



Western Washington University
Western CEDAR

Office of Survey Research

Institutes, Centers, and Offices

7-1-1995

Academic Integrity Survey

Gary (Gary Russell) McKinney
Western Washington University

Joseph E. Trimble
Western Washington University

Bradley Plemons
Western Washington University

Jacqueline M. Andrieu-Parker
Western Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: https://cedar.wwu.edu/surveyresearch_docs

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McKinney, Gary (Gary Russell); Trimble, Joseph E.; Plemons, Bradley; and Andrieu-Parker, Jacqueline M., "Academic Integrity Survey" (1995). *Office of Survey Research*. 589.
https://cedar.wwu.edu/surveyresearch_docs/589

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Institutes, Centers, and Offices at Western CEDAR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Office of Survey Research by an authorized administrator of Western CEDAR. For more information, please contact westerncedar@wwu.edu.

Academic Integrity Survey

(Report 1995-04)

Gary R. McKinney
Joseph E. Trimble
Bradley Plemons
Jacqueline M. Andrieu-Parker

July, 1995

Reports produced by the Office of Institutional Assessment and Testing (OIAT) are distributed routinely to a broad readership, including: Western Washington University administrators, deans, department chairs, offices, units, faculty and staff; assessment liaisons at other Washington State universities and colleges; and selected state government agencies and committees. Moreover, most reports are available by request for additional distribution to individuals, offices, committees, or other units both on and off campus. When presenting statistical information, the OIAT keeps in mind the wide-ranging interests, needs and backgrounds of its readership. Even when analyses become complex, results are presented so as to be readable by a wide audience. For interested parties, data utilized in OIAT reports are available for separate analyses.

Executive Summary

During the 1962-63 academic year, Western participated in a nationwide survey on cheating. In 1993, that survey was recreated and readministered, nationally and at Western, through the auspices of The Center for Academic Integrity--located in the Graduate School of Management at Rutgers University. For the 1993 administration, 302 valid survey forms were obtained from Western students, compared to 54 responses from students in 1962.

In both years survey respondents were mostly female (53.7% in 1962 and 63.8% in 1993), and mostly white, non-Hispanic (100% in 1962 and 92.1% in 1993). Most other demographic comparisons of the 1962 and 1993 cohorts indicated a relatively high degree of homogeneity. Two exceptions were noted: 1) the mothers of 1962 respondents were better educated than the fathers, and 2) nearly three-quarters of the 1962 cohort planned on education as a career, while just one-fifth of the 1993 cohort planned on education as a career, probably because in 1962 Western's reputation was still that of a teacher's college. (It was only in 1961 that the institution evolved from Western Washington College of Education to Western Washington State College.)

When asked how often respondents had seen another student cheat during a test, 62.3% of the 1962 cohort indicated at least once, while 60.5% the 1993 cohort indicated at least once. Nationally, the figures were slightly higher: 68.7% for the 1962 cohort, and 67.6% for the 1993 cohort. Asked of the 1993 cohort only, the percentage of respondents who believed plagiarism occurred 'often' or 'very often' was 36.7% at Western and 46.7% nationally, while the percentage who believed that cheating during tests occurred 'often' or 'very often' was 40.1% at Western and 46.4% nationally.

Students from the class of 1962 were more likely to have heard about incidents of cheating through official channels than were students from the class of 1993 (1962 = 54.9%; 1993 = 10.4%). Most students from both eras indicated that if they were asked for help during a test or exam they would "ignore or turn down the request" (1962 = 78.9%; 1993 = 63.8%). Responses changed, however, depending on who was requesting help: respondents were more likely to help a friend and less likely to a "campus leader."

When asked what a respondent would do personally if he/she saw a student cheating, for both cohorts most indicated they would 'mention it to other students but not report it' (1962 = 29.6%; 1993 = 35.5%), or 'ignore the incident' (1962 = 33.3%; 1993 = 27.4%). Few respondents indicated they would report the cheater to an appropriate authority or ask the cheater to report themselves, although the 1993 cohort was more likely to report a "campus leader" seen cheating to authorities than was the 1962 cohort.

