Gallant & Drinan,

2006). Critics of schools with traditional academic integrity policies report that

such policies are often vaguely defined, outdated, and rarely discussed among

faculty (McCabe & Trevino, 1993, 2007; McCabe et al., 1999).

A movement toward modified honor codes has begun to appear on the

campuses of many public and private colleges. An extensive search of the

literature found one study that looked at academic dishonesty on college

campuses with modified honor codes and traditional academic integrity policies.

McCabe et al. (1999) conducted a qualitative study titled *Academic Integrity in*

Honor Code and Non-honor Code Environments to investigate students' thoughts

and feelings about honor codes and how such codes influence their behavior

toward cheating. Prior to the data collection, McCabe et al. (1999) made some

assumptions about institutions with honor codes. First, institutions with honor

codes are likely to have lower incidents of cheating because students are better

informed of definitions of cheating behaviors and what is expected of them in the

classroom. Second, moral norms are frequently activated and behaviors are

influenced under honor code systems because students are given responsibility

for detecting violators, assessing responsibility, and assigning sanctions. Finally,

students are more likely to abide by honor codes because they are motivated to

preserve valued privileges, such as unproctored exams (McCabe et al., 1999). The

McCabe et al. study used qualitative variables to investigate students' thoughts

about academic integrity in honor code (N=3447) and non-honor code (N=3426)

institutions. In addition, students were asked to complete an open-ended

question about their thoughts on the effectiveness of academic integrity policies

on their campuses and the prevalence of cheating. The term "honor code" was

not mentioned in the study because the researchers didn't want the term "honor

code" to impact their responses (McCabe et al., 1999). Thirty-one U. S. colleges

and universities participated in the study. Fourteen of the 31 colleges employed

traditional honor codes and seventeen employed more traditional policies. The

McCabe et al. study reported some interesting findings:

- Campuses where honor codes had been in place for a relatively short
  period of time reported lower rates of both cheating on tests and
  exams and cheating on writing assignments than in colleges that did
  not have any code in place. Georgia Tech, for example, instituted an
  honor code and noticed a 22% drop in the number of reported cases
  (Selingo, 2004).

- Students at institutions with an honor code who believed they would be reported if caught cheating, coupled with the severity of the sanctions for cheating, were less likely to engage in academic misconduct than non-honor code students.

- Cheating among college students at institutions without honor codes was significantly higher than expected. Forty-seven percent of students at institutions without honor codes engaged in some form of serious cheating on a test or an exam compared to 24% of students at schools with honor codes.

- Students at institutions with strong honor codes tended to have a more fundamental understanding of honesty and integrity than students at schools that do not.

- Students at schools with honor codes tended to accept responsibility for their own personal integrity.

- At schools with effective honor codes, there didn't exist a 'we' and 'they,' only 'us.' Faculty and students recognized that they belonged to a special community that extended many privileges to the members and to maintain these privileges, students were willing to accept certain responsibilities for maintaining integrity in the classroom.

Based on these findings, McCabe et al. (1999) found that overall, students

at institutions with honor codes perceived academic integrity in a fundamentally

different way than students at institutions with traditional academic integrity

policies. The researchers assert,

> This difference seems to stem from the presence of the honor code and the
> influences that such codes have on the way students thought about
> academic honesty and dishonesty. Although honor code students feel the
> same pressures from the larger society as their non-code colleagues, they
> are significantly less likely to use such pressures to rationalize or justify
> their own cheating. Rather, they refer to the honor code as an integral part
> of the culture of integrity that permeates their institutions. (p. 230)

McCabe et al. (1999) concluded their study by emphasizing that honor

codes may offer an effective way to reduce cheating, but they are not perfect.

Students report that honor code systems tend to create a sense of fearful and

stressful environments. On the other hand, student, faculty, and administrative

involvement in the development and implementation of an honor code model

could produce some rewarding results. The impact of honor codes on many

campuses with an ethical appeal to students—rooted in a sense of community

responsibility—can help reduce cheating (McCabe & Trevino, 2007). While

McCabe and Trevino speak favorably of honor codes, they strongly believe that

some non-code schools have reduced academic dishonesty among students

> Although they lack a formal code, they subscribe to the basic strategy we have suggested: they communicate the campus's commitment to academic integrity and make it an active topic of discussion among students and faculty to help them understand that every member of the campus community is responsible for promoting it [integrity]" (p. 1)

The researchers further assert that not only do honor codes reduce cheating, these policies also build an environment of trust among faculty, students, and the institution. In the words of one student,

> I believe [my school] to be a rare example of integrity in college. . . the biggest factor is our honor code. By signing the honor code . . . we all agree to conduct our studies, as well as our social lives, in an ethical manner. This results in an atmosphere of trust between students and faculty. (McCabe & Trevino, 2007, p. 1)

These comments support the notion that preserving academic integrity is a collective responsibility involving students, faculty, and the administration. Furthermore, institutions that nurture an environment characterized by a genuine care for students as well as commitment to institutionalizing academic integrity are more likely to have a reduction in cheating incidents (Gallant & Drinan, 2006).

Faculty-Reported Perceptions and Understanding of Academic Integrity

A number of studies have looked at academic integrity from the students' perspective to understand why students cheat and to learn how to prevent academic dishonesty in the classroom. However, a review of the literature found that little is known about academic integrity from the faculty's perspective (Coalter et al., 2007). While research on faculty members' perspectives on academic integrity is scarce, researchers have reported that very few faculty members are reporting incidents of academic dishonesty or are taking the time to discuss the issues with their students (Dichtl, 2003; Schneider, 1999). Faculty members play a critical role in reducing incidents of academic dishonesty within the classroom. Unfortunately, preventing cheating and punishing students who cheat is often at the bottom of most faculty members' to-do list. Yet, when faculty members were asked to share their thoughts about academic integrity, most of them agreed that it important to the moral fabric of an academic community (Cizek, 2003; Schneider, 1999).

As simple as it may be to convey that academic integrity is critical to the integrity of the academic community, it is equally important to convey this message at the beginning of the semester as well as to enforce stated policies when cheating occurs in the classroom (Cizek, 2003). Unfortunately, this is not

always the case for many faculty members in post-secondary education. In the

literature the most cited reason for the increase in academic dishonesty was

faculty's tendency to ignore incidents of student cheating. McCabe noted similar

concerns when he surveyed faculty and found that one out of three faculty

members reported that they knew students were cheating in their classrooms

and chose not to report it to the appropriate campus authority (Selingo, 2004).

Moreover, a recent study found that 60% of faculty members observed cheating

in their classroom, but only 20% actually met with the student or reported the

incident to a higher authority (Nonis & Swift, 2001). Others have commented

that faculty members ignore incidents of cheating for the following reasons:

- *Avoidance* - Faculty simply did not want to deal with it (Coalter et al.,
  2007)

- *Understanding policy* - Most faculty members lacked a clear
  understanding of what behaviors are considered acceptable in the
  academic community. This lack of understanding translates into
  students receiving mixed messages about what behaviors constitute
  academic dishonesty (Higbee & Thomas, 2002).

- *Lack of Support* - Faculty tend to be apprehensive about enforcing
  academic integrity policies for fear of not being supported by the

administration (i.e., department deans, academic deans, student affairs, etc.) (Dichtl, 2003; Pavela, 1997).

- *Time* - Faculty in both high school and post secondary education tend to believe that it is too much of a hassle to charge students with academic dishonesty because having to deal with the investigation will take them away from their work, reporting, and defending such allegations (Dichtl, 2003; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Petress, 2003; Selingo, 2004).

- *Perceptions of others* - Faculty who choose to handle academic integrity cases privately report that they do so to avoid the attention that comes with filing formal charges. According to an engineering professor at a southern private university, "cheating has a stigma associated with it, and there is nothing positive to be gained" (Selingo, 2004, p. 30).

- *Not a serious problem* - Faculty don't perceive academic dishonesty to be a serious problem (Cizek, 1999). Jonathan Burke's 1997 study of faculty perceptions of and attitudes toward academic integrity at two-year colleges found that 86 percent of studied faculty suspected

academic dishonesty in their classroom, but they did not perceive it to

be a major problem (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004).

- *Policy design and implementation* - Faculty believe that campus

    integrity policies are often vaguely defined, outdated, and rarely

    discussed among faculty. Furthermore, they believe that campus

    policies are too bureaucratic and legalistic, often finding guilty

    students innocent (McCabe, 2005).

- *Not my responsibility* - Some faculty would argue that their

    responsibility is to teach, not police, students in the classroom. "If

    students haven't learned the difference between right and wrong by

    the time they entered college, it is not the faculty members' job to teach

    them" (McCabe, 2005, p. 27). While the research would suggest

    otherwise, many faculty believe that it is too little too late to be

    teaching students about academic integrity once they enter college.

- *Institutional procedures* - Academic integrity (AI) procedures often

    influence faculty decisions to report AI violations. Many faculty

    members do not view the process as fair and impartial. This is a

    significant concern because if the faculty do not perceive that the

    judicial process would protect parties involved, it is reasonable to

assume that faculty would be less likely to follow protocol and charge student offenders with academic dishonesty (Coalter et al., 2007, p. 8).

- *Lack of evidence/proof* - "There is a concern within the faculty as to how to deal with dishonest or questionable behavior when such behavior is 'witnessed' by only the faculty, the student claims to be innocent, and there is no other clear evidence to substantiate the act" (Coalter et al., 2007, p. 11).

Clearly, from the above comments, faculty perceptions and attitudes about academic dishonesty may reinforce the perceptions and attitudes of students that academic dishonesty is not an important issue in higher education. Researchers (Kibler, 1994; McCabe & Trevino, 2007) found that students are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty where it is believed that faculty members are more likely to look the other way. As was stated before, faculty often ignore cheating because of their lack of understanding of academic integrity policies and procedures, negative perceptions about the process, and confusion caused by an inconsistent definition of academic dishonesty. Fass (1986) reported that faculty members who are unaware of the academic integrity policies at their institution tend to be more reluctant to confront students suspected of cheating, or they prefer to handle the incident of misconduct

themselves rather than sending it through a more formal judicial process outlined by the university. On the other hand, if faculty members proactively address academic dishonesty by taking the time to gain an understanding of policies, discussing it in the classroom, as well as implementing strategies to reduce the likelihood that students will engage in academic dishonesty, they could have a profound impact in shaping the moral and ethical values of students and our society's future (Center for Academic Integrity, 2007; McCabe, 2005; McCabe et al., 2001; Selingo, 2004; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). These researchers further assert that failure on the part of faculty to discuss academic integrity policies or confront student cheating in the classroom can result in students lacking a clear understanding of what is expected of them and possibly defining their own rules. These reported findings suggest that faculty need a clear understanding of the academic integrity policies and procedures for the purpose of implementing strategies designed to create an educational community where students know what is expected of them in the classroom.

In the research, it is reported that promoting academic integrity is a shared responsibility of the faculty, staff, and students. However, some researchers reported that faculty members in particular play critical roles in promoting academic honesty within the academic community. According to

McCabe et al. (2001), faculty members have the ability to set academic standards and are ultimately responsible for designing and cultivating the educational environment. McCabe and Pavela's (1997) extensive research on academic integrity has yielded a set of ten principles (commonly referred to as standards) that reflect the values they believe faculty should employ in the classroom to promote academic integrity. These include:

1. *Affirm the importance of academic integrity* - Colleges and Universities as well as the faculty should focus on the pursuit of truth that is grounded in certain core values, including diligence, civility, and honesty.

2. *Foster a love for learning* - Faculty must be committed to academic integrity as well as promote high academic standards in the classroom which will allow students to thrive in an atmosphere where academic work is seen as challenging, relevant, useful, and fair.

3. *Treat students as an end in themselves* - Faculty members should give each student individual attention and consideration which students will generally reciprocate by respecting the values of their teachers, including a commitment to academic integrity.

4. *Promote an environment of trust in the classroom* - As adult learners, students value and appreciate an environment free of arbitrary rules and trivial assignments where trust is earned and given.

5. *Encourage student responsibility for academic integrity* - Like faculty, students should have the responsibility to help protect and promote academic integrity. Students are likely to do well in academic communities where competition is fair, integrity is respected, and cheating is punished.

6. *Clarify expectations for students* - Faculty members have primary responsibility for clarifying their expectations in advance in the course syllabi regarding honesty in academic work, including the nature and scope of student collaboration. Most students welcome it because it creates an educational environment of mutual responsibility conducive to the learning experience.

7. *Develop fair and relevant forms of assessment* - Faculty members should use and regularly revise various forms of assessments to ensure that students' work is fairly and fully assessed.

8. *Reduce opportunities to engage in academic dishonesty* - Preventing academic dishonesty requires that students not be tempted or induced to engage in acts of academic dishonesty by ambiguous policies, undefined or unrealistic

standards for collaboration, inadequate classroom management, or poor

examination security.

9. *Challenge academic dishonesty when it occurs* - As social learning theory

suggests, students observe how faculty members respond to students who cheat.

Therefore, faculty members who ignore or trivialize academic dishonesty send

the message that academic integrity is not important and not worthy of

enforcement.

10. *Help define and support campus-wide academic integrity standards* -

Although faculty members should be the primary role models for academic

integrity, responsibility for defining, promoting, and protecting academic

integrity must be a community-wide concern if academic integrity values of the

community are to be avowed (McCabe & Pavela, 1997).

The researchers further assert that faculty members who ignore these

principles are in essence promoting academic dishonesty and are sending a

message that academic integrity policies are not important and therefore are not

worth the effort to enforce. McCabe and Pavela (1997) assert that "one of the

greatest inducements to engaging in academic dishonesty is the perception that

academic dishonesty is rampant" (p. 1).

These abovementioned strategies also suggest that colleges and universities and their faculty should have a common understanding and uniformly support ethical behavior if students are to embrace academic integrity. According to Fass (1986), academic and professional ethics should be widely understood and supported throughout the institution if a college or university is to be regarded as a community in which it is legitimate to hold students to the highest standards of behavior in their academic works. Fass (1986) further asserts that faculty should discuss and affirm their commitment to integrity in the classroom. To ensure that students internalize academic standards, not only must faculty consistently reinforce academic integrity inside the classroom, they must also model high standards of ethical conduct outside the classroom (Nonis & Swift, 2001). According to McCabe and Pavela (1997), faculty can influence student behavior and facilitate the enhancement of ethical development of students. "Students emulate the values of those they admire" (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2002, p. 360). It can therefore be deduced that students who observe their faculty members ignoring or engaging in unethical behaviors are likely to do the same because, in their minds, if a faculty member is doing it, than it must be acceptable.

Summary

A thorough review of the literature confirms that academic dishonesty is a widespread problem in higher education. If we expect academic integrity to be an important value on campus, there needs to be a clear understanding of what academic integrity means, its impact on college campuses, and the role faculty play in educating students about academic integrity. The literature points out that the most cited reasons for the increase in academic dishonesty were the inconsistencies in the understanding and definition of academically dishonest behavior among faculty, administrators, and students, and the tendency of faculty to ignore incidents of student cheating. This coupled with the fact that students on most, if not all campuses, are engaging in some form of academic dishonesty at alarming levels without concern for getting caught suggests that educators cannot simply ignore the problem nor can they employ "quick fix" methods to make it go away. The issue is not why students cheat, but why faculties are not passionate about creating a campus culture that values academic integrity. Perhaps the answer lies in the understanding of faculty members' perspectives and commitment to integrity in the classroom. According to Coalter et al. (2007), omitting faculty members' perspectives on academic integrity prevents us from understanding the issue in its entirety and, thus, prevents us

from working toward finding solutions to problem. Faculty could view and

affirm academic integrity as a core institutional value because the lack thereof

could position students to resort to any means necessary to achieve good grades.

In addition, creating a campus culture that values integrity requires a

collaborative relationship between faculty, administrators, and students.

Collectively, these entities could utilize each others' knowledge, resources, and

individual ethical value systems to change the campus culture to one that

promotes and is committed to integrating academic integrity into the fabric of

the campus community for the purpose of sending a message that academic

dishonesty is socially unacceptable. The moral fabric of higher education is at

risk of eroding when students are not held accountable for the ethical

consequences of their actions.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Design Introduction

The purpose of this study was to characterize faculty members' patterns of beliefs, levels of understanding, and reported actions regarding academic integrity. To address this issue, five post-secondary (2 four-year public and 3 four-year private) institutions were originally selected for this study. However, two of the four-year private institutions dropped out of the study after IRB approval.

Within each institution, undergraduate teaching faculty (full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructors) were recruited to participate as respondents using both informed respondent sampling and intentional cluster sampling procedures. In this chapter, the researcher, who is the primary investigator, describes the different procedures used to collect and analyze the data.

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What beliefs do faculty members express about academic integrity?

2. What source of awareness do faculty members report regarding academic integrity policies?

3. What are the patterns of beliefs and level of awareness among faculty members about violations of academic integrity at two public, post-secondary and one private post-secondary institution?

4. What are the frequencies and types of reported violations among faculty at two public, post-secondary and one private post-secondary institution?

5. What methods do faculty members employ to respond to academic integrity violations?

Survey Research Design

This study used a survey research design to characterize faculty members' patterns of beliefs, levels of understanding, and reported actions regarding academic integrity. According to Creswell (2003) and Jaegere (1989), the purpose of survey research is to describe, using quantitative or numeric data, specific characteristics such as trends, attitudes, or opinions of a large population. Quantitative measures are utilized when the issue being studied can be measured objectively, the researcher is independent of the issue being researched, and the methodology uses logic, theories, or hypotheses to test variables (Creswell, 2003). Examined through the lens of the social learning

theoretical framework relating to how faculty members' behavior may influence

attitudes and beliefs about academic integrity with the campus culture, survey

research was selected because it allows the researcher to sample from a large

population for the purpose of performing a descriptive analysis of one or more

characteristics of the population being studied.

According to Jaegere (1998), survey research is not as simple as writing

questions, asking people, counting the responses, and writing a report. Jaeger

(1998) further asserts that survey research is very complex and requires the

researcher to be keenly familiar with the methodology, and recognize that such

methods can be rather extensive and time-consuming. In using a survey research

design, the researcher should be familiar with some of the limitations such as the

fact that a small difference in the wording of a question can have a significant

impact on the distribution of responses. Also, similar questions within a different

context can likely evoke a different distribution of responses. Dillman (2007)

argues that "a major challenge for all survey methods is in self-administered

surveys, in which direct feedback from respondents about poor questions is less

available than in interview surveys" (p. 10). Dillman further asserts that it is

critical to keep survey error to a minimum. Carefully designed questions and

implementation methods can usually keep survey errors (e.g., sampling error

and non-response error) at acceptable levels (Dillman, 2007). To ensure the

trustworthiness of the survey, the researcher provided a detailed description of

the site and participant selection process, survey data gathering protocol, pilot

study, and survey research protocol.

Site Selection

The researcher was interested in investigating the phenomenon in public

and private college and university settings with and without honor codes in the

Southeast U. S. Initially, two public and three private institutions were invited to

participate in the study. Three weeks prior to the data collection phase of the

study, Forest University withdrew from participating in the study despite

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. Sony University, which replaced

Forest University, was invited to participate but withdrew a week before data

collection, despite IRB approval as well. The senior level administrators at Sony

University communicated a high level of discomfort with the researcher

including their institution in the study. Perhaps one could deduce that the two

private institutions with honor codes unwillingness to participate in the study

may be associated with the belief that the findings from the study may have

negative repercussions. This belief is not uncommon given that some tuition

driven private colleges and universities face serious challenges of recruiting and

retaining students. This coupled with an image conscious administration is likely to cause private institutions to take significant steps to make sure they are perceived in a positive way. Therefore, the focus of the present study started with five institutions invited to participate and ended with three post-secondary institutions (see Table 1).