The 1993 cohort only was asked to rate various aspects of cheating policies at Western; most rated the severity of penalties, and the faculty's understanding and support of cheating policies high. When rating the *effectiveness* of the policies, however, respondents were split almost 50/50 low and high. Most rated the chance of getting *caught* at cheating low.

For the 1993 cohort, the most common form of cheating was to copy a few unfootnoted sentences of material for a paper (50.0%). Most respondents (60.3%) thought it unlikely they would get caught at this form of cheating, as well as thought of it as not really a form cheating at all, or trivial cheating at best (70.1%).

The next two most common forms of cheating were to copy from another student during a test *without* his or her knowledge (46.0% at least once), or to collaborate on an assignment when the instructor had asked for individual work (43.2% at least once). Most respondents who indicated they had copied during a test without another student's knowledge thought it unlikely they would get caught doing so (54.2%), although most did admit that it was serious cheating (65.8%). An even higher percentage of respondents thought it unlikely they would get caught collaborating on an assignment when individual work was expected (67.2%); moreover, very few felt that it was serious cheating (21.5%).

Forms of cheating that were rare at Western included writing a paper for another student (only 8.4% at least once), turning in work done by someone else (10.1% at least once), and copying someone else's computer program (11.9% at least once).

Yet in spite of the fact that quite a number of Western students admit to having cheated in some form or another, nearly three-quarters of respondents agreed that 'under no circumstances is cheating justified' (77.8% in 1962 and 73.3% in 1993), and that, moreover, very few agreed that 'reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating' (25.9% in 1962 and 16.4% in 1993).

The above findings appear at odds with one another and one answer as to why might lie in the gray area surrounding the definition of cheating. Report findings indicated that not all forms of cheating were considered 'serious' by respondents; thus it may be that respondents were dead set against 'serious' cheating like using crib notes but not so judgmental about 'trivial' cheating like collaborating when individual work was expected.

There were also considerable differences in attitude between cohorts when respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed that 'some faculty members condone cheating'. In 1962, only 7.4% agreed with this statement, while 22.2% weren't sure; in 1993, 12.0% agreed, while 37.8% weren't sure.

Findings also indicated that males were twice as likely to have used crib notes during a test than females (32.4% of males compared to 17.9% of females), and that students who attended religious services weekly were less likely to equivocate when it came to their opinion that "cheating is never justified" than respondents who attended religious services less than weekly (nearly all weekly church goers compared to about three-quarters of respondents in all other church attendance categories).

Introduction

During the 1962-63 academic year, Western participated in a nationwide survey on cheating. In 1993, The Center for Academic Integrity--located in the Graduate School of Management at Rutgers University--recreated that 1962 database and designed a new survey that would follow-up the earlier one as closely as possible. Schools who had participated in 1962 were given the opportunity to participate in the new project, an offer Western readily agreed to.

As Western's project liaison, the Office of Institutional Assessment and Testing (OIAT) worked with the Center for Academic Integrity to review and edit the survey form and took charge of administering the survey locally. The Center for Academic Integrity analyzed the data and returned the findings--mostly descriptive frequencies--as well as provided typed copies of the open-ended comments. The OIAT then ran its own set of statistical analyses--including cross-tabulations and inferential statistics--to add some further understanding of the data. The original data--tables for national and local findings, plus comments from Western respondents--will be presented intact and found in Appendices A (comments), B (local tables), and C (national tables). The body of report, however, will attempt to present the salient findings in a format that is somewhat more 'user-friendly', as well as point to findings of particular interest and develop some ideas as to what the findings may imply.

The survey forms were mailed from the OIAT during winter quarter, 1994, to a sample of Western students that included all classes--first-year through fifth-year undergraduates. As complete anonymity was considered the best way to ensure as candid a response to the survey questions as possible, participants were not asked to identify themselves other than to indicate their class standing, gender, and ethnicity, as well to respond to a few questions on general demographic backgrounds. Participating respondents returned the forms through the mail; completed surveys were eventually forwarded to the Center for Academic Integrity for statistical analysis.