Table 1

Site Selection Description

Institutions	Institution Type	Student/Faculty Ratio	Ethnicity	Academic Integrity (AI)
Spark University	Four-year Public	16:1	Majority White	AI Policy
Pride University	Four-year Public	15:1	Majority Black	AI Policy
Eagles University	Four-year Private	10:1	Majority White	Honor Code
Forest College	Four-year Private	14:1	Majority White	Honor Code
Sony College	Four-year Private	20:1	Majority White	Honor Code

Note: Spark University = Private, Predominately White University, Pride University = Public, Historically Blac k University, Forest & Sony University = Public, Historically White Universities.

In selecting the post-secondary institutions for this study, the researcher felt it was important to identify institutions with some similar characteristics (see Table 1). The researcher believed that these similarities allowed for greater probability of identifying patterns and more generalizable data. The researcher's investigation of the four institutions for the study found close similarities in institutional type (private and public), faculty to student ratio, honor code and academic integrity policy, and comparable academic structure which allowed for an accurate assessment of the research question.

A strength of this study is that it allowed for an in-depth review of academic integrity from diverse faculty perspectives as it relates to the conceptual framework. However, the fact that only one four-year private institution participated in the study is a weakness of the research study. Having only one private institution participate in the study limits the generalizability of the results to other private institutions. Furthermore, the undergraduate teaching faculty response rates at the four-year private, predominately White university (Eagles University =19.3%), four-year public, historically White university (Spark University= 25.4%) and four-year public, historically Black university (Pride University = .06%) were not at levels that the researcher had hoped for, given that all undergraduate teaching faculty were invited to participate in the study.

This limitation points to the need for further research into why faculty

participation was low. In addition, the data were drawn from undergraduate

teaching faculty; therefore, graduate and doctoral teaching faculty ideologies are

not represented. Therefore, the reader should exercise caution when generalizing

the findings. Regardless of the limitations, the data gathered in this study further

complement the limited body of research on faculty views regarding academic

integrity.

Participant Selection

The cluster sample consisted of undergraduate teaching faculty from a

variety of academic disciplines from two public institutions and one private

institution in the Southeast U. S. A cluster sample allows researchers to select

groups to be studied that are geographically close based on prior information

(Agresti & Finlay, 1997). "Cluster sampling is most useful when the population is

very large or spread out over a wide geographic area and is often the only

feasible method of selecting a sample" (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 129). The

researcher chose cluster sampling for several reasons: (a) a review of the

literature could not identify any studies that looked at faculty perspectives at

historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), (b) the researcher believed

that undergraduate teaching faculty at a HBCUs may hold views different from

those of historically White colleges and universities (HWCUs), (c) most studies

on the topic were done on a single campus, and (d) very few studies looked at

honor code verses non-honor code views regarding academic dishonesty from

the perspective of faculty. According to Gay and Airasian (2000), one of the

major disadvantages of cluster sampling is that the researcher's judgment may be

in error. In other words, "chances are greater of selecting a sample that is not

representative of the population" (p. 131). Cluster sampling procedures include

the following:

   1. Identify and define the population.
   2. Determine the desired sample size.
   3. Identify and define the logical cluster.
   4. List all clusters that make up the populations of clusters.
   5. Estimate the average number of population members per cluster.
   6. Include in your study all population's members in each selected cluster.
   (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 130)

The participants' sampling frame consisted of undergraduate teaching

faculty from two public institutions and one private institution. All respondents

were assumed to have had an informed understanding of academic integrity and

were willing to participate. The faculty members were told in an electronic cover

letter that the survey information would be kept confidential. Each faculty

member's e-mail address was recorded in an excel spreadsheet to ensure a valid

online response. To assure confidentiality while taking the online survey, no specific information regarding the faculty member's computer IP address, time, or location, was collected by the UNCG online data system. If the faculty member felt uncomfortable using his or her desktop machine, the researcher recommended using a common Internet terminal at work (e.g., the library, computer lab, or any other computer with Internet access). Also, faculty members were told that their school's name would not be used in the reporting of the data.

The researcher contacted a senior level administrator at each institution to get permission to conduct the study. Once permission was granted, the researcher called and/or sent e-mails to the senior level administrator or an institution designee to discuss the study, sampling procedures, methods for administering the survey instrument, and to obtain a complete and current list of undergraduate teaching faculty. The senior level administrator or designee was reminded of the importance of having a current faculty list. According to Mertens (1998), if the lists are not accurate, systematic error can occur because the sample may not represent a true population, and the generalizability of the study will be compromised. At the request of the researcher, it was recommended to each senior level administrator to procure the assistance of the

Institutional Research Office to get an accurate list of undergraduate teaching

faculty at each institution.

After several exchanges of email, for reasons unknown to the researcher,

one of the four original institutions, a four-year private university, decided not to

participate in the study. The researcher conducted an extensive search to find a

replacement for the institution that dropped out of the study. It was important

for the researcher to identify a replacement institution with similar characteristics

as the one that dropped out of the study. Once the replacement institution was

identified, an Institutional Review Board application was completed and

submitted for approval. Permission was granted to conduct the study at the

replacement four-year private institution, but was rescinded one week prior to

the beginning of the data collecting phase of the study by a senior level

administrator at the institution. Both institutions that decided not to participate

in the study were private, four-year institutions with an academic honor code.

For study duplication purposes, a further review of why private institutions may

choose not to participate in a similar study is recommended. After appropriate

approval, the various Departments of Institutional Research generated a

computerized list of undergraduate teaching faculty from each of the three

remaining institutions (two public and one private). To ensure maximum

participation and eliminate sampling error, all undergraduate teaching faculty members were invited to participate in the study through a personal electronic e-mail which explained the purpose of the study, survey instrument, data collection timeline, how important the response is to the research, assurance of confidentiality, and how the findings will be used.

Data Gathering Methodology

Having decided to use a survey, the researcher investigated several conduits to collect the data: mail, telephone, personal interviews, e-mail, or a combination of these methods. According to Creswell (2003) and Mertens (1998), when selecting a delivery mode for the survey, it is important that the researcher consider the purpose of the survey, the type of data being collected, cost, and sample size. The researcher chose survey research because such a method allowed for generalization from a sample population for the purpose of making inferences about some patterns, characteristics, attitudes, or behaviors of this population (Creswell, 2003; Fowler, 2002; Mertens, 1998). Also, survey research design is advantageous when the researcher is interested in gathering data from a large population and has a desire to generalize the data from the sample to make assertions about the sample population (Creswell, 2003).

One key advantage to using computer-assisted data collection methods such as e-mail is that it provides responses instantaneously in machine-readable form (Fowler, 2002). Therefore, the researcher selected the Internet as the preferred method for completing the survey. Fowler (2002) further identifies several advantages to Internet surveys: (a) low cost of data collection; (b) potential high speed of returns; (c) ease of presenting questions requiring visual aids; and (d) it provides time for thoughtful answers, checking records, and consulting with others. Other advantages to using the Internet include the ease of managing question form and order, the speed of data entry, and the potential to provide "help" instructions and definitions as needed (Flowers, 2002). The researcher should also be aware of the disadvantages of using the Internet such as errors in the program, challenges of enlisting cooperation, need for accurate e-mail addresses, and the risk of the computer system going down. Prior to data collection, the Institutional Review Boards at the participating universities reviewed research procedures.

The researcher used a pre-existing survey tool (the *Faculty Academic Integrity Survey*) developed by Mr. Donald McCabe of Rutgers University and founder of the Center for Academic Integrity (see Appendix A). Mr. McCabe is considered a preeminent scholar who has received national recognition for his

published research on academic integrity in higher education. According to

Marcoux (2002), similar studies using variations of McCabe's *Faculty Academic*

Integrity Survey have been conducted at colleges and universities (i.e., Duke

University, Clemson University, Kansas State University, Rutgers University,

Quinnipiac College, among others). The *Faculty Academic Integrity Survey* was

coded for the purpose of tracking the institutions' access to the survey, survey

validity, and process reliability, as well as to eliminate duplication and

fraudulent responses. The researcher received permission from Mr. McCabe to

use the survey because it is the most widely used instrument for measuring

faculty members' perspectives regarding academic integrity.

Pilot Study

Creswell (2003) stated the importance of establishing instrument validity

and reliability. In addition, Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) recommend that

researchers conduct a thorough pretest of the questionnaire before using it in the

main study. Therefore, content validity methodology was employed to

determine if the items in the survey represent the sample of behaviors of interest

in the research study. The researcher assessed content validity two ways. First,

the questionnaire was assessed using a matrix that relates the items in the survey

to the research questions (see Appendix B). The matrix allows the readers to see

how the researcher used the questionnaire items (Creswell, 2003). Second, the

questionnaire was critiqued by a panel of seven expert educators who were

familiar with the research topic for the purpose of establishing validity.

Mangione (1995) and Gall et al. (1996) recommend selecting six to ten content

experts similar to the sample population to be used in the main study. A panel of

ten experts in the field of higher education were identified and asked to review,

complete, and provide feedback about the clarity of the survey instrument, any

unclear instructions, ambiguous wording, and question difficulty. To strengthen

the validity of the survey, the researcher intentionally selected content experts,

whose professional background consisted of authoring several journal articles

and book chapters on the issue of academic integrity, serving on the Center for

Academic Integrity Advisory Council, as well as serving on journal review

boards.

Each content expert received e-mail with information about the study, a

link to the *Faculty Academic Integrity Survey*, and instructions asking them to

complete the survey. Space for comments and suggestions was included in the

survey instrument. The pilot study participants were asked to complete the

survey and provide feedback within 14 days of receiving the e-mail.

Seven of the ten content experts responded to the researcher's request. Results of the piloted study indicated that several questions needed to be revised for clarity and that additional questions needed to be added to the survey. Overall, the experts felt that the survey instrument matched the behaviors the researcher intends them to measure. After making the suggested revisions to the *Faculty Academic Integrity Survey*, the instrument was resubmitted to an additional content expert who then made final suggestions for instrument improvement.

Survey Research Protocol

As previously stated, this study incorporated both quantitative and open-ended response components which, according to Creswell (2003), are ways to thoroughly explore an issue. The survey protocol as outlined by Mertens (1998) was employed to collect the data: (a) an official cover letter was emailed to all undergraduate teaching faculty; (b) the electronic cover letter included a link to the questionnaire; (c) data collection took place over a three-week period; (d) follow up electronic e-mail reminders were sent to all respondents to procure a high response rate; (e) both the quantitative and opened-ended response data were entered into a database from returned questionnaires; and (f) the data were formatted and analyzed. Fowler (2002) noted that if the study is carried out

correctly and extensive follow-up procedures are followed, the return rate is likely to be similar to that of other methods reported. The survey collected topic-related information and demographic information. Data from the survey were analyzed with Statistics Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

The researcher asked two open-ended response questions which allowed the researcher to further explore issues and ideas presented in the survey research. According to Mertens (1998), using open-ended response questions is appropriate when the researcher is interested in how the individuals form a schema or perspective on a problem. The questions were reviewed and modified with assistance from the content validity experts and a research consultant. The open-ended portion of the survey included the following components: an opening statement regarding the subject of inquiry, and key open-ended questions arranged in a logical order at the end of most of the structured items.

The researcher was interested in analyzing the data of each institution similar in characteristics to see if patterns of beliefs, levels of understanding, and reported actions varied differently by campus type (four-year public vs. four-year private institutions ; academic honor codes vs. non-honor codes). In addition, the researcher performed cross-tabulation analysis of demographics to determine if certain faculty characteristics resulted in different ratings. Mertens

(1998) suggests that to control the threat to validity when using cross-tabulation

analysis methods, the researcher should employ the following guidelines: (a)

match on particular characteristics of relevance; (b) use statistical techniques

such as analysis of covariance to control for preexisting differences, and (c)

analyze by subgroup. To encourage a high response rate, reminder e-mail

messages were sent five and ten days after the initial contact. Because of the low

response rate, the study was extended for two additional weeks and a third and

final e-mail was sent to non-respondents encouraging them to participate. All

respondents were thanked for their participation. No additional follow-up was

initiated beyond the three reminders.

Design Test

Mertens (1993), Gall et al. (1996), and Creswell (2003) assert the

importance of content validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability

as these factors could raise questions about the quality of survey research design.

Content Validity

The researcher needs to be certain that the survey covers the appropriate

content. According to Mertens (1998); Gall et al. (1996); and Creswell (2003),

content validity can be established by asking content experts familiar with the

topic to review and make judgments about the data-gathering instrument. The

researcher asked a panel of experts familiar with academic integrity to critique the survey for the purpose of establishing the instrument's content validity.

Internal Validity

While reliability may be challenging for qualitative (opened-ended response) research, internal validity is a strength of qualitative methodology (Schumacher & McMillan, 1993). Strategies to increase internal validity for the qualitative portion of the study included the following: (a) the researcher provided a thick description of the data collection process so that the reader could assess the transferability of the results to their own situation; (b) the researcher used participants' language to minimize researcher bias; and (c) the researcher self-monitored and continued collaboration with experts familiar with integrative research design. According to Mertens (1998), it is important for the researcher to employ strategies to increase the credibility of the research. Peer debriefing, member checking, and triangulation of the data were implemented at various points of the study. Bryman (1988) asserts that researchers are likely to exhibit greater confidence in their findings when more than one method of investigation is used.

External Validity

External validity is the degree to which the researcher generalizes the results to other situations. Generalization of the findings is a key component of survey research. For the quantitative portion of the study, bias error and random error can threaten the validity of generalization. Bias error can occur if (a) the observed sample does not represent the target population, (b) there is a high rate of non-responses, or (c) the sample design is flawed. Random errors can occur when samples are used and respondents differ from the population. As a result, the findings from one sample differ from those obtained from another sample (Mertens, 1998). To statistically control for error, the researcher employed cluster sampling procedures. However, it is likely that the reader may draw his or her own interpretation of the study based on the researcher's thick description of the study and the findings. The researcher believes that the findings from this study can be used to further understand and expand research on academic integrity and encourage best practices for new faculty and college administrators who are responsible for developing and/or revising policies, and to educate students about the faculty perspective on academic integrity.

Reliability

Reliability in an integrative study can be challenging to measure and difficult to replicate. The following means were utilized to enhance the reliability of the study. First, the researcher employed an online survey data collection protocol that detailed each step in the research process as well as accounted for researcher biases. The survey study protocol consisted of the following: (a) an official cover letter was emailed to all undergraduate teaching faculty; (b) attached to the electronic cover letter was a link to the questionnaire; (c) data collection took place over a three-week period; (d) follow up electronic letter reminders were sent to all respondents to procure a high response rate; (e) the data from the survey were entered into a database from returned questionnaires; and (f) the data were formatted and analyzed. Second, the fact the researcher was unknown to the participants also contributed to the reliability of the study. Third, the selection of participants using cluster sampling was carefully described so that future researchers could accurately replicate the study if desired. The fourth means for enhancing reliability is description of the data analysis. The researcher carefully described how the data were analyzed and summarized for the study. Finally, the conceptual framework provided a blueprint for the desired direction and purpose of this study.

Role of the Researcher

The researcher has 17 years of experience in student affairs, coupled with additional experience in training new professionals, faculty and staff; teaching; and working in various leadership positions within professional associations in student affairs. These experiences have contributed to the researcher's awareness of current issues surrounding academic integrity in a university setting.

Three factors led to the researcher's choice of topic: (a) professional responsibilities, (b) exposure via the applied experience of adjudicating academic integrity violations with students the office serves, and (c) a review of the literature and research related to current issues regarding academic dishonesty facing higher education.

There has been a plethora of literature seeking to understand academic integrity from a student's perspective, with only a few studies seeking to understand this phenomenon from a faculty member's perspective. The researcher also found that the literature supports anecdotal evidence from contact with professional practice with regard to academic integrity. Based on professional experiences and supporting literature, the researcher believes that student academic integrity violations are increasing. According to Dr. Jen Day Shaw, Dean of Students at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, "75

academic charges were reported in 2004-2005 as compared to 52 cases in 2002-2003" (Jen Day Shaw, personal communication, December 15, 2005). Dr. Shaw also noted that 15 academic integrity hearings were held in the fall semester of 2005 semester as compared to 13 for the entire 2004-2005 academic year, and 6 the year before. Dr. Shaw believes this increase in academic integrity hearings may be due to students' awareness of their right to a panel if they disagree with charges or faculty members' perceptions and understanding of academic integrity and the process. "We believe through anecdotal evidence that faculty are much more aware of the academic integrity policies and procedures, but are unwilling to report violations" (Jen Day Shaw, personal communication, December 15, 2005). Faculty unwillingness to report student academic dishonesty initiated a desire by the researchers to further investigate faculty perspectives on academic integrity. The researcher believes that faculty has a desire to be informed of the frequency of student cheating in higher education. Also, it is important to the researcher to find out why faculty members choose not to report student academic dishonesty. Given the increase in student cheating, what measures, if any, are faculty members using to reduce cheating in their classrooms? What views does faculty hold about academic integrity? These questions, coupled with informal conversations with faculty members who

reported that they would rather handle student academic dishonesty violations informally rather than going through a more formal judicial process motivated the researcher to conduct the study. Other factors that contributed to the researcher's desire to conduct the study include the belief that faculty underestimate the seriousness of student cheating; the implications of academic dishonesty for the institutions, faculty, staff, and students; and the need to inform student affairs administrators on best practices for policy development and implementation.

The researcher wanted to study four institutions, one of which was the researcher's institution of employment. The researcher had no prior working relationship with the participants in the study. Studying one's institution could compromise the researcher's ability to disclose information and raise credibility issues. To avoid researcher bias, the researcher employed several validity strategies to build reader confidence in the accuracy of the findings (Creswell, 2003). Steps were employed to obtain permission from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at each institution to protect the rights of the participants. Identifying information of the participants was kept confidential.

Procedures for Data Analysis

A significant portion of the descriptive data was derived from the

quantitative questions on the survey (see Appendix B) and reported in terms of

frequencies and percentages of responses to the survey questions. Responses to

the *Faculty Academic Integrity Survey* were entered and analyzed using SPSS.

According to Creswell (2003), descriptive statistics in terms of frequencies,

percents, means, and standard deviation, along with other measures, are helpful

when the researcher wants to categorize, summarize, and determine trends in

numeric data.

Following the analysis of the quantitative data from the questionnaire, the

researcher invited faculty to respond to two open-ended questions in an effort to

further explore, clarify, and pursue additional explanations from the statistical

analysis of the *Faculty Academic Integrity Survey* used to answer the research

questions. The open-ended data also provided examples of "best practices"

faculty employed to improve policies, reduce academic dishonesty, and to

determine the role faculty could play in promoting academic integrity in their

classrooms.

For data analysis of the open-ended questions, the researcher used

Roxanne Coding software designed by Dr. Stephen Zerwas of The University of

North Carolina at Greensboro. The faculty written responses were organized into

chunks for the purpose of identifying common themes, patterns, phrases, or

categories, and to insure accuracy of the comments from the survey instrument.

The intention of such analysis was to describe the characteristics common to the

sample population that were conceptually meaningful, and to compare items to

other data coded in the same manner (Creswell, 2003). To check for the accuracy

and enhance reliability of the findings, the researcher used member-checking

procedures by sending the findings of this study to faculty members who self-

disclosed their e-mail addresses. Member checking is a technique most often

used to give credibility to open-ended response data sources. Faculty responses

from the member check were compared to those of the primary researcher.

Discrepancies were discussed via e-mail with the primary researcher and the

faculty until an agreement could be reached. Finally, the results from the open-

ended questions were summarized to identify similarities and commonalities

which were then evaluated for new constructs.

The analyzed data were aggregated and displayed in flowcharts,

frequency tables, cross comparison matrices, and other schemes. Final reporting

of the data included survey data and the researcher's interpretations and

conclusions. The researcher looked at consistencies between the quantitative

data, open-ended items, and triangulation (survey, member checking, and
secondary documents) which provided support for the concluding findings.

Summary

It is essential that academic integrity become the foundation of a student's
college experience because the success of an institution's mission is dependent on
faculty, staff, and students working together to maintain the academic integrity
of the institution. Research studies show that cheating among American high
school and college students is high and increasing (The Center for Academic
Integrity, 2007). For this reason, colleges and universities could strive to create
communities that promote academic integrity where students are held
accountable for their own learning and develop good academic habits that are
appreciated and valued after college. The results from this study will provide
new knowledge about faculty beliefs, level of understanding, and reported
actions regarding academic dishonesty for the purpose of identifying "best
practices" and raising the level of student understanding and appreciation for
maintaining integrity on college and university campuses. In addition, the
analyzed data may provide a more valid and trustworthy framework for
institutions to examine their academic integrity policies and procedures, as well
as increase one's knowledge about how faculty members perceive academic

integrity and respond to violators. To ensure the correct interpretations of the

reported data, the researcher involved participants familiar with the topic and

the study at different points in the data collection and analysis process.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty members' patterns of beliefs, level of understanding, and reported actions regarding academic integrity. The faculty at two public institutions and one private institution of higher education were asked to participate in the study.

The research questions that guided this investigation were:

1. What beliefs do faculty members express about academic integrity?

2. What source of awareness do faculty members report regarding academic integrity policies?

3. What are the patterns of beliefs and level of awareness among faculty members about violations of academic integrity at two public post-secondary institutions and one private post-secondary institution?

4. What are the frequencies and types of reported violations among faculty at two public post-secondary institutions and one private post-secondary institution?

5. What methods do faculty members employ to respond to academic integrity violation.

In this chapter, the results of data will be presented using descriptive statistics, inferential statistics, and responses to open-ended questions, reported according to the research question. SPSS (version 17.0) and Roxanne were used to perform all data analyses.

Demographic Information

Three hundred forty-six undergraduate teaching faculty members completed the survey from one public, historically White university (Spark University), one public, historically Black university (Pride University), and one private, predominantly White university (Eagles University) in the Southeast United States. Spark University is a four-year, coeducational, doctoral-granting, residential institution with an AI policy. Pride University is a public, comprehensive, land-grant university with an AI policy. Eagles University is a small, private, coeducational institution with an honor code. Within these three settings, female faculty represented 55.5% (n=192) of the total population, male faculty represented 43.4% (n=150) of the total population, and 1.2% (n=4) chose not to report their gender (See Table 2).

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

CATEGORY		
Gender	*n*	**%**
Female	192	55.5
Male	150	43.4
Primary Area of Teaching	*n*	**%**
Arts	35	10.1
Business	31	9
Communications/Journalism	15	4.3
Engineering	2	.6
Humanities	53	15.3
Math and Science	46	13.3
Nursing/Health Professions	42	12.1
Social Sciences	74	21.4
Interdisciplinary	4	1.2
Other	32	9.1
Number of Years Teaching	*n*	**%**
Less than 5 years	74	21.4
5-9 years	77	22.3
10-14 years	59	17.1
15-19 years	44	12.7
20 or more years	87	25.1

Completed surveys were received from 236 faculty members from Spark University. Of the 236 participants, 45 (19.1 %) were full professors, 53 (22.5%) were associate professors, 69 (29.2%) were assistant professors, 18 (7.6%) were instructors, 40 (16.9%) were lecturers, and 11 (4.7%) reported as other. Seventy-

seven completed surveys were received from Eagles University. Of the 77

participants, 17 (22.1 %) were full professors, 18 (23.4%) were associate

professors, 25 (32.5%) were assistant professors, 8 (10.4%) were instructors, 5

(6.5%) were lecturers, and 4 (5.2%) reported as other. Thirty-three completed

surveys were received from Pride University. Of the 33 participants, 12 (36.4%)

were associate professors, 4 (12.1%) were full professors, 7 (21.2%) were assistant

professors, 4 (12.1%) were instructors, 2 (6.1%) were lecturers, and 4 (12.1%)

reported as other. Table 2 describes additional demographic information.

Information on gender, primary area of teaching, and the number of years

teaching at the university level was requested.

Data Analysis

Research Question 1:   *What beliefs do faculty members express about academic integrity?*

Table 3 reports descriptive statistics of the means and standard deviations

of undergraduate teaching faculty beliefs about the academic environment

regarding academic integrity (AI) policies. Participants rated their beliefs about

academic integrity policies on a five-point Likert scale (1="Very Low"; 2="Low";

3="Medium"; 4="High"; 5="Very High").

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviation of Faculty Beliefs about the Academic Environment

Survey Item	Eagles University			Pride University			Spark University		
	N	*M*	*SD*	N	*M*	*SD*	N	*M*	*SD*
Understanding of AI Policies	76	4.00	.673	33	3.64	.994	233	3.82	.771
Severity of Penalties for Cheating	75	3.23	.831	33	2.94	1.223	231	3.30	.871
Student Understanding of Policies	75	3.11	.746	33	2.30	.984	231	2.43	.820
Students' Support	75	3.19	.748	33	2.39	.747	229	2.75	.824
Faculty Support	75	3.85	.766	33	3.42	.936	231	3.43	.934
Effectiveness of Policies	75	3.13	.794	33	2.58	.902	232	2.92	.864

Note: (1) Eagles University=Private, Predominately White University, Pride University.= Public, Historically Black University, & Eagles University = Public, Predominately White University.

A review of the means and standard deviations in Table 3 shows that faculties at all three institutions report a high rating (Eagles University: *M*=4.00, *SD*=.673; Pride University: *M*=3.64, *SD*=.994; Spark University: *M*=3.82, *SD*=.771) in their level of understanding of their institution's AI policy/honor code. The faculty at all three institutions reported a medium rating (Eagles University: *M*=3.23, *SD*=.813; Pride University: *M*=2.94, *SD*=1.223; Spark University: *M*=3.30, *SD*=.871) in their beliefs about the severity of penalties for cheating. Furthermore,

the faculty at Eagles University reported a slightly higher rating (*M*=3.85,

SD=.766) regarding faculty support for AI policies than did the faculty at the two

public, four-year institutions (Pride University: *M*=3.42, *SD*=.936; Spark

University: *M*=3.43, *SD*=.934). When asked how faculty felt about the overall

effectiveness of AI policies at their institution, Eagles University faculty reported

beliefs that were greater (*M*=3.13, SD=.794) than the reported rating of faculty at

the two public, four-year universities who reported a low rating (Pride

University: *M*=2.58, *SD*=.902; Spark University: *M*=2.92, *SD*=.864). With the

exception of a slight increase in Eagles University faculty beliefs related to the

effectiveness of AI policies, there were virtually no noteworthy differences in

faculty beliefs related to their understanding of AI policies, the severity of

penalties for cheating, and faculty support for AI policies. Thus, the findings

show that faculty beliefs do not differ between honor code and non-honor code

(AI policy) institutions.

When asked to rate students' understanding and support for AI policies,

scores were notably different for all three institutions (See Table 3). As shown in

Table 3, Eagles University faculty reported a medium rating (*M*=3.11, *SD*=.746)

related to students' understanding of AI policies, and a rating slightly higher

than the medium rating (*M*=3.85, *SD*=.766) regarding students' support for such

policies. On the other hand, faculty at the two public, four-year institutions reported a low rating related to students' understanding of policies (Pride University: *M*=2.30,*SD*=.984; Spark University: *M*=2.43,*SD*=.820) and students' support for AI policies (Pride University: *M*=2.39,*SD*=.747; Spark University: *M*=2.75,*SD*=.824). These findings support research (McCabe et al., 1999; McCabe & Trevino, 2007; Vandehey et al., 2007) that suggests institutions with honor codes tend to receive very favorable support from faculty and students because such codes create an environment where peers have a low tolerance for cheating.

When looking at the overall mean and standard deviation of the three institutions, a slightly high rating was reported in faculty beliefs related to their understanding of AI policies (*M*=3.85, *SD*=.779) and a medium rating in faculty perceptions about the severity of penalties for cheating (*M*=3.25, *SD*=.906), and support for the institutions' AI policies (*M*=3.52, *SD*=.914). However, the faculty collectively gave a low rating to students' understanding of AI policies (*M*=2.57, *SD*=.869), students' support for AI policies (*M*=2.81, *SD*=.830), and overall effectiveness of AI policies (*M*=2.94, *SD*=.863). These findings may suggest that while faculties are well informed and support AI policies, they believe that students have a poor understanding and support for AI policies. This finding supports a recent finding by Vandehey et al. (2007), who report that the overall

academic dishonesty violations among college students remains high, ranging from 52 to 90%.

The researcher was interested in knowing if there was any statistical significance in the mean scores of all three schools regarding faculty beliefs about AI policies within the college environment. To analyze for statistical significance, the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis-of-variance-by-ranks test was used. The Kruskal-Wallis Test is a non-parametric alternative to a single classification ANOVA, and is used to test for mean differences or similarities among three or more independent variables (Black, 1999). The Kruskal-Wallis Test is most commonly used when there is one attribute variable and one measurement variable, and the measurement variable does not meet the assumptions of an ANOVA (normality and homoscedasticity) (Black, 1999). Table 4 shows a statistically significant ($p < .05$) difference in the overall mean rank scores of the independent variables in four of the six conditions. According to the Kruskal-Wallis Test, students' understanding of university AI policies, students' support for AI policies, faculty support for AI policies, and the effectiveness of such policies were significant, which may suggest they were very important to faculties at all three institutions (See Table 4).

Table 4

Kruskal-Wallis Test of Faculty Mean Rank

Survey Item	School ID	*n*	Mean Rank
Understanding of Academic Integrity Policy	Eagles University	76	188.95
	Pride University	33	153.86
	Spark University	233	168.30
Severity of Penalties for Cheating	Eagles University	75	166.81
	Pride University	33	146.82
	Spark University	231	174.35
Student Understanding of University Policies	Eagles University	75	229.04
	Pride University	33	141.39
	Spark University	231	154.92
Students' Support	Eagles University	75	207.17
	Pride University	33	123.35
	Spark University	229	163.08
Faculty Support	Eagles University	75	204.65
	Pride University	33	160.52
	Spark University	231	160.11
Effectiveness of Policies	Eagles University	75	190.50
	Pride University	33	129.83
	Spark University	232	169.82

Note: Eagles University. (N=77), Pride University (N=33), & Spark University (N=246)

	Understanding of Academic Integrity Policy	Severity of Penalties for Cheating	Student Understanding of University Policies	Students' Support	Faculty Support	Effectiveness of Policies
Chi-Square df Asymp. Sig.	4.362 2 .113	2.742 2 .254	40.780 2 .000	23.313 2 .000	13.408 2 .001	10.603 2 .005

Note: $p < .05$

However, faculty understanding of AI policies and severity of penalties for cheating were not noteworthy. Table 4 reports faculty mean rank about the academic environment regarding AI policies.

Finally, to probe further into faculty beliefs about academic integrity within the college environment, open response questions were included on the survey. Faculties were asked to respond to the open-ended question, "How the campus might improve AI policies." Several noteworthy themes emerged from this question. The faculty at Eagles University reported that they believe the honor code to be effective at reducing academic dishonesty. Furthermore, hosting academic summits, discussions about AI at the beginning of each semester, hosting educational workshops for faculty and students, publicizing incidents of cheating, and making it easier to report violations were commonly reported themes by faculty at Eagles University, an institution that subscribes to an honor code. While AI studies find that cheating is less common at institutions with strong honor codes, faculty in this study felt that it needed some improvement (Gallant & Drinan, 2006; Levy & Rakovski, 2006; Vandehey et al., 2007). In the words of one female associate professor in the Humanities discipline at Eagles University: "The Honor Board at my institution is comprised of faculty, staff and students who are not fully aware of ways students can cheat

. . . [they] need to be educated to sit on the board, and [they] need to be more

carefully selected." Other faculty members at Eagles University reported that the

institution should make the consequences of cheating more serious. One female

associate professor in the Social Sciences discipline at Eagles University, for

example, commented that at a previous institution, students were expelled for

cheating which resulted in the students taking the honor code more seriously. In

addition, the faculty believes that students who take the honor code seriously are

likely to police themselves and take a more active role in reporting their peers.

On the other hand, some faculty members commented how cumbersome the

process is when reporting violations to the Honor Board. According to one male

associate professor in the Social Science discipline at Eagles University, "There is

so much bureaucracy involved and paperwork to fill out that it discourages from

reporting it through more formal channels."

Faculty at the two public, four- year academic integrity code institutions

reported similar responses to those reported by their private counterparts on

how their campuses could improve policies related to academic integrity.

However, several additional themes emerged to improve policies related to

academic integrity. Several faculty members at Spark University suggested

implementing a proactive approach to enforcing AI policies by forwarding cases

directly to the Dean's office. In the words of one female assistant professor in the

Social Science discipline at Spark University, "Making the faculty handle the

situation first, then have the case go before the hearing panel, puts too much

pressure on the faculty member and introduces the possibility for potential

retaliation." Faculty members at both Pride University and Spark University

reported that consistent enforcement of AI policies by other faculty, the

introduction of anti-plagiarism software (e.g., Turnitin.com), orientation

programs for new faculty, stiffer penalties, clearly defined sanctions for cheating,

and administrative support could reduce student cheating. Furthermore, faculty

at Pride University reported that students would take academic dishonesty

seriously if the institution policies were firmly defined rather than using the

explanations that "everyone does it." As one female assistant professor in the

Nursing/Health professionals discipline at a Spark University explained, "I am

an advocate of zero tolerance. As an alum of the University of Virginia, I took the

[zero tolerance] honor code very seriously. . . . we could follow UVA's lead and

adopt a zero tolerance code."

Faculty at both four-year, public institutions also felt that their institutions

should revise its AI policies to make public the penalties that are imposed on

students who cheat in a totally anonymous way. Faculty reported a desire to be

informed of cheating incidents, how frequently they occur, in what courses students are likely to cheat, and what other faculty are doing to discourage cheating. Faculty also reported how complicated the process is when reporting student violations. In the words of one female associate professional in the Humanities discipline at Spark University, "The 'process' needs to be less cumbersome while still protecting the students' rights. Because of the cumbersome process, I have heard faculty comment that 'it is not worth all the hassle to charge a student.'"

Unlike colleges and universities with honor codes, institutions with AI policies do not require or penalize students for not reporting their peers for cheating. This argument contradicts what faculty at the two public universities reported in the study. Several faculty members at Pride University and Spark University reported that their AI policy could incorporate a mandatory student and faculty reporting responsibility piece if an alleged incident of academic dishonesty is observed in the classroom. Furthermore, the faculty reported that the institution could make it mandatory that the AI policy be included on all syllabi so that it is reinforced consistently. As one female full professor in the Social Science discipline at Pride University noted:

AI policies should be put in the forefront of faculty and students' minds. University should explain clearly to [faculty and students] what cheating is and should have consistent and clearly defined penalties for reported infractions.

Faculty general beliefs about academic integrity behaviors were measured by six survey items, with responses on a five-point Likert scale (1="Disagree Strongly"; 2="Disagree"; 3="Not Sure"; 4="Agree"; 5="Agree Strongly"). The findings in Table 5 show that the faculty at all three institutions were either "not sure" or "agreed" that cheating was a serious problem at their institution. In response to the question: "The student judicial process is fair and impartial," a majority (54%) of the faculty at Eagles University with an honor code "agreed." However, a majority of the faculty at the two, four-year public universities, Pride University (60.1%), and Spark University (54.7%), with an AI policy were "not sure." Table 5 shows that the majority of faculty at all three institutions "agreed" that students should be held responsible for failing to report AI violations. While the reporting of an AI violation is expected at institutions with honor codes, such action is not typically expected of students at institutions with AI policies. When it comes to the belief that their colleagues are vigilant in discovering and reporting suspected cases of academic dishonesty, faculty members were once again "not sure" about their colleagues detecting and reporting AI violations.

Table 5

Frequency Responses of Faculty Beliefs Regarding Academic Integrity

Survey Item	School ID	Disagree Strongly n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Not Sure n (%)	Agree n (%)	Agree Strongly n (%)
Cheating is a serious problem at our institution	Eagles University	2 (2.6)	14 (18.2)	**37 (48.1)**	21 (27.3)	1(1.3)
	Pride University	0 (0)	2 (6.1)	**12(36.4)**	11(33.3)	6(18.2)
	Spark University	4 (1.7)	26 (11)	**96(40.7)**	83(35.2)	24(10.2)
Student judicial process is fair /impartial	Eagles University	1 (1.3)	6 (7.8)	19(24.7)	**42(54.5)**	7 (9.1)
	Pride University	0 (0)	0 (0)	**20(60.1)**	8(24.2)	3 (9.1)
	Spark University	4 (1.7)	11 (4.7)	**129(54.7)**	73(30.9)	15 (6.4)
Students held responsible for failing to report AI violations	Eagles University	0 (0)	4 (5.2)	22(28.6)	**41(53.2)**	8 (10.4)
	Pride University	1 (3)	2 (6.1)	4 (12.1)	**19(57.6)**	5 (15.2)
	Spark University	3 (1.3)	36 (15.3)	59 (25)	**106(44.9)**	28(11.9)
Faculty are vigilant discovering /reporting academic dishonesty	Eagles University	1 (1.3)	13(16.9)	**34 (44.2)**	25 (32.5)	2 (2.6%)
	Pride University	1(3)	9 (27.3)	**11 (33.3)**	9 (27.3)	1 (3%)
	Spark University	13 (5.5)	65(27.5)	**94 (39.8)**	55 (22.3)	5 (2.1%)

Note: Eagles University (N=77), Pride University (N=33), & Spark University (N=236)

What is interesting to note here is the difference in faculty-perceived

understanding and support for AI policies and how concerned faculty members

feel. Table 5 shows faculty's reported responses related to their general beliefs regarding academic integrity.

While faculty perceived understanding and support for AI policies were "medium" to "high" (see Table 3), they were "not sure" when it comes to the belief that faculty are vigilant in discovering and/or reporting suspected cases of academic dishonesty. This finding may suggest that faculty members are not sharing information with their colleagues about the frequency of reported AI violations. This finding is supported by faculty who participated in the study. According to a male assistant professor in the Social Science discipline at Spark University, "It would be helpful to receive information about academic integrity . . . what are recent cases and penalties? More importantly, what are other faculty doing to discourage cheating in the classroom?"