Background Information on Survey Respondents

Ultimately, for the 1993 administration, 302 valid survey forms were obtained. The number of participants from 1962, at 54, was considerably less the current survey, though the demographic dispersion across classes was relatively similar, especially for the sophomore and senior classes. (See Table 1.)

Table 1: Class Standings. (Row = 100%)

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	5th year
1962	22.2	20.4	20.4	33.3	3.7
1993	12.7	22.0	31.3	34.0	0.0

In 1962, survey respondents were mostly female (53.7% female versus 46.3% male), which constituted an almost exact reversal to the predominately male student population at the time (approximately 54% male and 46% female). In 1993, survey respondents were

overwhelmingly female (63.8% female versus 36.2%) from what had become a predominately female student population (55.1% female and 44.9% male undergraduates). Thus it would appear that the problem of male reluctance towards filling out surveys has been one researchers have faced for quite a number of years.

Both the 1962 and 1993 surveys included information on ethnicity. In 1962, all respondents were 'Euro-American'; in 1993, nearly all, 92.1%, were 'Euro-American'. Asian-Americans made up 4.8% of the 1993 cohort, Hispanics 1.4%, and African-Americans 1.0%.

All of the 1962 cohort provided information on the education level of their parents, as did nearly all of the 1993 cohort. The most striking contrast between cohorts was for fathers' level of education. While 56.9% of the fathers of 1993 respondents had earned undergraduate or graduate college degrees, the same was true for only 11.1% of the fathers of 1962 respondents. Moreover, 38.9% of the fathers of the 1962 cohort indicated they had not even finished high school. When mothers' level of education was compared, the disparity between cohorts was not nearly so pronounced. For the 1993 cohort, 44.4% of the mothers had earned undergraduate or graduate college degrees, while the same was true for 27.8% of the 1962 cohort.

A reason that so many more of the mothers' of 1962 survey respondents had college degrees than fathers might be that during the World War II years--when most of the parents of the 1962 cohort would have been college age--many more women than men were attending college. In 1941, for instance, Western's student population was made up of 62.2% females and only 37.8% males. Furthermore, by 1962 the continuing interest in science and technology that had begun in the early fifties with the advent of the nuclear and electronic age, as well as the continuing after-effects of post-war education programs such as the GI Bill, delivered an unprecedented number of students to the doors of academe, and included many who were the first-generation in their family to attend college. (See Table 2.)

Table 2: Parents' Education Level. (Row =100%)

Father's Level of Education					
	< HS	HS Grad	Some College	College Grad	Grad Degree
1962	38.9	33.3	16.7	5.6	5.6
1993	3.3	16.7	23.1	33.4	23.4
Mother's Level of Education					
	< HS	HS Grad	Some College	College Grad	Grad Degree
1962	16.7	46.3	9.3	20.4	7.4
1993	5.0	21.3	29.3	29.7	14.7

Respondents were asked in what major or field they expected to graduate. Field by field comparisons indicated that the 1962 cohort was more likely than the 1993 cohort to indicate humanities, languages, arts, and education as their choice of major, while the 1993 cohort was more likely than the 1962 cohort to indicate engineering/science and business as their choice of

major. Nearly identical percentages indicated they would major in social sciences. A majority of the 1962 cohort indicated they would pursue graduate work (66.7%); considerably fewer of the 1993 indicated they would pursue graduate work (41.2%). When asked which post-graduate degree respondents thought they might pursue, most of the 1962 cohort indicated a Master's degree or better (79.3%). Most of the 1993 cohort indicated the same (78.6%).

In 1962, most respondents planned on teaching as an occupation (70.4%). In 1993, occupational choices were more diversely spread, with 20.8% planning on teaching, 19.8% planning on business, 17.4% planning on public service, and 15.4% planning on engineering/science. This disparity would be due, of course, to the fact that Western had been a teacher's college until 1961, when it changed from Western Washington College of Education to Western Washington State College. (Not until 1977 did Western obtain university status.)