Based on the reported findings in Table 5, there doesn't appear to be a noteworthy difference in the reported beliefs of faculty and institutional type (public vs. private or honor code vs. AI policy) as it relates to the seriousness of academic dishonesty, student responsibility for failing to report cheating, and faculty vigilance in discovering and reporting academic dishonesty.

Research Question 2:   _What sources of awareness do faculty members report regarding academic integrity policies?_

With respect to the second research question, in order to better understand the source of awareness, faculties were asked to select from a list of sources regarding how they learned about AI policies at their institutions. Table 6 suggests that the degrees to which faculty are informed of AI policies do differ by institutional type.

Table 6

Faculty-Reported Source of Awareness about Academic Integrity Policies

Source of Information	Eagles University (N=77) _n (%)_	Pride University (N=33) _n (%)_	Spark University (N=236) _n (%)_
Faculty Orientation	**50 (64.9)	5 (15.2)	66 (28)
Faculty Handbook	**51 (66.2)	**21 (63.6)	**106 (44.9)
Department Chair	16 (20.8)	9 (27.3)	57 (24.2)
Other Faculty	**27 (35.1)	8 (24.2)	**102 (43.2)
Web Site	**29 (37.7)	7 (21.2)	**136 (57.6)
Never Informed	3 (3.9)	6 (18.2)	15 (6.4)
Students	3 (3.9)	–	7 (3)
Dean/Other Administrator	**37 (48.1)	3 (9.1)	34 (14.4)
Publicized Hearings	2 (2.6)	1 (3)	5 (2.1)
University Catalog	7 (9.15)	**18 (54.5)	40 (16.9)
Other	12 (15.6)	1 (3)	32 (13.6)

**is an indication of the highest selected source of information (by percentage) about awareness of AI policies at each institution.

Table 6 is a comparison of faculty-reported responses related to the source of awareness about academic integrity policies between schools.

As can be seen in Table 6, faculty members at Eagles University reported that they most commonly learn of AI policies from the faculty handbook (66.2%), at faculty orientation (64.9%), and from the dean and/or other university administrators (48.1%). In contrast, faculty members at Pride University reported that they most commonly learned of AI policy from the faculty handbook (63.6%) or the university catalog (54.5%). Faculty members at Spark University reported that they most commonly learn of AI policies from the Website (57.6%), faculty handbook (44.9%), and conversations with other faculty (43.2%).

Faculty members at both Pride University and Spark University reported that they are most often informed of the institution's AI policies via faculty committees, the student calendar/handbook (also referred to as planners), AI judicial panels, and/or through direct communication with the Dean of Students Office. Several faculty members at Spark University reported that they learned of the AI policy after having a negative encounter with the process. In the words of a male full professor of Humanities at Spark University, "A badly handled AI violation within the department resulted in the need for me to become familiar with the AI policies and procedures." On the other hand, faculty at Eagle

University emphasized the high value placed on integrating the honor code into

the campus culture. A female instructor of Humanities at Eagles University

commented:

> My university holds an honor ceremony at the beginning of each school
> year. During the ceremony, faculty are encouraged to attend in full regalia
> and first-year students pledge to uphold the university honor code. In
> addition, E-mails regarding the honor code are sent from the Vice
> President of Academic Affairs and the importance of the honor code is
> covered during faculty meetings and forums.

In reviewing the survey responses related to resources used to increase

faculty members' source of awareness between institutions, the most frequently

selected response was the faculty handbook. This particular finding is

noteworthy because it corroborates earlier findings in this study related to

faculty believing they have a moderate to high understanding of AI policies (See

Table 3). Similarly, previous AI research suggests that there is a relationship

between institutions that place value in providing academic integrity education

to faculty and the enforcement of policies (Gallant & Drinan, 2006). Institutions

that place a high value on educating faculty about academic integrity are more

likely to see an increase in academic dishonesty reporting. According to McCabe

et al. (1999), institutions that have clearly-defined expectations and definitions of

cheating behavior tend to have a lower level of academic dishonesty. Perhaps the most telling finding in Table 6 is the high response rate of Eagles University faculty members who reported that they frequently learn about AI policies through faculty orientation (64.9%), which is notably higher than their public counterparts, who reported 15.2% (Pride University) and 28% (Spark University). This is of particular interest considering the fact that faculty orientation tends to set the tone for what the institution values and expects of faculty to carry forward during their tenure at the institution. On the other hand, 43.2% of Pride University faculty members reported that they frequently learn of AI policies from other faculty members, which is higher than the reported responses of faculty at both Eagles University and Pride University.

Tables 7-9 investigate faculty reports of their level of awareness of AI policies in the classroom. They show that when it comes to raising the level of awareness about AI policies in the classroom, the majority of faculty at all three institutions implement similar procedures (i.e., use of course outline and discussion at the start of the semester) when discussing policies with their students about plagiarism. Similarly, the majority of faculty at each institution reported that they discuss group work/collaboration and the citing/referencing of resources policies on individual assignments (See Tables 7-9).

Table 7

Faculty Discussion of Academic Integrity Policies with Students at Eagles University (N=77)

Discussion Item	Do Not Discuss n (%)	On Individual Assignments n (%)	Syllabus/ Course Outline n (%)	Start of Semester n (%)	Other n (%)	Not Really n (%)	Not Applicable n (%)
Plagiarism	2 (2.6)	31 (40)	58 (75)	49 (63)	4 (5.2)	1 (1.3)	0 (0)
Group Work/ Collaboration	1 (1.3)	46 (59.7)	25 (32)	27 (35.1)	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	8 (10.4)
Citation/ Referencing Sources	3 (3.9)	50 (64.9)	30 (39)	29 (37.7)	9 (11.7)	4 (5.2)	2 (2.6)
Citation of Internet Sources	3 (3.9)	52 (67.5)	19 (24.7)	22 (28.6)	10 (13)	3 (3.9)	3 (3.9)
Falsification/ Fabrication of Research Data	15 (19.5)	24 (31.2)	15 (19.5)	17 (22.1)	7 (9.1)	6 (7.8)	16 (20.8)
Falsification/ Fabrication of Lab Data	14 (18.2)	10 (13)	3 (3.9)	6 (7.8)	2 (2.7)	4 (5.2)	40 (51.9)

Table 8

Faculty Discussion of Academic Integrity Policies with Students at Pride University (N=33)

Discussion Item	Do Not Discuss n (%)	On Individual Assignments n (%)	Syllabus/ Course Outline n (%)	Start of Semester n (%)	Other n (%)	Not Really n (%)	Not Applicable n (%)
Plagiarism	1 (3)	10 (30.3)	22 (66.7)	24 (72.7)	3 (9.1)	1 (3)	0 (0)
Group Work/ Collaboration	0 (0)	19 (57.6)	12 (36.4)	16 (48.5)	0 (0)	1(3)	1(3)
Citation/ Referencing Sources	0 (0)	19 (57.6)	13 (39.4)	17 (51.5)	1 (3)	1 (3)	0 (0)
Citation of Internet Sources	0 (0)	20 (60.6)	13 (39.4)	15 (45.5)	1 (3)	1 (3)	0 (0)
Falsification/ Fabrication of Research Data	0 (0)	9 (27.3)	8 (24.2)	14 (42.4)	1 (3)	1 (3)	11 (33.3)
Falsification/ Fabrication of Lab Data	1 (3)	7 (21.25)	4 (12.1)	8 (24.2)	0 (0)	1 (3)	18 (54.5)

Table 9

Faculty Discussion of Academic Integrity Policies with Students at Spark University (N=236)

Discussion Item	Do Not Discuss n (%)	On Individual Assignments n (%)	Syllabus/ Course Outline n (%)	Start of Semester n (%)	Other n (%)	Not Really n (%)	Not Applicable n (%)
Plagiarism	9 (3.8)	91 (38.6)	158 (66.9)	145 (61.4)	23 (9.7)	7 (3.0)	5 (2.1)
Group Work/ Collaboration	13 (5.5)	119 (50.4)	88 (37.3)	86 (36.4)	15 (6.4)	7 (3)	26 (11)
Citation/ Referencing Sources	5 (2.1)	158 (66.9)	81 (34.3)	76 (32.2)	26 (11)	7 (3)	21 (8.9)
Citation of Internet Sources	12 (5.1)	143 (60.6)	68 (28.8)	75 (31.8)	25 (10.6)	7 (3)	23 (9.7)
Falsification/ Fabrication of Research Data	40 (16.9)	46 (19.5)	27 (11.4)	37 (15.7)	14 (5.9)	10 (4.2)	110 (46.6)
Falsification/ Fabrication of Lab Data	34 (14.4)	25 (10.6)	11 (4.7)	19 (8.1)	8 (3.4)	6 (2.5)	155 (65.7)

Therefore, the findings show no notable difference in institution type and

reported level of awareness related to the types of AI policies discussed by

faculty in the classroom.

Research Question 3:   ***What are the patterns of beliefs and level of awareness***
among faculty members about violations of academic
integrity at two public and one private post-secondary
institutions?

Table 10 reports the frequencies of observed behaviors related to academic

dishonesty in the classroom and faculty awareness of what is considered serious

cheating.

Faculty were asked to indicate, in a two-part question on the survey

instrument, to report how often, if ever, they have observed or become aware of

one or more cheating behaviors of students within the past three years. In part

two of the survey question, faculties were asked to report their level of

awareness related to the seriousness of each cheating behavior. Responses to the

two-part question are summarized in Table 10. With the exception of receiving

unpermitted help and failing to use references/footnoting, the majority of faculty

at all three institutions reported that they have "never" observed a high volume

of cheating in the past three years.

Table 10

Cheating Behaviors and Frequency of Seriousness of Cheating Behaviors

Description of Academic Behaviors	School ID	In the last three years, how often have you observed any of the following behaviors in your class? [a]				How serious do you consider this a form of cheating? [b]			
		N %	O %	MTO %	NR %	NC %	TC %	MC %	SC %
Fabricating or Falsifying Bibliography	Eagles University	64.9	6.5	24.7	3.9	0	7.8	37.7	46.8
	Pride University	36.4	6.1	33.3	18.2	6.1	3.0	24.2	42.4
	Spark University	58.1	7.2	17.4	15.7	.8	6.8	36.4	45.3
Collaborating when instructor asked for individual work	Eagles University	37.7	5.2	41.6	15.6	0	13	40.3	35.1
	Pride University	24.2	6.1	51.5	12.1	0	6.1	39.4	36.4
	Spark University	35.2	12.7	33.5	16.1	2.1	10.2	44.5	33.9
Getting questions/answers from someone already taken the test	Eagles University	66.2	6.5	19.5	7.8	0	5.2	20.8	61
	Pride University	36.4	12.1	36.4	9.1	0	3	24.2	52.5
	Spark University	61.9	9.71	16.5	8.9	1.3	2.5	12.	74.6
Not writing own computer program	Eagles University	33.8	2.6	3.9	58.4	0	0	5.2	62.3
	Pride University	24.2	0	21.2	45.5	0	6.1	9.1	45.5
	Spark University	28	2.5	5.4	59.3	2.1	0	10.6	59.3
Helping someone cheat on test	Eagles University	71.4	6.5	14.3	7.8	0	1.3	9.1	74
	Pride University	33.3	21.2	27.3	9.1	0	3	15.2	60.6
	Spark University	66.5	11	12.7	7.2	.8	.8	9.3	80.5
Fabricating/falsifying lab data	Eagles University	42.9	0	5.2	50.6	0	0	13	61
	Pride University	30.3	0	3	63.6	3	3	3	42.4
	Spark University	32.6	1.7	3	59.7	.8	0	7.2	64.8

NOTE : (a) N= Never, O=Once, MTO=More Than Once, NR=Not Relevant. (b) NC=Not Cheating, TC=Trivial Cheating, MC=Moderate Cheating, and SC=Serious Cheating. The greater the percentage in column B, the greater the importance the faculty believe it is serious cheating. Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding and missing values.

114

Description of Academic Behaviors	School ID	In the last three years, how often have you observed any of the following behaviors in your class? [a]				How serious do you consider this a form of cheating?[b]			
		N %	O %	MTO %	NR %	NC %	TC %	MC %	SC %
Fabricating/falsifying research data	Eagles University	57.1	9.1	52.2	28.6	0	0	3.9	75.3
	Pride University	27.3	12.1	3	51.5	0	3	0	51.5
	Spark University	47	3.4	2.1	44.5	.8	.4	4.2	72
Copying from another student with her/his knowledge	Eagles University	68.8	7.8	16.9	6.5	0	1.3	5.2	80.5
	Pride University	36.4	9.1	39.4	6.1	0	0	6.1	72.7
	Spark University	66.1	10.6	12.3	8.1	.8	0	5.9	83.5
Copying from another student without her/his knowledge	Eagles University	6.1	14.3	**18.2**	5.2	0	1.3	5.2	80.5
	Pride University	39.4	12.1	33.3	6.1	0	0	9.1	69.7
	Spark University	55.5	15.3	17.8	8.5	.8	.4	6.4	82.2
Receiving unpermitted help	Eagles University	1.3	3.9	51.9	26	1.3	3.9	51.9	26
	Pride University	6.1	12.1	24.2	33.3	6.1	12.1	24.2	33.3
	Spark University	1.3	9.7	42.8	33.5	1.3	9.7	42.8	33.5
Not using references or footnotes from written sources	Eagles University	22.1	9.1	62.3	2.6	1.3	14.3	37.7	35.1
	Pride University	9.1	9.1	63.6	3.0	3	12.1	30.3	36.4
	Spark University	19.1	11	56.8	9.3	.8	9.7	43.2	39.4
Turning in paper from "paper mill"	Eagles University	55.8	17.7	20.8	6.5	1.3	3.9	0	80.5
	Pride University	27.3	18.2	27.3	12.1	0	3	0	75.8
	Spark University	59.7	11.9	13.6	11.9	.8	.4	2.1	87.7
Not using references or footnotes from electronic sources	Eagles University	26	11.7	52.2	3.9	1.3	13	37.7	33.8
	Pride University	15.2	15.2	54.5	0	3	15.2	24.2	42.4
	Spark University	22.5	14	51.3	8.9	.8	8.5	43.2	41.1

NOTE : (a) N= Never, O=Once, MTO=More Than Once, NR=Not Relevant. (b) NC=Not Cheating, TC=Trivial Cheating, MC=Moderate Cheating, and SC=Serious Cheating. The greater the percentage in column B, the greater the importance the faculty believe it is serious cheating. Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding and missing values.

Description of Academic Behaviors	In the last three years, how often have you observed any of the following behaviors in your class? [a]				How serious do you consider this a form of cheating?[b]			
		N	O	MTO	NR	NC	TC	MC	SC
	School ID	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Using cheat sheet	Eagles University	67.5	10.4	10.4	6.5	0	1.3	6.5	75.3
	Pride University	42.4	12.1	24.2	9.1	0	3	6.1	63.6
	Spark University	61.4	14.4	4.9	14	.8	.8	9.3	76.7
Using unauthorized electronic device	Eagles University	75.3	5.2	2.6	13	0	7.8	0	70.1
	Pride University	63.6	6.1	9.1	9.1	3	0	9.1	57.6
	Spark University	73.3	3.8	2.1	16.9	.8	.4	7.6	77.1
Copying from written source and turning in as own	Eagles University	39	15.6	4.3	1.3	0	6.5	0	83.1
	Pride University	18.2	12.1	**39.4**	12.1	0	3	0	75.8
	Spark University	36.9	17.4	26.4	6.4	.8	.4	4.2	87.3
Turning in work copied from another student paper	Eagles University	54.4	19.5	19.5	1.3	0	10.4	0	76.6
	Pride University	36.4	12.1	27.3	9.1	3	6.1	6.1	66.7
	Spark University	62.3	11	14	8.1	.8	.4	6.4	82.6
Using false/forged excuses to delay taking an examination	Eagles University	51.9	14.3	23.4	6.5	1.3	6.5	32.5	45.5
	Pride University	36.4	12.1	30.3	9.1	3	9.1	15.2	48.5
	Spark University	58.5	12.7	15.7	9.7	1.7	9.7	35.2	41.5
Turning in work done by someone else	Eagles University	63.6	13	18.2	1.3	0	5.2	0	79.2
	Pride University	51.5	6.1	21.2	9.1	3	3	9.1	60.6
	Spark University	65.3	13.1	14	4.2	.8	.4	3.4	86.4
Cheating on a test in any other way	Eagles University	62.3	7.8	15.6	6.5	2.6	0	15.6	59.7
	Pride University	39.4	18.2	21.2	6.1	0	3	15.2	60
	Spark University	59.3	10.2	11.9	13.1	.8	.8	10.2	72

NOTE: (a) N= Never, O=Once, MTO=More Than Once, NR=Not Relevant. (b) NC=Not Cheating, TC=Trivial Cheating, MC=Moderate Cheating, and SC=Serious Cheating. The greater the percentage in column B, the greater the importance the faculty believe it's serious cheating. Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding and missing values.

Also, as can be observed in Table 10 (except for receiving unpermitted help), the majority of faculty members reported that all cheating behaviors presented in the instrument were considered "serious cheating."

Thus, there were virtually no noteworthy differences in the reported percentage of observed cheating behaviors and institutional type (public vs. private; honor code vs. AI policy). Furthermore, there was no noteworthy difference in the reported seriousness of cheating behaviors and institutional type (public vs. private; honor code vs. AI policy).

Although there is no evidence that suggests institutional type affects faculty perceptions related to observed and/or seriousness of cheating behaviors, it is interesting to note that observed cheating behaviors and frequency of cheating during a test or examination did differ slightly. As can be seen in Table 10, a majority of faculty (Eagles University: 62.3%; Pride University: 39.4%; Spark University: 59.3%) reported that they "never" observed cheating. However, in a different section of the survey, faculty were asked to rate how often they believe cheating occurs during a test or examination on a five-point Likert scale (1="Never"; 2="Very Seldom"; 3="Seldom/Sometimes"; 4="Often"; 5="Very Often").

Table 11

Frequency of Faculty Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty Violations Occur on Campus

Types of Violations	Category	Eagles University (N=77) *n* (%)	Pride University (N=33) *n* (%)	Spark University (N=237) *n* (%)
Plagiarism	Never	0	0	0
	Seldom/Sometimes	**45 (52%)**	10(30.3%)	90(38.1%)
	Often-Very Often	32(41.6%)	**21(63.7%)**	**132(55.5%)**
	Don't Know	5(6.5%)	1(3%)	13(5.5%)
Inappropriately sharing work on group assignments	Never	1(1.3%)	1(3%)	3(1.3%)
	Seldom/Sometimes	**3(48.1%)**	10 (30.3)	76 (12.2%)
	Often-Very Often	30 (39%)	**19(57.5%)**	**104(48.2%)**
	Don't Know	9 (11.7%)	3 (9.1%)	43 (18.25)
Cheating during test or examination	Never	1(1.3%)	1(1.3%)	5(2.1%)
	Seldom/Sometime	**59(76.6%)**	**19(57.6%)**	**139(58.9%)**
	Often-Very Often	8(10.4%)	10(30.3%)	64 (27.1%)
	Don't Know	9 (11.7%)	3 (9.1%)	28(11.9%)

NOTE: Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding and missing values.

As can be seen in Table 11, a majority of the faculty (Eagles University: *n*=59 (76.6%); Pride University: *n*=19 (57.6%); Spark University: *n*=139 (58.9%)) reported that it happens "sometimes."

Research Question 4: ***What are the frequencies and types of reported AI violations among faculty at two public and one private post-secondary institutions?***

Table 11 reports the frequencies of faculty members' responses regarding the occurrence of academic dishonesty behaviors on campus.

On the survey faculty members were asked using a five-point Likert scale (1="Never"; 2="Very Seldom"; 3="Seldom/Sometimes"; 4="Often"; and 5="Very Often") to report their perception regarding the frequency of academic dishonesty behavior of students relating to plagiarism, unauthorized group work, and cheating on tests or examinations. As can be seen in Table 11, the majority of respondents at the two public institutions with AI policies believe that "plagiarism" and "inappropriate sharing on group assignments" happens "often" to "very often" on their campuses. However, their private counterparts whose students subscribe to an honor code reported that "plagiarism" and "inappropriate sharing on group assignments" happen "seldom" to "sometimes" on their campus. When it comes to "cheating during a test or examination," the reported responses of all three institutions were "seldom" to "sometimes." While there is virtually no difference on the measure between institutions regarding the reported frequency of cheating during a test or examination, it is interesting to note that plagiarism and inappropriate sharing of work in group assignments did differ slightly by institution type as summarized in Table 11.

In comparison to the faculty as a whole (see Table 12), the results show that faculty as a whole believe that "plagiarism" (M=3.82; SD=.94) and

"inappropriately sharing of work in group assignments" (*M*=4.05; *SD*=1.17) occur

more often on campus than does "cheating on an exam" (*M*=3.42; *SD*=1.22).

Table 12

Combined Mean and Standard Deviations of Frequency of Faculty Perception of Report Academic Dishonesty Violations Occur on Campus

All Faculty	Plagiarism on Written Assignments	Inappropriately Sharing Work in Group Assignments	Cheating During a Test or Examination
N	343	342	342
Mean	3.8222	4.0556	3.4240
Std. Deviation	.94614	1.17394	1.22955

NOTE: (1) The greater the means, the greater it is perceived by faculty to occur on campus.

To further investigate the occurrence of a particular type of AI violation

frequently mentioned in the literature as a common form of cheating, faculty

were asked how often they observed students cheating on tests or examinations.

Almost 50% of faculty members at the PRWCU reported "never" seeing students

cheat on tests/examinations; 14 faculty members at Pride University (42.4%)

reported observing students cheat on tests/examinations "a few times"; and 112

faculty members at Spark University (47.5%) reported "never" observing student

cheating on tests/examinations.

Table 13 shows reported frequencies of observed student cheating during

a test or examination by faculty at public and private post-secondary institutions.

Table 13

Frequency of Observed Student Cheating on a Test or Examination by Faculty

School ID	Category	Frequency	%
Eagles University (N=76)	Never	40	51.9%
	Once	11	14.3%
	a few times	21	27.3%
	several times	3	3.9%
	many times	1	1.3%
Pride University (N=32)	Never	8	24.2%
	Once	3	9.1%
	a few times	14	42.4%
	several times	7	21.2%
	many times	0	0.0%
Spark University (N=233)	Never	112	47.5%
	Once	25	10.6%
	a few times	78	33.1%
	several times	14	5.9%
	many times	4	1.7%

Research Question 5:   *What methods do faculty members employ to respond to academic integrity violations?*

Table 14 shows reported "yes" responses of faculty to referring students

for cheating.

Table 14

Faculty Response to Having Referred a Student for Cheating to a Department Chair, Dean, or Anyone Else

School ID	N	Total Responses	% Yes
Eagles University	77	44	57.1
Pride University	33	17	51.5
Spark University	236	86	36.4

To understand the gap between policy (and procedure) implementation and faculty practice (methods used to reduce academic integrity violations), it is important to investigate the likelihood that faculty will report incidents of academic dishonesty. With respect to the frequency of reporting incidents of student cheating behaviors, faculties were asked if they ever reported a student for cheating to the chair, department dean, or anyone else (e.g., other faculty members, or college administrator such as the Dean of Students). Table 15 shows the variations that exist by institution type in the number of faculty who have reported incidents of academic dishonesty to their chair, dean, or other university administrator. While there appears to be a noticeable difference in the number of faculty who would report student cheating by institution type (public vs. private; honor code vs. AI policy), the overall results in Table 15 revealed that more faculty members (*n*=197; 56%) selected "no" to reporting cheating than

faculty members who selected "yes" (*n*=147; 42.5%) to reporting incidents of

academic dishonesty to a chair, department dean, or other administrator.

Table 15

Overall "Yes" and "No" Responses of all Three Institutions Combined Related to Students Referred for Cheating

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		2	.6	.6	.6
	No	197	56.9	56.9	57.5
	Yes	147	42.5	42.5	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Of the faculty members who answered "yes" to referring a student for

cheating, they were asked to report if they were satisfied with the way their AI

case was handled on a five-point Likert scale (1="Very Satisfied"; 2="Satisfied";

3="Neutral"; 4="Unsatisfied"; 5="Very Unsatisfied").

Table 16 shows that overall, faculty members reported that they were

satisfied with the way the AI case was handled. On the other hand, faculty

members who answered "unsatisfied" or "very unsatisfied" were asked to

explain their answers. An assistant professor of Math and Science at Pride

University commented that the "chair of the department did not share the

serious nature of the incident, so he assisted the student in changing his major

and keep going."

Table 16

*Ever Referred to Chair/Dean/Anyone Else * Satisfaction with Handling*

		Satisfaction with Handling					
		Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Total
Ever Referred to Chair/Dean/Anyone Else	Yes	17	16	24	56	34	147
Total		17	16	24	56	34	147

Another instructor of Technology at Pride University felt that he/she was not

supported in a blatant case of plagiarism and was told to "take it out of the

department." Several faculty members at Spark University reported that "the

matter was swept under the rug or was dismissed because the faculty member

didn't make it clear enough to the students that plagiarism is unacceptable." As

one full professor of the Business discipline at Spark University noted:

> The hearing did not result in a finding of responsibility. The student who
> had turned in another student cheating off her paper, declined to come to
> the hearing. Therefore, the panel declined to find the student responsible.

Another faculty member commented about her dissatisfaction with a colleague

who chose to handle the situation herself but did not keep sufficient paperwork.

The lecturer of Exercise and Sports Science at Spark University asserted,

> The issue was not properly addressed. I felt like the severity of the
> cheating incident should have been brought to the attention of the Dean or
> Department Chair. . . . the junior faculty member should not have handled
> it on his own with the student.

These types of responses are not uncommon among faculty members

who, according to the literature, frequently choose to handle cheating on their

own because they are more than likely not familiar with AI policy and

procedures, or felt that they were not being supported by the administration. As

one assistant professor of Business at Eagles University asserts, "the honor code

system gives too much power to the students given that there are more student

members on the hearing board than faculty members." The faculty member

further asserts that his/her experience has been that "students are too lenient

when they considered the violation to be trivial."

Table 17 summarizes responses of faculty who were asked if they have

ever ignored suspected incidents of cheating. As can be seen in Table 17, 31

Eagles University faculty members (40.3%), 11 Pride University faculty members

(33%), and 78 Spark University faculty members (33.1%) reported ignoring

suspected incidents of cheating.

Table 17

Faculty by Rank Who Have Ignored Cheating

	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Lecturer	Other
Faculty Who Have Ignored Cheating in Their Courses by School ID and Academic Rank						
University	*n*	*n*	*n*	*n*	*n*	*n*
Eagles University(n =31)	8	9	9	2	1	2
% within School ID (a)	25.8%	29%	29%	6.5%	3.2%	6.5%
% within Academic Rank (b)	38.1%	30%	28.1%	16.7%	6.3%	22.2%
Pride University (n=11)	1	5	3	2	0	0
% within School ID	9.1%	45.5%	27.3%	18.2%	0	0
% within Academic Rank	4.8%	16.7%	9.4%	16.7%	0	0
Spark University (n=78)	12	16	20	8	15	7
% within School ID	15.4%	20.5%	25.6%	10.3%	19.2%	9%
% within Academic Rank	57.1%	53.3%	62.5%	66.7%	93.8%	77.8%

Note: Cross tabulation by school ID and rank: (a) The percentage of faculty who ignored cheating at their institution by rank; (b) The percentage of faculty by rank with the total population (N=346).

Surprisingly, more faculty members at the honor code institutions reported

ignoring cheating than did faculty at the non-honor code institutions. A cross-

tabulation of faculty by rank within institutions and within the academic ranks

finds that assistant and associate professors are more likely to ignore cheating in

their course. See Table 17 for additional cross-tabulations regarding faculty

position by those faculty members who are most likely to ignore cheating.

Table 18 shows faculty beliefs regarding the decision to ignore suspected

incidents of cheating and the reasons for their decision.

Table 18

Factors Influencing Faculty Decisions to Ignore Suspected Incidents of Academic Dishonesty

| | School ID | | |
| | Eagles University N=77 | Pride University N=33 | Spark University N=236 |
Survey Item	*n (%)*	*n (%)*	*n (%)*
Lacked Evidence or Proof	25(32)	10(30)	67(45.5)
Cheating was trivial/not serious	7(9.1)	1(3)	13(5.5)
Lack support from adm.	5(6.5)	2(6.1)	7(3)
Student will ultimately suffer	2(2.6)	3(9.1)	7(3)
Didn't want to deal with it, system is bureaucratic	3(3.9)	2(6.1)	16(6.8)
Lack time	2(2.6)	2(6.1)	8(3.4)
Fear of legal or other repercussions from student	1(1.3)	1(3)	7(3)
Other	3(3.9)	0	11(4.7)

NOTE: Totals do not equal 100% because subjects were asked to select all the applicable responses for ignoring academic dishonesty.

Of the faculty who responded "yes" to ignoring cheating, they were asked a follow up question: "If your response is 'yes' to ignoring cheating, what factors influenced your decision?"

Table 18 shows that the most frequently selected factor was "lack of evidence/proof" by all three institutions. This finding is noteworthy because it contradicts open-ended responses of faculty participating in this study, as well as earlier studies conducted by McCabe (1993b), Whitley and Spiegel (2002), and Alschuler and Blimling (1995), who reported that faculty were less likely to report student cheating because of the lack of support from the administration, time, and fear of legal or other repercussions from students.

Further examination of individual faculty members' written responses from each institution revealed some interesting reasons for ignoring cheating behaviors. Faculty commonly reported that students who were observed cheating, in most cases, received a failing grade anyway, so there was no need to report the violation. Furthermore, faculty members consistently reported that it is often too difficult to prove. In the words of an assistant professor of Math and Science at Spark University, "Ignore is too strong of a word. If I noticed a student glancing toward another student's paper during an exam (this is very hard to prove without another witness), so I'll give a firm general reminder to the class

and watch the student like a hawk." Other faculty noted that they feared

repercussion from students such as a bad final evaluation or legal action.

Table 19 shows actions that are most likely to be taken by faculty members

who are convinced a student has cheated on a test or assignment.

An extensive review of the literature finds that external factors (e.g.,

judicial punishment, fear of getting caught, disappointing parents, being

dropped from a course) have proven to be effective at reducing cheating. "The

reduction of academic dishonesty depends primarily on faculty and institutional

actions" (Vandehey et al., 2007, p. 467).

To understand methods used to reduce academic integrity violations,

faculty members were asked to report the most likely response if they were

convinced a student was cheating. Next, faculty members were asked what

safeguards are employed to reduce cheating. As can be seen in Table 19, the top

three most selected responses varied slightly for each institution. Of the selected

responses, "Pursue actions through the AI system" and "Follow the AI policy"

differed between institutions.

A majority (*n*=56; 72.7%) of PRWCU faculty frequently selected "pursue

actions through the AI system" and 50 (64.9%) selected "follow the AI policy,"

which correlate to the average to high response rate of faculty support, perceived

student support, and effectiveness of the institution's AI policies (or honor code)

(see Table 1).

Table 19

Likely Actions of Faculty Convinced of Student Cheating on a Test or Assignment

Reported Action	Eagles University (N=77)		Pride University (N=33)		Spark University (N=237)	
	n	(%)	*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)
Reprimand /Warn Student	16	(24.7)	9	(27.3)	87	(36.9)
Lower Test Grade	12	(15.6)	8	(24.2)	35	(14.8)
"F" on the test or assignment	*34	(44.2)	*23	(69.7)	*126	(53.4)
'F" in the course	13	(16.9)	7	(21.2)	21	(8.9)
Retake Test	4	(5.2)	4	(12.1)	34	(14.4)
Report to the Dean of Students	18	(23.4)	3	(9.1)	44	(18.6)
Report to the Chair, Director, or Dean	25	(32.5)	*12	(36.4)	77	(32.6)
Do Nothing	0	(0)	0	(0)	3	(1.3)
Redo Assignment	8	(10.4)	5	(15.2)	40	(16.9)
Pursue Action through the AI system	*56	(72.7)	2	(6.1)	*104	(44.1)
Follow AI policy	*50	(64.9)	*13	(39.4)	*122	(51.7)
Faculty/Student Conference	18	(23.4)	7	(21.2)	75	(31.8)
Other	4	(5.2)	0	(0)	13	(5.5)

Note: (*) indicates the top three selected responses. Totals do not equal 100% because subjects were asked to select all that applicable responses.

One lecturer of Arts at the PRWCU explained that his/her response depends on the severity of the situation. For example, "glancing at a neighbor's paper to copy a response is not as severe—in my opinion—as cheating throughout the test." On the other hand, faculty at both Pride University and Spark University reported frequently that it depended on the situation and proof that a violation has occurred as to their likely reaction to handling the situation. Oftentimes "it would depend if I had enough evidence that could prove it [AI violations]," asserts one clinical associate professor of Nursing/Health at Spark University. Another lecturer of Humanities at Spark University reported, "I tell my students during the first week of class that I'm not afraid of the process." Fewer Pride University faculty members (n=2; 6.1%) and Spark University faculty members (n=104; 44.1%) frequently selected that they would pursue action through the AI system. In addition, 13 (39.4%) Pride University faculty members and 122 (51.7%) Spark University faculty members frequently selected that they would "follow the AI policy." This was not surprising to the researcher given that both institutions reported a low to average response to perceived faculty/student support for AI policies and a slightly average response rate regarding policy effectiveness. Furthermore, the findings may contribute to why a majority of the respondents reported that they are "not sure" in their beliefs in the student

judicial process rate, which may suggest a lack of awareness in the effectiveness

or confidence (specifically for Pride University) in the judicial process.

Table 20 shows safeguards faculty employ to reduce cheating in the

classroom.

Table 20

Descriptive Statistical Results of Safeguards Used to Reduce Cheating

	Institution					
	Eagles University N=77		Pride University (N= 33)		Spark University (N=236)	
Description of Items	*n*	*(%)*	*n*	*(%)*	*n*	*(%)*
Don't use safeguard in classroom	2	(2.5)	-	-	1	(.4)
Use Internet or software	15	(19.4)	8	(24.2)	63	(26.6)
Provide information on course outline or assignment sheet	*56	(72.7)	*21	(63.6)	*169	(71.6)
Change exams regularly	*61	(79.2)	*24	(72.7)	*158	(66.9)
Hand out different versions of exam	26	(33.7)	17	(51.5)	89	(37.7)
Discuss AI in the classroom	*54	(70.1)	*20	(60.6)	*152	(64.4)
Remind students periodically about AI policy	43	(55.8)	14	(42.4)	148	(62.7)
Closely monitor students taking a test/exam	*55	(71.42)	*26	(78.7)	*168	(71.1)
Require students to sign AI pledge on assignment/exam	29	(37.6)	4	(12.1)	141	(59.7)
Other	12	(15.5)	4	(12.1)	43	(22.27)

Note: (*) indicates the top four frequently selected responses. Totals do not equal 100% because subjects were asked to select all that applicable responses.

Regarding the question "What safeguards do you employ to reduce cheating in your course," faculty were asked to select from a list of nine potential safeguards noted on the instrument and the top four most frequently selected responses were noted (see Table 20). There was no difference in the frequently selected safeguards and institution type.

As can be seen in Table 20, changing exams regularly, discussing AI policies in the classroom, and closely monitoring students taking a test or exam were frequently selected by faculty at all three institutions. Therefore, there wasn't a noteworthy difference in school type and methods for reducing academic dishonesty.

These themes were consistent with previous research findings related to the topic. However, further analysis of the faculty written responses from the survey revealed four unique themes related to the reduction of academic dishonesty: creative writing assignments, in/out of class examinations, honor Code/AI policy discourse, and the use of online resources for detecting and preventing student cheating. These themes, because of the way faculties are implementing them in the academic community, add to the existing research by way of offering faculty "best practices" for reducing student cheating.

Creative writing assignments. Faculty members reported the importance of implementing nontraditional methods (e.g. writing a paper on a particular topic related to a subject and/or area covered in class) in order to reduce cheating on assignments. One faculty member frequently requires students to complete assignments that are individualized enough that plagiarism and copying straight from the text are less of an issue. Another assistant professor of Communications/Journalism at Spark University mentioned that writing assignments could be designed in such a way that "requires students to synthesize and integrate materials rather than simply regurgitating what has already been written." Finally, faculty reported frequently introducing several writing assignments in class, requiring students to submit all drafts of their research papers (including referenced articles), designing final papers to build on previous work required for the class, or design projects and writing assignments in such a way as to prevent students from using the Internet as their sole source for information. Several faculty members at the four-year, public university reported that "Writing assignments should be developed in such a way that addresses specific questions related to materials discussed in the class."

In/out of class examinations. Students report that they are most likely to cheat on test and/or examinations if faculty members are less likely to confront

the situation. According to the data from the survey, the frequently selected

response for ignoring suspected incidents of cheating by faculty (n=102; 30%)

was because of the "lack of evidence or proof." Faculty also reported that they no

longer use true/false or multiple choice exams because it makes it easy for

students to cheat. Instead, most faculty members give essay exams or design

tests that are difficult for students to work on in groups. A lecturer of Business at

Spark University reported that she "embeds the student's name in many places

on exams/assignments files" (i.e., in a footer, or a word document, charts,

pictures captions, or file name) which allows her to identify students who may

have collaborated on the exam/assignment. Another lecturer of Arts at Spark

University reported that he/she never gives the same exam for makeup and often

will give two different exams in class or move students around before giving out

the test. Additionally, faculty frequently reported that they require students to

put away electronic devices such as cell phones, iPods, laptops, and palm pilots

before starting the exam. Regarding open books exams, students are required to

frame their argument where they exercise critical thinking skills and not simply

rewrite what has already been written.

These findings support previous research which reports that faculty

members have a significant influence on student behaviors in and outside the

classroom (Bies, 1998; Saddlemire, 2005). As role models, faculty members are in

the best position to communicate and enforce academic standards and

expectations regarding class assignments and examinations within the

classrooms as well as the academic community.