A higher percentage of the 1962 cohort indicated they lived at home or with relatives, or in off-campus apartments or rooms, while a higher percentage of the 1993 cohort indicated they lived in on-campus or off-campus residence halls. These differences quite likely have to do with the nature of the housing available in the eras under study.

Regardless of era, few respondents in either cohort indicated that they lived alone (7.4% in 1962; 9.3% in 1993). Respondents from 1962, however, were more likely to have indicated they lived with a spouse (16.7%), or parent/relative (25.9%), while respondents from 1993 were more likely to indicate they lived with one roommate (43.7%) or more than one roommate (32.5%).

The survey next attempted to establish the importance respondents placed on certain socio-cultural values, including an active social life, good personality, interest in ideas, appreciation of the arts, and study habits. The percentage responses to active social life, good personality, and an appreciation of the arts were higher for the 1962 cohort, although only somewhat. On the other hand, the percentage response to interest in ideas and intellectual problems was considerably higher for the 1993 cohort. Generally, though, it would appear that in terms of the socio-cultural values polled, the two cohorts were generally more alike than different.¹ (See Table 3.)

Table 3: Social Values Compared. (Percent of each total cohort)

"How much does each of the following contribute to a student's standing in <i>your</i> eyes?"	'A great deal' or 'fair amount'	
	1962	1993
Active social life (lots of parties/dates)	48.1	41.1
Good personality (fun to be with)	96.3	92.7
Interest in ideas and intellectual problems	76.3	93.7
Appreciation of the arts	70.4	62.0
Study habits	n/a	80.3

¹ The value placed on study habits was quite high for the 1993 cohort, but not asked of the 1962 cohort.

Respondents then indicated which of a series of activities they had participated in at Western. Unlike responses to socio-cultural values, these activities showed a remarkable contrast between cohorts. In 1962, respondents were much more likely to have participated in student government, cultural or literary groups, honor society, and musical or theatrical groups. In 1993, respondents were much more likely to have participated in intramural athletics, and somewhat more likely to have participated in intercollegiate athletics and with 'other' special interest groups. The dearth of participation by the 1993 cohort in literary, cultural and/or musical and theatrical activities is in particular a vivid portrait of the difference in interests of two cohorts studied thirty years apart. Among these twelve variables a few healthy differences were noted between national and Western findings (for instance, nationally only 17.0% of the 1962 cohort had participated in student government).² However, findings for literary club and musical/theatrical group participation were nearly identical to those found at Western. (See Table 4.)

Table 4: Activities Participated in at Western.
(Percent of each total cohort)

	1962	1993
Intercollegiate athletics	5.6	11.9
Student government	33.3	4.6
College paper/publications	3.7	3.0
Political/public affairs group	14.8	5.3
A religious group on campus	16.7	22.9
Campus cultural or literary group	31.5	4.3
An honor society	22.2	4.6
Musical or theatrical group	25.9	9.9
Intramural athletics	9.3	37.1
Other special interest group	7.4	18.5
Club sports/other recreational group	n/a	18.2

Academic Integrity at Western

With backgrounds and some findings on values and attitudes completed, the questions at the heart of the survey began by asking respondents how frequently they *thought* plagiarism on written assignments and cheating during tests or examinations occurred at Western. The percentage of 1993 respondents who believed plagiarism occurred 'often' or 'very often' was 36.7% at Western and 46.7% nationally, while the percentage that felt that plagiarism 'never' occurred was a minuscule 0.7% both at Western and nationally. The percentage who believed that cheating during tests occurred 'often' or 'very often' was 40.1% at Western and 46.4% nationally, while the percentage that felt that cheating during tests 'never' occurred was 17.2% at Western and 1.0% nationally. Apparently, regarding cheating on tests, anyway, the Western respondents appeared much less cynical than their peers nationally.³

² Throughout the analysis of data found in this report national findings were referenced in relation to findings at Western and were so often found to be identical, nearly identical, or only slightly variant that only when differences were at all remarkable will they be mentioned.

³ This question was not asked of the 1962 cohort.