> Students consistently indicate that when they perceive that faculty are
> committed to maintaining academic integrity within their courses, and
> when they are aware of the policies of their institution concerning
> academic integrity, they are less likely to engage in acts of academic
> dishonesty. (McCabe & Trevino, 1996, p. 30)

McCabe and Pavela (1997) further assert that "one of the greatest inducements to

engaging in academic dishonesty is the perception that academic dishonesty is

rampant" on college and university campuses" (p. 1).

Honor Code/AI policy discourse. Faculty reported that they frequently

discuss the honor code/AI policy in class as well as require students to sign

and/or write the honor pledge on test and assignments. This finding is consistent

with the results reported in this study where a majority of the faculty reported

that they write the AI policies in the syllabus /course outline as well as discuss

them at the start of the semester. Other faculty members have been known to

promote a "zero" tolerance policy for students who cheat. One assistant

professor of Nursing/Health Professions at Spark University noted:

> I tell students in the beginning of the course that I have a 'zero tolerance policy' on cheating and that if caught, I will work to have the student expelled from the University even if it is their first offense. Additionally, I remind them during every exam to sign the pledge.

An associate professor of Arts at Spark University reported that there are no "degrees of cheating. You are either cheating, or not cheating." Finally, another assistant professor of Humanities at Spark University reported giving student AI pins and encouraging them to wear them to class. "I wear my pin daily as well as talk about what it means to uphold the values of the community" asserted the faculty member.

Online resources. Surprisingly, faculty did not report the use of online resources (e.g., Turnitin.com) or special software design to detect plagiarism. Instead, faculty frequently mentioned the use of a free Web link "Google" to identify incidents of academic dishonesty on written assignments and research papers. While a limited number of studies have addressed the impact of online resources on reducing academic dishonesty, faculty frequently reported that non-sophisticated search engines such as "Google" have proven to be an effective tool for catching student plagiarism. Faculty plug in two or three phrases from a student's paper into "Google" to determine what portion of the paper has been plagiarized (Selingo, 2004).

Finally, on the open-ended portion of the instrument, faculty was asked to respond to "what role do they think faculty should play in promoting academic integrity and/or controlling cheating in their classroom." The impetus for asking this question was guided by a review of the literature that reported that faculty and university administrators were frequently disengaged from student cheating. According to Vandehey et al. (2007), in 1999 less than 3% of student cheating was reported being caught by their professor. Additionally, only 9% of instructors who caught students cheating penalized them.

In response to the perceived role of faculty in reducing academic dishonesty, instructors at Eagle University reported several approaches such as role modeling integrity in and outside the classroom, holding students responsible for breaches of integrity, and focusing on designing courses that make it difficult for students to cheat. According to an assistant professor of Math and Science at Spark University, "Faculty could prevent cheating by designing the course to require long-term work on assignments, changing tests, giving oral make-up exams and being vigilant at catching student cheaters."

Several faculty members at all three institutions noted what has already been reported in the literature: faculties need a better understanding of what constitutes intended and unintended cheating. Furthermore, it was noted that

faculty could take an active role in educating students for the purpose of

changing behaviors, beliefs, and attitudes. An associate professor of Math and

Science at Spark University describes his responsibility for curbing academic

dishonesty by asserting:

> Faculty should care highly about integrity in the academy. Plagiarism
> especially, is something our students do not understand and should be
> instructed on often. [Faculty] should let students know the concrete
> integrity they will face in a particular course, how important integrity is to
> faculty members personally, and why integrity is important.

Consistent with the findings of the faculty at Eagle University, developing more

creative assignments where students cannot simply duplicate from another

source, being vigilant and committed to following through in addressing

cheating behaviors, educating students about academic integrity policies and

procedures, taking teaching more seriously, and keeping the issue in the

forefront of students' minds were commonly reported by faculty at the two

public institutions. Several faculty members at Pride University reported that

faculty members have an ethical responsibility to aid students in developing a

sense of academic integrity. In the words of one assistant professor of

Humanities at Pride University,

Faculty should take an active role in promoting academic integrity by demonstrating it in all areas of teaching, research and service. Furthermore, [faculty] could lead the way in promoting, enforcing, and modifying academic integrity policies.

This is certainly understandable when "71% of faculty stated that confronting a student about cheating is one of the most negative aspects of being a college professor" (Vandehey et al., 2007, p. 269). A lecturer of Social Science at Spark University further asserted, "Faculty could play an active role at preventing academic integrity. The world will not improve without the efforts of everyone and it isn't fair to the students not to help them understand the standards of the world." The faculty further recommended that students be required to sign a pledge and be consistent with enforcing the pledge when a violation occurs.

Other most frequently reported survey responses to reducing academic dishonesty in this study include: computerized testing with random order questions; closely monitoring students during exams; encouraging students to collaborate in healthy ways; requiring in-class assignments as part of the course expectations; giving consistent messages about what academic integrity means; making the classes interesting, challenging, and relevant; and establishing an atmosphere of integrity in the classroom by communicating clear expectations. Furthermore, well-established support systems within the faculty community

can also lead to a reduction in academic dishonesty among students. Several

faculty members at Spark University frequently reported that lack of consistency

among faculty in dealing with student cheating is a major concern. "I was

shocked to find out how differently my colleagues dealt with cheating," asserted

one assistant professor of Social Science at Spark University.

Another assistant professor of Nursing/Health Professionals echoed the

same feelings:

> Students need to be aware that faculty are not 'looking the other way' with regards to cheating. Academic integrity discussion should occur at various points in the semester regarding what exactly constitutes a violation of academic integrity—students don't always know.

Upon further review of the written responses, some faculty members

reported concerns that it wasn't their responsibility to promote academic

integrity and/or control cheating in their course. In the words of one assistant

professor of Humanities at the Spark University:

> I think it is an extremely insulting question, especially considering the level of effort I put in my courses to prevent plagiarism and cheating. I'm not the students' mother . . . they are adults, and in the real world, people are fired for this kind of act.

Collectively, the faculty in this study reported that it is the responsibility of the administration to promote academic integrity on campus. Furthermore, the faculty feels that the administration does not support them when reporting students for cheating. Finally, faculty members also reported that it wasn't their job to police the classroom and that the responsibility ultimately falls upon students to promote and enforce integrity in the classroom.

Summary

In light of the limitations, this study provides some informative data that suggest while faculty beliefs, level of understanding, and reported actions did not differ considerably according to institutional type, there was a general consensus that academic integrity is an important concern of faculty and that a majority of faculty are familiar and support their institution's AI policies. Whether it is a four-year private or public institution with an honor code or academic integrity policy in place, faculty overall share the same beliefs about what is considered serious student academic dishonesty. On the other hand, this study finds that most faculty members are unaware of how serious a problem student cheating is at their institution. This study also finds that faculty members do not believe students support the institutional AI policies and feel that their colleagues are not vigilant at reporting incidents of student academic

dishonesty. Despite these findings, faculty at all three institutions recognize the importance of employing intervention efforts to reduce student cheating and are likely to take action if they were convinced of student cheating. Chapter V presents the conclusions, implications, and future research from the findings of the analyses in this chapter.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents discussion and implications of the findings based on the research questions presented in Chapter IV. Recommendations for policy, practice, and future research are also discussed.

This study was undertaken to better understand and to add to the current body of literature about faculty perceptions and attitudes regarding academic integrity, particularly student academic dishonesty and how it is viewed at different types of campuses. The researcher was particularly interested in determining if institutional type (e.g., private vs. public; honor code vs. traditional academic integrity policies) made a difference in faculty perceptions and attitudes about academic integrity. Also, the researcher wanted to determine if the findings in the study related to faculty beliefs, levels of understanding, and reported actions are consistent with recent research on the topic.

Discussion

The literature reports that it is essential that academic integrity becomes the foundation of a student's college experience because the success of an

institution's educational purpose and mission is dependent on faculty, staff, and students working together to maintain the academic integrity of the institution. With regard to student cheating, the literature presented in Chapter II indicated that over the past 30 years of studying student academic dishonesty, researchers (Alschuler & Blimling, 1995; Jendrek, 1989; Passow et al., 2006) reported that college students have and continue to engage in acts of academic dishonesty at alarming levels. According to Cizek (1999), "Cheating is a serious threat to the validity of learning . . . to begin to understand cheating, we must first understand the source of the problem" (p. 8). A majority of the academic integrity research attributed students as the source of the academic integrity crisis. Efforts to correct the problem led to a plethora of studies that focused primarily on students' perceptions and attitudes about academic dishonesty within the context of high school and higher education. Results from these studies suggest that faculty may be contributing to the problem by unknowingly creating an environment where academic dishonesty is socially acceptable.

Very few academic integrity studies have examined faculty perceptions, attitudes, and approaches to addressing student academic dishonesty. Additionally, research on faculty commitment to academic integrity has been limited. One thing that is concretely defined in the literature regarding student

cheating is that faculty play a critical role in responding to and reducing student

academic dishonesty (Aaron & Georgia, 1994). Several reasons have been

presented in the literature as to why faculties choose not to make academic

integrity a priority. Reasons for not responding range from it being too time

consuming, to lack of evidence and/or proof, and the lack of faculty/

administrative support. Perhaps these reasons, coupled with faculty

unwillingness to address academic dishonesty, are also contributing factors to

the problem of increasing student cheating. The failure of faculty to address

academic integrity could be sending the message to students that cheating is

acceptable or too much trouble to address by the institution.

In terms of research design, the researcher used a survey research design

as the framework for this study. According to Creswell (2003), survey research

provides a quantitative or numerical description of trends, attitudes, or opinions

of a population by studying a sample of that population. Utilizing survey

research is most beneficial when the issue being studied can be measured

objectively, the researcher is independent of the issue being researched, and the

methodology uses logic, theories, or hypotheses to test variables (Creswell, 2003).

For this study, the researcher chose survey research methodology to gather the

data for this study because such a method allows for generalization from a

sample population for the purpose of making inferences about some patterns,

characteristics, attitudes, or behaviors of the population (Creswell, 2003; Fowler,

2002; Mertens, 1998). A thorough examination of the academic integrity literature

and data collection in the study provides the framework for answering the

research questions.

Research Question 1:   ***What beliefs do faculty members express about academic integrity?***

The results in this study showed no noteworthy difference in faculty

beliefs regarding academic integrity (AI) policies by institution type (e.g., public

vs. private or honor code vs. AI policy). Unlike previously reported literature,

which indicates that faculties at institutions with honor codes tend to be better

versed in their understanding of AI policies and procedures than academic

integrity policy institutions, the findings from this study revealed that faculties at

all three institutions reported a "high" response rate regarding the

understanding of academic integrity policies regardless of institution type.

Faculty responses were on a five-point Likert scale (1="Very Low"; 2="Low";

3="Medium"; 4="High"; 5="Very High"). Similarly, faculty at all three

institutions reported a slightly "high" response in their support of AI policies.

The results related to faculty beliefs about AI policy effectiveness related to

student understanding and support for AI policies did differ by institutional type (e.g., public or private; honor code or academic integrity policy). There was a noticeable difference in the private, predominantly White university (Eagles University) faculty perceptions related to the effectiveness of AI policies in the college environment and students' understanding and support for AI policies than were the beliefs of both public, historically Black university (Pride University) and the public, historically White university (Spark University) faculty. Both Pride University and Spark University faculties reported a "low" response in their beliefs about effectiveness and students' understanding and support for AI policies. These findings support earlier findings of researchers (McCabe et al., 1999; McCabe & Trevino, 2007; Vandehey et al., 2007) who advocate for honor codes because such codes receive very favorable faculty/student support and the willingness of faculty/students to report incidents of academic dishonesty as compared to institutions with AI policies.

There does not appear to be any noteworthy difference by institutional type (e.g., public or private; honor code or academic integrity policy) when it comes to faculty beliefs about the seriousness of academic dishonesty, faculty vigilance in discovering and reporting academic dishonesty, and student responsibility for reporting cheating. Using a five-point Likert scale (1="Disagree

Strongly"; 2="Disagree"; 3="Not Sure" 4=" Agree"; 5="Agree Strongly"), a

majority of faculty at all three institutions reported that they were "not sure" that

cheating was a serious problem on their campus. Also, the faculty in the study

reported that they felt that their colleagues were not vigilant at discovering and

reporting academic dishonesty. Two possible reasons reported in this study that

could be associated with why faculty are not aware of how serious of a problem

student academic dishonesty is and/or are not vigilant at discovering and

reporting academic dishonesty were: (a) not being informed of the number of

reported academic integrity violations, and (b) the lack of support from other

faculty and college administrators.

These findings were supported by several faculty members in the study

who recommended that the university frequently disclose the number of AI

violations. According to one faculty member, "It would be helpful to receive

information about academic integrity . . . what are recent cases and penalties?

More importantly, what are other faculties doing to discourage cheating in the

classroom?" Additionally, faculty at all three institutions reported instances

where they were not supported by their department chair/head or college

administrators which contributed to their reasons for why they chose to ignore

student cheating. The findings reflect the current research on academic integrity

that suggests some of the challenges with confronting student academic

dishonesty in higher education can be attributed to faculty not enforcing AI

policies and procedures or the perception that they are not being supported by

their administration. Other cited challenges include the perception of faculty that

cheating is not a serious problem on campus and the belief of faculty that the AI

process is not fair and impartial (Cizek, 1999; Coalter et al., 2007; Selingo, 2004).

Research Question 2:   *What sources of awareness do faculty members report regarding academic integrity policies?*

With respect to faculty source of awareness of academic integrity policies,

there were a few noteworthy findings among the three institutions. In the study,

faculties were asked to what degree they are informed of academic integrity

policies at their institution. The results of the study revealed that a majority of

Eagles University faculty whose institution subscribes to an honor code selected

"faculty orientation" as their source for learning about AI policies. A majority of

Spark University faculty frequently selected the "Web" as a source for learning

about AI policies. Additionally, a majority of Eagles University and Pride

University faculties frequently selected the "faculty handbook" as their source

for learning about the institution's AI policies. It is interesting that the faculty at

all three institutions reported low response levels to learning of academic

integrity policies from the dean of students, other college administrators, and/or department chairs. The good news, however, is that when faculties were asked if they were likely to refer a student for cheating to a department chair, dean, or anyone else, a majority of Eagles University and Pride University faculty reported that they would make the referral. On the other hand, a small percentage of Spark University faculty members reported they would make a referral to the department chair, dean, or anyone else. These findings are particularly interesting to the research considering that several faculty members from all three institutions in the study expressed concerns about the lack of support they receive from the department chair, faculty, and/or other college administrators. Additionally, Pride University and Spark University faculties commented that their level of awareness of AI policies often increased while serving on faculty committees. The reported differences that exist between institutions related to sources used to raise faculty sources of awareness of AI policies could be a result of what the institution feels is the best approach to address academic dishonesty.

Research Question 3:   ***What are the patterns of beliefs and level of awareness among faculty members about violations of academic integrity at two public and one private post-secondary institutions?***

Using a four-point Likert scale (1="Never"; 2="Once"; 3="More than Once"; 4="Not Relevant"), faculties were asked to report their views on the seriousness of specific cheating behaviors and the level of awareness in the amount of cheating in the past three years. The general consensus of the faculty at all three institutions was that all forms of cheating outlined in the survey (with the exception of collaborating on individual work) were overwhelmingly viewed as "serious cheating"(see Table 10). Also, a majority of the faculty at all three institutions reported that they had "never" observed students engaging in individual cheating behaviors in the classroom within the past three years. Surprisingly, Pride University and Spark University faculty reported that they "never" observed cheating behaviors related to plagiarism and collaboration on group assignments, but later in the study contradicted this finding by reporting that such behaviors occur "often –very often" on campus. These results may suggest that Pride University and Spark University faculty are unfamiliar with the frequency of plagiarism and/or inappropriately collaborating on group

assignments by students without permission from the instructor which,

according to the literature, occurs more frequently.

Research Question 4:   *What are the frequencies and types of reported AI violations among faculty at two public and one private post-secondary institutions?*

Responses to faculty beliefs on a six-point Likert scale (1="Never"; 2="Very Seldom"; 3="Seldom/Sometimes"; 4="Often"; 5="Very Often"; 6="Don't Know") about the frequency of plagiarism and inappropriately sharing of work on group assignments differed slightly among the three institutions. Faculty at the honor code institution felt that plagiarism and inappropriate sharing of work on group assignments "seldom/sometimes" occurred, while the faculty at the institutions with an AI policy reported that such behaviors occur "often." When faculty were asked how frequently they believe students cheat during a test or examination, a majority of respondents at all three institutions reported that they believe it "seldom/sometimes" occurs at their institution than collaborating on group assignments. This finding is consistent with a follow up question regarding student cheating on a test or examination. Regarding the frequency of observing student cheating during a test or examination, a high percentage of Pride University and Spark University faculty members reported observing student cheating "a few times." A small percentage of Eagles University faculty

reported that they never observed student cheating at their institution. These findings are particularly interesting to the researcher given that the academic integrity literature reports that overall 52-90% of college students admitted to cheating on exams, quizzes, and assignments with only 8% of students reporting they had ever been caught (Vandehey et al., 2007).

Research Question 5:   ***What methods do faculty members employ to respond to academic integrity violations?***

A noted criticism in the literature about academic integrity is the reluctance of faculty to take actions when confronted with incidents of academic dishonesty (McCabe & Trevino 2007; Pavela, 1997; Vandehey et al., 2007). Seventy-one percent of faculty surveyed in a 1998 study conducted by Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, Whitely, and Washburn reported that confronting students about cheating is the most negative aspect of being a college professor (as cited in Vandehey et al., 2007). A review of empirical studies on cheating behaviors finds that students are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty if they believe faculty are less likely to take action. "Students consistently indicate that when they believe faculty are committed to their courses, they are less likely to engage in acts of academic dishonesty" (McCabe & Trevino, 1996, p. 30). Therefore,

faculty responses to academic dishonesty can have a positive or negative effect on students' views about academic integrity.

This study examined actions taken by faculty to address student academic dishonesty and found that faculty in this study were more likely to ignore incidents of academic dishonesty and were less likely to refer students to college officials for cheating. These findings were frequently reported in the literature as actions commonly taken by faculty (Coalter et al., 2007; McCabe, 2005; Vandehey et al., 2007). "Dealing with a cheating student is one of the most onerous aspects of the job" (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002, p. 11). While Eagles University faculty had a slightly higher referral rate than did faculty at Pride University and a noticeably higher referral rate when compared to Spark University faculty, it was interesting to note that the combined responses of all three schools suggest that faculty were less likely to refer students for cheating.

The results related to specific avenues (i.e. individual assignments, course syllabus/outline, at the beginning of the semester) used by faculty to increase students' awareness of AI policies in the classroom did not differ by institutional type (e.g. public vs. private; honor code vs. academic integrity policy). The results in the study show that a majority of faculty at all three institutions reported that in the classroom they frequently discuss certain types of academic

integrity violations such as plagiarism, group work/collaboration, citation, and

referencing of sources from Internet resources. These findings support research

by Cizek (2003) who emphasizes the importance of conveying to students at the

beginning of each semester the institution's academic integrity policies, as well as

clearly defining classroom expectations and taking immediate action when

student academic dishonesty occurs. Williams and Janosik (2007) also reported

that "cheating may be reduced by faculty members who reinforce a commitment

to ethical behavior and academic honesty in their classrooms" (p. 713).