When asked how often respondents themselves had actually *seen* another student cheat during a test, 62.3% of the 1962 cohort indicated at least once, while 60.5% the 1993 cohort indicated at least once--extraordinarily similar findings, one would think, across a thirty-year time span. Nationally, the figures were slightly higher: 68.7% for the 1963 cohort, and 67.6% for the 1993 cohort. Thus, between what students *thought* was occurring and what they had actually *seen* occur, one would have to assume that students were, if nothing else, very *aware* of the issue of cheating, both at Western and nationally regardless of survey year. (See Table 5.)

Table 5: How Often Respondent Saw Another Student Cheat During a Test or Exam. (Row = 100%)

	Never	Once	A few times	Several times	Many times
1962	37.7	5.7	45.3	11.3	0.0
1993	39.5	13.6	32.6	11.0	3.3

Outside of the parental education level difference, the survey's first generational contrast was found when respondents were asked how they *learned* about "most of the cases of cheating and plagiarism (they knew) about." In 1962, 52.9% learned of cheating and plagiarism through official channels like the school paper or Dean's office; in 1993, only 10.5% of the cohort found about cases of cheating or plagiarism through official channels. The 1993 cohort was far more likely to have observed incidents of cheating or plagiarism first hand (34.4%), or to have heard about them from other students (39.7%). Of particular interest is that 15.4% of the 1993 cohort learned of cheating from the offenders themselves, a finding true of only 3.9% of the 1962 cohort. (See Table 6.)

Table 6: How Respondents Learned about Most of the Cases of Cheating and Plagiarism They Knew about. (Row = 100%)

	Observed personally	Heard about from offenders	Through official channels	Heard from other students
1962	13.7	3.9	54.9	27.4
1993	34.4	15.4	10.5	39.7

When it came to aiding someone asking for help during an exam, the responses between cohorts were again more similar than different. Most respondents indicated they would 'ignore or turn down the request' (78.9% in 1962; 63.8% in 1993). A somewhat higher percentage of the 1993 cohort indicated they would 'express disapproval informally but not report' (20.9% in 1993 versus 7.7% in 1962), but other responses were nearly identical. (See Table 7.)

Table 7: If Respondent Were Asked for Help During a Test or Exam, What Would They Do? (Row = 100%)

	Give him/her answer	Expose paper so he/she can copy	Ignore or turn down request	Express disapproval, but not report	Report to appropriate authorities
1962	0.0	11.5	78.9	7.7	1.9
1993	2.0	11.3	63.8	20.9	2.0

If, however, the person asking for help were a close friend, the response to the request for help changed considerably, regardless of cohort. Whether in 1962 or 1993, a much lower percentage would ignore or turn down the request, while a considerably higher percentage would either give the answer or expose their paper so it could be copied. As well, a somewhat higher percentage would express disapproval but not report. (See Table 8.)

Table 8: If Asked for Help During a Tests or Exam by a *Close Friend*, What Would Respondent Do? (Row = 100%)

	Give him/her answer	Expose paper so he/she can copy	Ignore or turn down request	Express disapproval, but not report	Report to appropriate authorities
1962	9.5	26.4	52.8	9.4	1.9
1993	8.3	32.3	33.0	25.3	1.0

The next behavioral contrast between cohorts was found when respondents were queried what they would do if a campus leader were to ask for help during a test or exam. In 1962, respondents were more likely to indicate they would ignore the request for assistance and somewhat more likely to report the incident to authorities. In 1993, respondents were much less likely to simply ignore the request, and far more likely to express informal disapproval or to report the incident to appropriate authorities. Especially in 1993, respondents appear to believe that campus leaders should be setting a moral example, and if they were not, should expect disapproval if not out-and-out exposure to authorities. In 1962, while campus leaders were still expected to set a moral example, if they deviated from that expectation they were more likely to be ignored than confronted. (See Table 9.)

Table 9: If Asked for Help During a Test or Exam by a *Campus Leader*, What Would Respondent Do? (Row = 100%)

	Give him/her answer	Expose paper so he/she can copy	Ignore or turn down request	Express disapproval, but not report	Report to appropriate authorities
1962	0.0	9.4	81.1	3.8	5.7
1993	1.7	6.4	47.5	34.0	10.4

The 1993 cohort was then asked "How likely is it that the *typical Western student* would report an incident of cheating they observed?" Only 3.3% considered it likely, while 96.7% considered it unlikely or very unlikely. When asked what a respondent would do personally if he/she saw a student cheating, for both cohorts most indicated they would 'mention it to other students but not report it', or 'ignore the incident'. Few indicated they would report the cheater to an appropriate authority or ask the cheater to report themselves.

Table 10: If Respondent Saw a Student Cheating, What Actions Would They Take? (Row = 100%)

	Report to appropriate authorities	Ask cheater to report him/herself	Express disapproval, but not report	Mention to other students, but not report	Ignore the incident
1962	3.7	3.7	33.3	29.6	29.6
1993	5.1	1.0	27.4	35.5	31.1

Reactions for both cohorts changed, however, if the student seen cheating was a close friend. While the percentage that would ignore the incident remained about the same, far more would express disapproval to but not report the cheater, and far *fewer* would mention the incident to other students. A friend's good name, in other words, appears likely to receive some protection, just as a friend would be more likely to receive assistance (refer back to Table 8). The 1962 cohort, however, were also more likely to ask the cheater to turn him/herself in, while the 1993 cohort were more likely to mention the incident to others. These findings may be indicative of the shift in who students consider to be the enforcement body of any real or implicit code of honor: in 1962, the administration and/or faculty were seen as primary enforcers, while in 1993, peer pressure was seen as the primary enforcer. (See Table 11.)

Table 11: If Respondent Saw a *Close Friend* Cheating, What Actions Would They Take? (Row = 100%)

	Report to appropriate authorities	Ask cheater to report him/herself	Express disapproval, but not report	Mention to other students, but not report	Ignore the incident
1962	1.9	9.4	56.6	1.9	30.2
1993	1.4	1.7	52.5	7.7	36.7

Campus leaders, however, were again held to a higher moral standard than 'regular' students. In both 1962 and 1993, the percentage of respondents who would report to appropriate authorities a cheating incident they personally witnessed and involving a campus leader increased considerably. Moreover, in 1993 the percentage indicating they would ignore the incident fell to half of what it was for that of a close friend. In other words, when it came to the behavior of campus leaders the 1993 cohort felt compelled to do something rather than nothing. And unlike the response to seeing a close friend cheat, in neither year would a campus leaders' good name be spared. Moreover, the percentage of respondents indicating they would mention the incident of a campus leader cheating to other students but not report it to authorities was higher than what they were for just *any* student seen cheating.

Table 12: If Respondent Saw a *Campus Leader* Cheating, What Actions Would They Take? (Row = 100%)

	Report to appropriate authorities	Ask cheater to report him/herself	Express disapproval, but not report	Mention to other students, but not report	Ignore the incident
1962	9.4	5.7	24.5	32.1	28.3
1993	10.2	4.8	29.3	37.4	18.4

When the 1993 cohort was asked to rate various aspects of cheating policies at Western, most rated the severity of penalties, and the faculty's understanding and support of cheating policies high. When rating the *effectiveness* of the policies, however, respondents were split almost 50/50; and most rated the chance of getting caught at cheating low. Unfortunately, this series of questions was not asked of the 1962 cohort. (See Table 13.)

Table 13: How 1993 Respondents Would Rate Cheating Policy Issues at Western. (Column = 100%)

	The severity of penalties for cheating	Chance of getting caught cheating	Faculty's understanding of policies	Faculty's support of the policies	The effectiveness of the policies
Very Low	1.2	10.0	0.4	1.9	8.5
Low	19.0	62.3	16.7	15.4	44.2
High	70.9	25.6	68.2	68.0	43.5
Very High	8.9	2.1	14.7	14.7	3.8

The 1993 respondents were then asked how strongly certain individuals would disapprove if they were to find out that the respondent had cheated in a course. Findings indicated that a faculty member or a parent would disapprove the most, a close friend's response would be ambivalent, while 'one of the crowd' would disapprove the least. The response by authority figures was, in other words, unequivocal: cheating is wrong. Close friends, on the other hand, might try to weigh all the circumstances and be understanding. Peer groups in 1993, however, appear to be ready to treat cheating fairly casually. (See Table 14.)