Consistent with previous findings by Coalter et al. (2007), the lack of

evidence/proof was commonly cited by faculty as the reason for ignoring student

cheating. Surprisingly, faculty at all three institutions did not indicate that they

feel the lack of time, fear of legal action, or other repercussions from students

were reasons for ignoring cheating, which contradict findings in earlier studies

that reported the opposite (Dichtl, 2003; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Pavela, 1997;

Petress, 2003; Selingo, 2004). The study also found that Eagles University faculty

members were more likely to follow guidelines and take action under the honor

code than would Pride University and Spark University faculty members.

Furthermore, Pride University and Spark University faculties were more likely to

give an "F" on a test or assignment if they were convinced that a student was

cheating than would the Eagles University faculty. This may suggest that Pride

University and Spark University faculties are likely to handle cheating on their

own, thus bypassing institutional policies. These results were not surprising to

the researcher given that Pride University and Spark University faculties

reported a low to average response rate to perceived faculty/student support for

AI policies and an average response rate regarding policy effectiveness. The

findings may also explain why a majority of Pride University and Spark

University faculty members reported that they were "not sure" in their beliefs

about the fairness of the student judicial process. This may suggest a lack

confidence or awareness of faculty in the judicial process.

Responses related to what safeguards faculties use to reduce cheating in

the classroom proved not to differ by institution type. Faculties at all three

institutions consistently reported that changing exams regularly, creative writing

assignments, discussion of AI/honor code policies, and the use of non-

sophisticated search engines (Google) were methods employed to reduce

cheating. Other reported suggestions for reducing academic dishonesty

behaviors include: faculty role modeling integrity behaviors, holding students

accountable for maintaining integrity in and outside the classroom by

establishing an atmosphere of integrity through communicating clear

expectations, giving consistent messages about what academic integrity means, creative course designs, developing more creative assignments where students cannot simply duplicate from another source, being vigilant and committed to following through in addressing cheating behaviors, taking teaching more seriously, and computerized testing with random order questions.

Open-ended responses related to the role faculty play in promoting academic integrity and controlling cheating in the classroom did not differ by institution. Written responses of faculties at all three institutions suggest that they overwhelmingly agreed that faculties play a critical role in reducing student cheating and promoting academic integrity in the classroom. In addition, the faculties at all three institutions felt that administrator and student support was equally important in reducing cheating. These reflect the findings of previous research that suggest it is essential that academic integrity becomes the foundation of a student's college experience because the success of an institution's mission is dependent on faculty, staff, and students working together to maintain the academic integrity of the institution.

These reported findings have several implications for faculty and student affairs professionals who shoulder the responsibility for policy development and classroom practice with an emphasis on creating a campus culture that values

academic integrity. Consistent with what has been written in the literature, faculties seem to agree that academic integrity is a serious problem in higher education. While faculties believe they play an important role in reducing academic dishonesty in the classroom, findings in this study show that a gap still remains between knowledge of policy and practices. In particular, fewer faculties are addressing student academic dishonesty as recommended by institutional policies, even though they report that they are well aware of the institution's academic integrity policies and procedures.

Implications for Policy

Academic dishonesty (e.g., cheating, plagiarism, purchasing papers on the Internet, stealing exams, etc.) has become a serious problem in higher education (Center for Academic Integrity, 2007; Higbee & Thomas, 2002; Kibler, 1994; McCabe, 2005; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; Ruderman, 2004). Previous research by McCabe et al. (1999) found that faculty and students are more likely to support AI policies when such policies are deeply embedded in the campus culture. With the continual rise in student cheating, the findings in this study suggest that faculty and student affairs professionals could initiate collaborative relationships with each other for the purpose of providing on-going education, ideas, and feedback about current academic integrity policies and procedures, discussing

the difficulties of putting academic integrity initiatives into practice, and

exploring creative ways to proactively promote academic integrity in the

classroom. This finding supports Kibler's (1994) argument that most colleges and

universities aren't actively communicating with or involving faculty in efforts to

prevent dishonesty and are, in fact, isolating faculty from being involved in the

development and implementation of campus-wide academic integrity

prevention initiatives. A major concern found within the academic integrity

literature is that at institutions where faculties are routinely left out of the

development of AI policies, they tend not to adhere to academic integrity

procedures and policy enforcement. Communicating academic integrity policies

and procedures to faculty and students, as well as involving faculty in policy

development and implementation, will likely lead to reduced unethical behavior

and potentially close the gap between policy and practice (Gallant & Drinan,

2006).

Student affairs administrators and faculty could assess the procedures for

reporting and adjudicating AI violations to see if there are ways to make the

process seamless. This is because this study found that faculty members were

more likely to ignore incidents of student academic dishonesty because of the

reporting process. Alschuler and Blimling (1995) further assert that colleges and

universities are more likely to see an increase in faculty reporting of student

cheating if institutions could implement a better reporting process to minimize

the bureaucracy often associated with academic integrity processes. The

argument was further supported by one faculty member in the study who

asserts, "There is so much bureaucracy involved and paperwork to fill out that it

discourages faculty from reporting it through more formal channels." According

to the academic integrity research, faculties tend to believe that the academic

integrity reporting process is too complex to charge students with academic

dishonesty because having to deal with the investigation will take them away

from their work (Dichtl, 2003; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Petress, 2003; Selingo,

2004). Furthermore, faculty at all levels could be encouraged to get involved in

the policy planning and implementation, as well as training of other faculty on

how to integrate academic integrity policies and anti-cheating strategies in the

classroom. This, according to Gallant and Drian (2006), may result in an

increased number of faculties being vigilant about enforcing academic integrity

policies and procedures.

Another point from the findings in this study suggests that there is a need

for institutions with AI policies to consider the inclusion of student reporting in

their academic integrity policies. Adding the expectation of student reporting

places the responsibility on students to report cheating and sends a strong

message to student cheaters to beware. Also, faculties could partner with student

affairs administrators to promote academic integrity policies and stress the

importance of honest behavior on campus. According to Vandehey et al. (2007),

such partnerships not only send a message to students that the administration

supports faculty in their efforts to promote academic honesty, but also send a

message that the academic community will not tolerate cheating. A content

analysis of faculty open-ended responses revealed several common themes for

promoting AI policies such as hosting educational workshops for faculty,

implementing stronger institutional initiatives that emphasize the importance of

academic integrity, publicizing incidents of cheating, making it easier to report

violations, creating a seamless reporting process, making the consequences for

cheating more severe, clearly defining sanctions for cheating, and enforcing AI

policies consistently by faculty. These results are consistent with previous

findings in the literature that suggest that AI policies were likely to have a

significant impact on student academic dishonesty if institutions established

comprehensive initiatives that promoted an environment of integrity, students

perceived there to be serious punitive outcomes for cheating, if there was strong

faculty involvement in the enforcement of AI policies, and if the process was less

cumbersome (Vandehey et al., 2007; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002).

Finally, faculty responses to the questions regarding students being held

responsible for failing to report academic integrity violation were strong at all

three institutions. This finding was surprising to the researcher considering that

Pride University and Spark University subscribe to an AI policy system that does

not typically require students to report their peers for cheating. This noteworthy

finding suggests that faculties at institutions with AI policies may want to take a

look at implementing some form of modified honor code

> where expectations regarding cheating are clearly communicated, where
> students are encouraged to know and abide by the rules of proper
> conduct, where policies and guidelines regarding cheating are established,
> where mutual respect between professors and students occurs, and where
> cheating is taken very seriously. (McCabe et al., 1999, p. 232)

Implications for Practice

Simply educating faculty about policies and procedures is not enough.

> Academic integrity promotion and education activities, support by
> consistent enforcement of academic integrity policies and procedures,
> could create a culture in which academic integrity is normative and
> valued in the educational organization. (Gallant & Drinan, 2006, p. 76)

As simple as it may be to convey that academic integrity is critical to the integrity of the academic community, it is equally important to convey this message to both high school and college students at the beginning of the school year, as well as to enforce institutional policies when cheating occurs in the class room. Faculty members who believe that it is not their responsibility to promote academic integrity and/or are reluctant to confront students suspected of cheating may be sending a negative message about the importance of academic integrity policies. Finally, proactively addressing the importance of academic integrity and consequences of cheating behaviors at the high school level and during new student orientation could heighten awareness that the academic community support, values, and appreciates a community of integrity.

The researcher agrees with the Gallant and Drinan (2006) who argue that, "in order for academic integrity to 'stick' within the fabric of the college or university, there could be structures, procedures, and symbols that support the enactment of academic integrity" (p. 66). A review of the literature finds that the gap is widening between institutional AI policy development and faculty enforcement. Gallant and Drinan (2006) found that colleges and universities tend to focus most of their attention on policy enforcement and punishing student academic dishonesty, and less on developing best practices of academic integrity

within the collegial environment. What we have learned from the literature is that those faculties that are well informed about policies are likely to enforce them. Aaron and Georgia (1994) argue that it is the responsibility of all stakeholders to develop, promote, and enforce academic integrity standards. "Only through such common effort can the desired level of academic integrity be achieved" (p. 90). So, closing the gap between policy development and practice can be as simple as campus administrators being responsible for overseeing AI initiatives, providing opportunities for seasoned faculty to collaborate with faculty who are new to the institution, and communicating to them best practices for confronting and preventing academic dishonesty in the classroom.

Encouraging faculty to take an active responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty in the classroom is a huge undertaking considering that most faculty members in the study were "not sure" if their colleagues were vigilant in discovering and reporting student academic cheating. Therefore, special attention and effort could be directed toward getting faculty to engage in critical discourse among themselves more frequently about the importance of academic integrity, behaviors that bring about student cheating, integrating academic integrity practices and values through as many channels as possible, and assisting student affairs administrators in developing best practices for

integrating academic integrity values inside and outside of the classroom.

Student affairs administrators could make it a priority to stress the importance of

creating academic learning communities of integrity by seeking out faculty

members who are strong advocates for putting into practice academic integrity

initiatives. Faculties may be more committed to reducing academic dishonesty if

they knew how serious the problem is on their campuses. Additionally, student

affairs administrators could explore ways to publicize academic integrity

violations while protecting the privacy rights, as outlined by the Family

Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), of the students' records.

Faculties may not fully understand the implications of ignoring incidents

of academic dishonesty. Aaron and Georgia (1994) argue that faculties that

choose to ignore academic dishonesty are putting non-cheating students at a

competitive disadvantage, preventing the institution from keeping track of

repeat offenders, and undermining the institution's mission. According to Aaron

and Georgia (1994), this could damage the institution's reputation and the public

confidence in higher education. Having knowledge of these negative

implications further supports the need for student affairs administrators to work

in partnership with faculty to integrate academic integrity into their pedagogy

practices.

While the findings in this study contradict an earlier study conducted by

McCabe et al. (1999), who reported that honor codes have a more positive impact

on faculty perceptions about the integrity of the academic community than did

non-honor code institutions, the findings in this study suggest that college

administrators could make academic integrity an institutional priority and

explore initiatives that enable faculty to be well informed and involved in the

institution's efforts to develop best practices for creating a community of

integrity. An analysis of the open-ended responses of faculty in this survey

revealed that faculty at both the honor code and non-honor code (academic

integrity policy) institutions expressed concerns about student cheating and the

lack of administrative support when reporting violations. That being said, one

should not overlook the benefits of honor codes. According to the literature,

honor codes place the responsibility of reporting academic dishonesty violations

on the students who, according to the researchers (McCabe et al., 1999; McCabe

& Trevino, 2007), tend to support as well as regard honor codes more seriously

because they are intentionally integrated into the campus culture. The

researchers further assert that honor codes, by design, seek to create a campus

culture that values integrity, one with clearly defined academic integrity policies

and procedures and consistent enforcement of sanctions for integrity violations.

Finally, the academic integrity research reports that there is a relationship between institutions that place value in providing academic integrity education for faculty and the enforcement of policies (Gallant & Drinan, 2006). This finding suggests the desire for educational institutions to make their expectations known about academically ethical behaviors, provide practical training on how to recognize unethical behavior in the classroom, and create an educational environment that fosters a sense of ethical decision-making. McCabe (2005) agreed by suggesting that the academic community could make it a priority to assure that students understand what is expected of them in the classroom when it comes to academically dishonest behavior. Both new and seasoned faculties are more likely to embrace and enforce AI policies at institutions where it is perceived that their campus community is committed to addressing academic dishonesty. Therefore, "institutions could clearly articulate the value of academic integrity and involve the academic community in the efforts to prevent dishonesty and promote integrity" (Gallant & Drinan, 2006, p. 62).

Implications for Future Research

With the growing concern over the rise in student cheating in higher education and the responsibility of faculty to uphold academic integrity, this study served to lay the groundwork for future studies to better understand

faculty perspectives and understanding of academic integrity. For this particular

study, a concern of the researcher was the low faculty response rate and the

refusal of Forest University and Sony University with honor codes to participate

in the study. Therefore, it would be useful to examine faculty reluctance to

participate in academic integrity research. It would also be interesting to see

what factors predict certain faculty responses and attitudes about academic

integrity. Another interesting point for future research would be to see if there is

a correlation between low faculty response and concerns for institutional self

image. For example, faculty response rates were low at Pride University.

Therefore, could the low response rate be correlated with fears of university

officials that the findings may present a negative image of the university or

reinforce existing negative stereotypes of the institution?

Because this study did not address how involved faculty were in the

development and implementation of academic integrity policies and procedures,

it would be interesting to conduct evidence-based research on whether or not

there is a relationship between faculty involvement in policy development and

reporting rates of student academic dishonesty. Additionally, further research

that examines faculty and student perceptions of the effectiveness of reported

safeguards used to reduce student cheating would be useful. Finally, qualitative

studies are needed to further examine in depth why faculty choose to ignore

student cheating behaviors. Currently, only quantitative data is available related

to this topic. Research in the abovementioned areas could provide faculty and

student affairs administrators with some additional insight into faculty

perceptions, attitudes, and commitment regarding academic integrity and may

uncover additional strategies for reducing student academic dishonesty.

Summary

It is not surprising that today's students are arriving on campus having

grown up in a society where ethical wrongdoing is the norm rather than the

exception and where academic integrity is embraced by a minority rather than a

majority of faculty, staff, and students, as well as high school counselors and

parents of college-age students. Additionally, the media's influence on young

adults certainly has change the way integrity is viewed in today's society. We

have become a culture that is fixated with "reality television" where greed, lying,

deceptions, and dishonesty are worth millions and integrity will get you voted

off the island or fired in the board room. It is no wonder so many students arrive

on campus with the attitude "I'll do whatever it takes" to get ahead. McCabe and

Trevino (1996), who study academically dishonest behaviors among college

students, found the highest predictor of academic dishonesty occurs when

students perceive that cheating is acceptable by the academic community, hence the prevalence of cheating. Therefore, if we expect academic integrity to be an important value on college and university campuses, faculties need to be aware of how serious the problem of academic dishonesty is and the serious implications for higher education if academic integrity is not institutionalized. Without a doubt, faculty input and involvement in academic integrity initiatives, including policy development and implementation, is critical in creating a campus culture that is intolerant of student cheating. Furthermore, it is important for faculty, in collaboration with student affairs administrators, to develop comprehensive training initiatives that emphasize and promote academic integrity, clearly communicating academic integrity policies throughout the campus community and creating strategies for preventing and/or reducing incidents of student academic dishonesty.

Whether in a public or private institution with an honor code or academic integrity policy, the results in this study show that faculties support academic integrity policies, but a gap remains between knowledge of policies and practice. In other words, faculty awareness of policy does not necessarily lead to faculty enforcement when confronted with student academic dishonesty. Also, because this study showed very little difference in faculty beliefs, levels of

understanding, and reported action regarding academic integrity, one could

suggest that honor codes, which were frequently mentioned throughout the

literature, may not be the "magic bullet" to reduce student academic dishonesty.

Similarly, academic integrity policies alone will not deter students from cheating.

A review of the academic literature finds that students have admitted to cheating

regardless of efforts by faculty to educate students about academic integrity or to

enforce academic integrity policies on campus (Harding et al., 2001; McCabe et

al., 2001). This finding suggests that honor codes and policy alone will not reduce

student cheating. Instead, policy enforcement coupled with academic reduction

strategies such as changing exams regularly, closely monitoring student taking

tests/examinations, communicating clear expectations about academic integrity

in the classroom, providing academic integrity information on course outlines

and assignment sheets, and making a commitment to follow through on

reporting cheating incidents may be the most effective deterrents to cheating.

These examples were frequently cited by faculty in the study as best practices for

reducing academic integrity in their classrooms.

Finally, the prevalence of academic dishonesty on college and university

campuses suggests that it is essential that administrative and academic leaders

continue in their efforts to seek feedback from faculty, as well as further define

the role faculty could play in integrating the values associated with integrity into the academic community. The quantitative data and the comments of faculty members from all three institutions confirm what the researcher and others have written about academic integrity: (a) faculties are not aware of the severity/seriousness or the frequency of student cheating; (b) faculties are choosing not to report and/or are ignoring cheating incidents because there is very little proof, which suggests a need to educate faculty about strategies for detecting cheating behaviors; (c) faculty perceive that there is very little support from other faculty and/or college administrators when reporting student cheating; and (d) faculty decisions to report cheating can be influenced by their experience with the judicial process. These and other findings in this study could hopefully serve as a springboard for further research into understanding faculty perceptions and attitudes regarding academic integrity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aaron, R. M., & Georgia, R. T. (1994). Administrator perceptions of student academic dishonesty in collegiate institutions. *NASPA Journal*, *31*(2), 83-91.

Agresti, A., & Finlay, B. (1997). *Statistical methods for the social science* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Alschuler, A. S., & Blimling, G. S. (1995). Curbing epidemic cheating through systemic change. *College Teaching, 43*(4), 123-126.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (1987). *Statement of professional Ethics.* Retrieved January 14, 2007, from http://www.aaup.org/ AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/statementonprofessionalethics.htm.

Ashworth, P., & Bannister, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perception of cheating and plagiarism in academics. *Students in Higher Education, 22*(2), 187-204.

Baird, J. S. (1980). Current trends in college cheating. *Psychology in the School, 17*, 515-522.

Bies, J. B. (1998). Faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty: A private midwestern college perspective (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota).

Bandura, A. (2006). *Social cognitive theory.* Retrieved March 24, 2006, from http://hsc.usf.edu/~knbrown/Social_Cognitive_Theory_overview.html.

Black, T. R. (1999). *Doing quantitative research in the social sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Bower, W. J. (1964). *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research.

Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Center for Academic Integrity. (1999). *The fundamental values of academic integrity.* [Brochure]. Duke University.

Center for Academic Integrity (CAI). *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity.* Retrieved January14, 2007, from http://wwwacademicintegrity.org/pdf/ fvProject.pdf.

Cizek, G. J. (1999). *Cheating on tests: How to do it, detect it, and prevent it*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Association, Inc.

Cizek, G. J. (2003). *Detecting and preventing classroom cheating: Promoting integrity in assessment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Coalter, T., Lim, C. L., & Wanorie, T. (2007). Factors that influence faculty actions: A study on faculty responses to academic dishonesty. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 1*(1), 1-2.

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.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cruikshank, B. (2004). Plagiarism: It's alive. *Texas Library Journal, 80*(4), 132-136.

Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H., & McGregor L. N. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants techniques, and punishments. *Teaching of Psychology, 19*(1), 16-20.