Table 14: Percentage Response to the Question: "If you had cheated in a course and the following individuals knew about it, how strongly would they disapprove?" (Column = 100%)

	Close Friend	One of the 'crowd'	Faculty member	Parents
Very strongly	26.4	14.9	84.8	77.6
Fairly strongly	29.4	31.2	14.9	19.0
Not very strongly	29.1	43.4	0.3	2.4
Not at all	15.2	10.5	0.0	1.0

At this point having discovered that a majority of students had seen cheating at least once, that a fair degree of ambivalence in regards to condemning cheating existed, and that students did not think the chance of getting caught cheating was very likely, the survey next turned to the subtleties of cheating: the various modes of cheating, the likelihood of getting caught at that particular mode of cheating, and with what severity respondents view the mode of cheating, or if they even consider the activity cheating at all.

With 50.0% of all 1993 respondents indicating they personally had done so at least once, the most common form of cheating was to copy a few unfootnoted sentences of material for a paper. Most respondents (60.3%) thought it unlikely they would get caught at this form of cheating, as well as thought of it as not really a form cheating at all, or trivial cheating at best (70.1%).

The next two most common forms of cheating were to copy from another student during a test *without* his or her knowledge (46.0% at least once), or to collaborate on an assignment when the instructor had asked for individual work (43.2% at least once). Most respondents who indicated they had copied during a test without another student's knowledge thought it unlikely they would get caught doing so (54.2%), although most did admit that it was serious cheating

(65.8%). An even higher percentage of respondents thought it unlikely they would get caught collaborating on an assignment when individual work was expected (67.2%); moreover, very few felt that it was serious cheating (21.5%).

Forms of cheating that were rare at Western included writing a paper for another student (only 8.4% at least once), turning in work done by someone else (10.1% at least once), and copying someone else's computer program (11.9% at least once). (See Table 15.)

Table 15: Percentage Response to Forms of Cheating Activities for 1993 Survey Respondents.
(Each cell represents the percent of respondents)

	Engaged in at least once	Feel it is unlikely to get caught	Considered 'serious' cheating
Copied during test without permission	46.0	54.2	65.8
Copied during test with permission	31.4	45.6	69.8
Used crib notes during test	23.1	31.9	77.5
Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given	20.4	59.3	57.4
Helped someone else cheat on test	34.7	46.0	60.8
Cheated on test in any other way	16.6	36.0	64.8
Copied material, almost word for word, and turned in as own	19.1	28.7	78.8
Fabricated or falsified a bibliography	25.8	45.5	43.4
Turned in work done by someone else	10.1	44.5	83.2
Received substantial, unpermitted help on assignment	19.5	64.9	32.4
Collaborated on assignment when individual work was assigned	43.2	67.2	21.5
Used unfootnoted material in a paper	50.0	60.3	29.9
Written a paper for another student	8.4	57.9	81.8
Copied computer program	11.9	36.2	72.9

Respondents from both the 1962 and 1993 cohorts were asked what disciplinary measures they thought students caught cheating on mid-terms or finals at Western were most likely to receive. The 1993 cohort was also asked what disciplinary measures they thought students caught cheating on writing assignments would receive. The comparisons across generations was rather extraordinary. Punishments for cheating on finals will be the first example: in 1962, over three-quarters of respondents felt that being suspended or expelled would be likely while in 1993 barely ten percent felt the same way (80.4% in 1962 versus 11.3% in 1993). The 1993 cohort rather expected to be failed on the assignment if caught cheating on a mid-term (54.4%) or failed on the course if caught cheating on a final (57.1%). If caught cheating on a written assignment, the 1993 cohort felt that failing the assignment was most likely (46.9%), although a sizable percentage felt that being made to redo the assignment was most likely. (See Table 16.)