Decoo, W. (2002). *Crisis on campus: Confronting academic misconduct*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and Internet Surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Ditchtl, J. (2003). Teaching integrity. *The History Teacher, 36*(3), 367-373.

Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, K. S., Shinohura, H., & Yasukawa, H. (1999). College

cheating in Japan and the United States. *Research in Higher Education, 17*(3),

343-353.

Ercegovac, Z., & Richardson, J. V., Jr. (2004). Academic dishonesty, plagiarism

included, in the digital age: A Literature review. *College and Research

Libraries*, 301-317.

Fass, R. A. (1986). By honor bound: Encouraging academic honesty. *Educational

Records, 67*, 32-36.

Fowler, F. J. (2002). *Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*

(6th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Gallant, T. B., & Drinan, P. (2006). Institutionalizing academic integrity:

Administrator perception and institutional action. *NASPA Journal, 43*(4),

61-81.

Gehring, D., & Pavela, G. (1994). *Issues and perspectives on academic integrity* (2nd

ed.*).* Washington DC: National Association of Student Personnel

Administrators.

Gehring, D., Nuss, E. M., & Pavela, G. (1986). *Issues and perspectives on academic integrity.* Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administration.

Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and application* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Grusec, J. E. (1992). Social learning theory and development psychology: The Legacies of Robert Sears and Albert Bandura. *Developmental Psychology, 28*(5), 776-786.

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.

Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Montgomery, M. S., & Steneck, N. H. (2001). *The current state of research on academic dishonesty among engineering students.* Paper presented at 31st ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference, Reno, NV.

Harris, R. A. (2001). *The plagiarism handbook: Strategies for preventing, detecting, and dealing with plagiarism*. Los Angeles, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Hendershott, A., Drinan, P. F., & Cross, M. (1999). Gender and academic integrity. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(4), 345-352.

Higbee, L. J., & Thomas, P. V. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of behavior that constitute cheating. *NASPA Journal, 1*(40), 36-52.

Howell, D. C. (1997). *Statistical methods for psychology* (4th ed.) Boston: Duxbury Press.

Jaeger, R. M. (1988). *Complementary methods for research in education* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Jendrek, M. P. (1989). Faculty reaction to academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development, 30*, 401-406.

Kibler, W. L. (1993). A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective. *NASPA Journal, 31*(1), 12.

Kibler, W. L., & Kibler, P. V. (1993). When students report cheating. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *39*(45), B1-2.

Kibler, W. L. (1994). Addressing academic dishonesty: What are institutions of higher education doing and not doing? *NASPA Journal, 31*(2), 92-101.

Lathrop, A., & Foss, K. (2000). *Student cheating and plagiarism in the internet area: A wake-up call.* Englewood, CO: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Levy, E. S., & Rakovski, C. C. (2006). Academic dishonesty: A zero tolerance professor and student registration choices. *Research in Higher Education*, *47*(6), 735-754.

Lupton, R. A., Chapman, K. J., & Weiss, J. E. (2000). A cross-national exploration

    of business students' attitudes, perceptions, and tendencies toward

    academic dishonesty. *Journal of Education and Business*, *75*(4), 231-235.

Madsen, D. (1992). *Successful dissertations and theses* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA:

    Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mangione, T. W. (1995). *Mail surveys: Improving the quality.* Thousand Oaks, CA:

    Sage Publications, Inc.

Maramark, S., & Maline, M. B. (1993). Academic dishonesty among college

    students. Washington, DC: Office of Research, U. S. Department of

    Education.

Marcoux, H. (2002). Kansas State University honor system (Dissertation Survey).

    [Online]. Retrieved April 29, 2006, from http://www.k-state.edu/honor/

    researchlinks/mccabesurvey1999/survey.htm.

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand

    Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

McCabe, D. L. (1993a). Academic integrity: What the latest research shows.

    Interview by Gary Pavela in *Synthesis, 5,* 340-343.

McCabe, D. L. (1993b). Faculty response to academic dishonesty: The influences

    of student honor codes. *Research in Higher Education, 34,* 647-658.

McCabe, D. L. (2005). It takes a village: Academic dishonesty and educational

opportunities. *Liberal Education, 91*, 26-32.

McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (1997). *Ten principles of academic integrity.* [Online].

Retrieved January 23, 2007, from College Administration Publications

Web site: http://www.collegepubs.com/ref/10PrinAcaInteg.shtml.

McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (1998). The effect of institutional policies and

procedures on academic integrity. In *Academic integrity matters.*

Washington, DC: NASPA

McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2004). Ten (updated) principles of academic

integrity: How faculty can foster student honesty. *Change, 36,* 10-16.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor code and

other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 520-538.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college.

Change, 28, 28-33.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual contextual influence on

academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher

Education, 38*(2), 379-396.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (2007). *Honesty and honor codes.* [Online].

Retrieved January 2007, from http://www.aaup.org/publications/

Academe/2002/02JF/02jfmcc.htm.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (1999). Academic integrity in

honor code and non-honor code environments: A qualitative

investigation. *Journal of Higher Education*, *70*(2), 211-234.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Dishonesty in academic

environments: The influence of peer reporting requirements. *Journal of*

Higher Education, *72*(1), 30-44.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2002). Honor codes and other

contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension

to modified honor code Settings, *Research in Higher Education*, *43*(3), 357-

378

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (2005). *Belief.* [Online]. Retrieved December

28, 2005, from Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary Web site:

http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/belief.

Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating*

diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage Publications, Inc.

Michaels, J. W. (1989) Applying theories of deviance to academic cheating, *Social Science Quarterly, 70*(4), 870-885.

Mouly, G. J. (1978). Educational research: *The art and science of investigation*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Myers, J. L., & Well, A. D. (2003). *Research design and statistical analysis* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Noah, H. J., & Eckstein, M. A. (2001). *Fraud and education: The worm in the apple.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing, Inc.

Nonis, S., & Swift, C. (1998). Deterring cheating behaviors in the marketing classroom: An analysis of the effects of demographics, attitudes, and in-class deterrent strategies. *Journal of Marketing Education, 20(3)*, 188-200.

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

Nuss, E. M. (1984). Academic integrity: Comparing faculty and student attitudes. *Improving College and University Teaching, 34(3)*, 140-144.

Ormrod, J. E. (1999). *Human learning* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Passow, H. J., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., Harding, T. S., & Carpenter, D. D. (2006). Factors influencing engineering students' decisions to cheat by type of assessment. *Research in Higher Education, 47*(6), 643-684.

Pavela, G. (1997) Faculty attitudes toward academic integrity. *Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 9*(1), 642-644.

Petress, K. C. (2003). Academic dishonesty: A plague on your profession. *Education, 123*(3), 624-627.

Pincus, H. S., & Schmelkin, L. P. (2003). Faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *Journal of Higher Education, 74*(2), 196-209.

Pulvers, K., & Diekoff, G. M. (1999). The relationship between academic dishonesty and college classroom environment. *Research in Higher Education, 40*(4), 487-498.

Roberts, D., & Rabinowits, W. (1992). An Investigation of Student Perceptions of Cheating in Academic Situations. *Review of Higher Education, 15*(2), 179-190.

Rosen, B. (1980). The teaching of undergraduate ethics. In D. Callahan & S. Bok (Eds.), *Ethics teaching in higher education* (pp. 171-190). New York: Plenum Press.

Ruderman, J. (2004). Faculty play a critical academic integrity role. *Academic Leader*, *20*(3), 8-9.

Saddlemire, M. T. (2005). *Faculty perceptions of undergraduate academic dishonesty.* (Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University).

Schneider, A. (1999). Why professors don't do more to stop students who cheat. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(20), A8-A11.

Schumacher, S., & McMillan, J. H. (1993). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Scoll, R. W. (2002). Attitudes and attitude change (University of Rhode Island). [Online]. Retrieved March 11, 2005, from http://tip.psychology.org/ theories.html.

Selingo, J. (2004). The cheating culture. *ASSEE Prism*, *14*(1), 24-30.

Sims, R. L. (1995). The severity of academic dishonesty: A comparison of faculty and student views. *Psychology in the Schools, 32*(3), 233-238.

Sousa-Peoples, K. (1999-2000). *Perceptions of the occupational status of Student Affairs* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro).

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sterngold, A. (2004). Confronting plagiarism. *Change, 36(3)*, 16-21.

Stewart, D. W., & Kamins, M. A. (1993). *Secondary research: Information sources and methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Teddle, C., & Tashakkori, A. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Todd, Z., Nerlich, B., McKeown, S., & Clarke, D. D. (2004). *Mixing methods in psychology.* NY: Psychology Press.

Vandehey, M. A., Diekhoff, G. M., & LaBeff, E. E. (2007). College cheating: A twenty-year follow-up and the addition of honor code. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(4), 468-479.

Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

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.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA GREENSBORO

Project Title: *Faculty Beliefs, Level of Understanding and Reported Actions Regarding Academic Integrity*
(The study is for the dissertation of Brett Carter, Ph.D. Candidate in Curriculum and Instruction – Higher Education Administration – The University of North Carolina at Greensboro)

Project Director: Brett Carter, Ph.D. Candidate

DESCRIPTION AND EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURES: Research on academic integrity has, for the most part, focused on student attitudes and responses to academic dishonesty, why students cheat, and what factors contribute to student cheating. However, there has been very little research on faculty perspectives on and understanding about academic integrity. Therefore, the purpose of this dissertation is to investigate faculty beliefs, level of understanding, and reported actions regarding academic integrity. The research will be conducted in two parts: part I: quantitative and part II: opened-ended responses with a 10-20 minutes completion time. Both part of the study will occur simultaneously.

For part I and II of the study, the entire faculty population teaching undergraduate courses during the fall 2006 semester will be asked to complete and return the online survey which will be e-mailed in February 2007. For part II, the researcher will recruit potential participants from respondents who self-disclosed their e-mail address on the online questionnaire which was coded to a specific institution to further clarify the survey findings. The open-ended response data will be recorded and transcribed into written documents.

Returned data from the survey tool will be analyzed with Statistics Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Roxanne Coding software designed by Dr. Stephen Zerwas of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro for

descriptive statistics of frequency distribution, means testing, variance, and standard deviation, inferential statistics, and verbal analysis was applied to the questionnaire.

RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS: There are no foreseeable risks or discomfort to participants.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS: Result of this study will be of benefit to faculty, judicial officers, and other administrators at public and private four-year institutions who are involved in the development and implementation of academic integrity policy and procedures. Also, the results of this study may assist faculty and administrators in facilitating training built from the findings in order to proactively address issues of academic integrity. Finally, there will be professional benefit from this study, as the information we obtain will be communicated to the profession through publication, presentation at professional meetings, and direct dissemination to the professional associations (Association of Student Judicial Affairs).

Participation is entirely voluntary. Participants may withdraw without penalty or prejudice at any time. Participants are encouraged to ask questions at any time. Regarding questions on the research, contact Brett Carter at (336) 334-5516 or by e-mail (bacarte2@uncg.edu). A University committee that works to protect respondents' rights and welfare reviews all research on human volunteers. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject you may contact, anonymously if you wish, the Institutional Review Board at phone (336) 256-1482 or by email to orc@uncg.edu.

Names will be held in confidence. Privacy will be protected because respondents will not be identified by name as a participant in this study. To assure confidentiality while taking the online survey, you will be assigned an access code which will only be associated with you as an individual respondent and is used only to insure a valid online response. Furthermore, no specific information regarding your computer's IP address, time, or location, will be collected by the online data system. If you feel uncomfortable using your desktop machine, consider using a common Internet terminal at work, the public library, or any computer with Internet access.

The Principle Investigator (Brett Carter) is projected to be the only researcher in the study. Returned questionnaires will be maintained in a secured (password protected) server maintained by The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. For backup purposes, hard copies of the survey tool will be maintained in a locked file cabinet at the residency of Brett Carter. The survey tool and transcriptions of the open-ended response data will be destroyed after 3 years of dissertation completion.

CONSENT:
Return of the completed survey tool implies consent to participate and understanding of the information contained on this page. Your candid and honest response is essential to the success of this important research. Your participation is greatly appreciated. The researcher and consent forms have been approved by The University of North Carolina at Greensboro Institutional Review Board, which insures that research involving people follows federal regulations. Any new information that develops during the project will be provided to you if the information might affect your willingness to continue participation in the project.

APPENDIX B

FACULTY ACADEMIC INTEGRITY SURVEY

ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT

Please tell me about the academic environment at your institution.

1. How would you rate:	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
Your understanding of the academic integrity policies at your institution					
The severity of penalties for cheating at your institution.					
The average student's understanding of University policies concerning cheating					
Students' support of these policies					
Faculty support of these policies					
The effectiveness of these polic ies					

2. When, if at all, do you discuss with students your policies concerning: (check all that apply)	Do not discuss	On individual assignments	In the syllabus or course outline	At start of Semester	Other	Not Really	Not Applicable
Plagiarism							
Permitted and prohibited group work or collaboration							
The proper citation or referencing of sources							
Proper citation/referencing of Internet sources							
Falsifying/fabricating research data							
Falsifying/fabrication lab data							

3. **Please note the primary sources from which you learned about the academic integrity policies at your institution. (Check all that apply)**

	Faculty orientation		Students
	Faculty handbook		Dean or other administration
	Department Chair		Publicized results of judicial hearings
	Other faculty		University catalog
	University Web site		Other
	I have never really been informed about campus policies concerning student cheating.		

4. How frequently do you think the following occur at your institution?	Never	Very Seldom	Seldom/ Sometime	Often	Very Often	I don't Know
Plagiarism on written assignments						
Student inappropriately sharing work in group assignments						
Cheating during test or examinations						

5. How often, if ever, have you seen a student cheat during a test or examination at your institution?

	Never
	Once
	A few times
	Several times
	Many times

6. If you were convinced, even after discussing with the student, that a student had cheated on a major test or assignment in your class, what would be your most likely reaction? (Check all that apply)

	Reprimand or warning student		Report student to the Dean of Students
	Lower the student's grade		Report student to your chair, Director or Dean
	Fail the student on the test or assignment		Do nothing about the incident
	Fail the student for the course		Other
	Require student to retake the test		Require student to redo he assignment
	Pursue actions through the academic integrity system		Engage a faculty/student conference to resolve the allegation
	Follow academic integrity policy for cheating		

7. Have you ever ignored a suspected incident of cheating in one of your courses for <u>any</u> reason?

Yes	No

If so, did any of the following influence your decision? (Check all that apply)

	Lacked evidence/proof		Student is the one who will ultimately suffer
	Cheating was trivial/not serious		Didn't want to deal with it, system is so bureaucratic
	Lack of support from administration		Lacked enough time
	Other		Fear legal or other repercussions from student

8. Have you ever referred a suspected case to your chair, a Dean, or anyone else?

Yes	No

If yes, how satisfied were you with the way it was the case was handled?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied

If you answered "unsatisfied" or "very unsatisfied" please explain your response.

Specific Behaviors

9. Students have different views on what constitutes cheating and what is acceptable behavior. I would like to ask you some questions about specific behaviors that some students might consider cheating. Please mark one response for each question.

In the **RED** column please mark how often, if ever, you have observed or become aware of a student in your class engaging in any of the following behaviors during the last three years. If a question does not apply to any of your courses, please check the "**Not Relevant**" column. For example, if you do not use test/exams, you would check "**Not Relevant**" related to tests/exams. In the **BLUE** column please mark how serious you think each type of behavior is.

	Never	Once	More Than Once	Not Relevant	Not Cheating	Trivial Cheating	Moderate Cheating	Serious Cheating
Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography								
Working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work								
Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the test								
In a course requiring computer work, copying another student's program rather than writing their own								
Helping someone else cheat on a test								
Fabricating or falsifying lab data								

	Never	Once	More Than Once	Not Relevant	Not Cheating	Trivial Cheating	Moderate Cheating	Serious Cheating
Fabrication or falsifying research data.								
Coping from another student during a test with his or her knowledge								
Copying from another student during a test or examination without the student's knowledge								
Receiving unpermitted help on an assignments.								
Paraphrasing or copying a few sentences of material from a written source without footnoting or referencing it in a paper								
Turning in a paper obtained in large part from a term paper "mill" or Web site								
Paraphrasing or copying a few sentences of material from an electronic source – e.g., the Internet-without citing it in a paper								
Using unpermitted "crib notes" (or cheat sheets) during a test								
Using an electronic/digital device as an unauthorized aid during an exam								
Copying materials, almost word for word from any written source and turning it in as ones own								
Turning in a paper copied, at least in part, from another student's paper, whether or not that student is currently taking the same course								
Using a false or forged excuse to obtain an examination on a due date or delay taking an exam								
Turning in work done by someone else								

Cheating on a test in any other way								

10. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Disagree Strongly	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Agree Strongly
Cheating is a serious problem at your institution					
Our student judicial process is fair and impartial					
Students should be held responsible for failing to report an academic integrity violation they witnessed					
Faculty members are vigilant in discovering and reporting suspected cases of academic dishonesty					
The types of assessment used in my course are effective at evaluating students understanding of course concepts					
The types of assessment used in my course are effective at helping my students learn course concepts					

11. What safeguards do you employ to reduce cheating in your courses? (Check all that apply)

	None, I do not use any safeguards in my classroom
	Use the Internet or software such as (i.e., turnitin.com) to direct or confirm plagiarism
	Provide information about cheating/plagiarism on courses outlined or assignment sheet
	Change exams regularly
	Hand out different versions of an exam
	Discuss my view on the importance of honesty and academic integrity with my students
	Remind students periodically about their obligation under our University's academic integrity policy
	Closely monitor students taking a test/exam
	Require students to sign an academic integrity pledge on every assignment
	Other:

Demographics

12. What is you academic rank?

Assistant professor	
Associate professor	
Full Professor	
Instructor	
Lab coordinator/instructor	
Other	

13. Sex

Female	Male

14. In which of the following areas is your primary teaching responsibilities?

Arts	
Business	
Communications/Journalism	
Engineering	
Humanities	

Math and Science	
Nursing/Health Professions	
Social Sciences	
Interdisciplinary	
Other	

15. How long have you been teaching at the University level?

Less than 5 years	
5-9 years	
10-14 years	
15-19 years	
20 or more years	

16. Do you have any suggestions on how your campus might improve its policies concerning issues of academic integrity or any additional comments you would like to make?

17. What role do you think faculty should play in promoting academic integrity and/or controlling cheating in their courses?

Thank you for participating in this survey.

APPENDIX C

Content Validity/Data Analysis Matrix

Research Questions	Items in the Survey	Data Analysis
Question 1: What beliefs do faculty members express about academic integrity?	*See questions: 1, 10, & 16*	*Descriptive Verbal Analysis Inferential*
Question 2: What sources of awareness do faculty members report regarding academic integrity policies?	*See questions: 2 & 3*	*Descriptive Verbal Analysis*
Question 3: What are the patterns of beliefs and levels of awareness among faculty members about violations of academic integrity at two public and two private post-secondary institutions?	*See questions: 9*	*Descriptive*
Question 4: What are the frequencies and types of reported violations among faculty at two public and two private post-secondary institutions?	*See questions: 4 & 5*	*Descriptive Inferential*
Question 5: What methods do faculty members employ to respond to academic integrity violations?	*See questions: 6, 7,8, & 11, 17*	*Descriptive Verbal Analysis*