Table 16: For Mid-Term or Final Test, and Written Assignments, Which Disciplinary Measures Are Most Likely to Be Taken at Western. (Column = 100%)

	Mid-Term		Final		Written
	1962	1993	1962	1993	1993 only
Reprimand; warn not to do again	1.9	4.7	0.0	1.4	1.4
Redo, make-up, or do extra assign	0.0	6.2	2.0	3.3	22.5
Fail assignment	11.5	54.5	3.9	21.2	46.9
Fail course	9.6	21.3	13.7	57.1	15.3
Warning on file, or probation	0.0	7.6	0.0	5.7	8.1
Suspend	30.8	2.4	27.5	5.2	2.9
Expel	46.2	3.3	52.9	6.1	2.9

In contrast to what might appear as a rather laissez faire attitude on the part of many Western students, not to mention that a rather large number had indicated that in one form or another they had cheated at least once, it might appear surprising that nearly three-quarters of respondents agreed that 'under no circumstances is cheating justified' (77.8% in 1962 and 73.3% in 1993), and that, moreover, very few agreed that 'reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating' (25.9% in 1962 and 16.4% in 1993). Such findings appear to indicate that when it comes to issues of cheating, what people *say* is the right thing to do is rather different from what is actually done. For instance, while nearly 73.3% of respondents claim to believe that cheating is never justified, 46.3% also admit to copying from another student during a test without them knowing it. Even respondents who agreed *strongly* with the statement that cheating is never justified had cheated--and depending on the mode of cheating, sometimes in rather high percentages. (See Table 17.)

Table 17: Percentage of Respondents From the 1993 Cohort Who Agreed *Strongly* that Cheating is *Never* Justified Who Cheated in the Following Ways at Least Once:

Copied during test without permission	30.2
Copied during test with permission	14.0
Used crib notes during test	17.1
Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given	14.0
Helped someone else cheat on test	20.3
Cheated on test in any other way	10.9
Copied material, almost word for word, and turned in as own	13.2
Fabricated or falsified a bibliography	18.6
Turned in work done by someone else	6.3
Received substantial, unpermitted help on assignment	14.1
Collaborated on assignment when individual work was assigned	28.9
Used unfootnoted material in a paper	40.9
Written a paper for another student	3.1
Copied computer program	4.7

The above findings appear at odds with one another and one might asked how it is possible. One answer may lie in the gray area surrounding the definition of cheating. As findings

presented earlier in the report indicated, not all forms of cheating were considered 'serious'; thus it may be that respondents were dead set against 'serious' cheating like using crib notes but not so judgmental about 'trivial' cheating like collaborating when individual work was expected.

It may also be that certain cultural messages have changed. For instance, there was a considerable difference in attitude between cohorts when respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed that 'some faculty members condone cheating'. In 1962, only 7.4% agreed with this statement, while 22.2% weren't sure; in 1993, 12.0% agreed, while 37.8% weren't sure. Could it be fact or fancy that students feel they are receiving a mixed message from faculty in regards to cheating? Some respondents felt that 'faculty members show little uniformity in handling instances of cheating (24.0% in 1962; 27.9% in 1993), and still more felt that 'faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters (37.0% in 1962; 41.7% in 1993). Yet this may also reflect a larger ambivalence that students in the 1993 cohort had toward faculty generally. Whether fact or fancy on the part of the survey respondents, nearly a quarter of the 1993 cohort (22.6%) agreed with the statement that 'faculty do not devote adequate effort to their teaching responsibilities.'

To further explore the survey data, selected crosstabulations were performed by gender, frequency of religious service attendance, and anticipated occupation. Findings for gender indicated that males were twice as likely to have used crib notes during a test than females (32.4% of males compared to 17.9% of females). Males were also more likely to have found some *other* way of cheating on a test than females (21.7% of males compared to 17.4% of females). These findings were significant at the .05 level.

Survey respondents who attended religious services weekly were less likely to equivocate when it came to their opinion that "cheating is never justified" than respondents who attended religious services less than weekly. Nearly all (94.3%) weekly church-goers agreed with the statement that "under no circumstances is cheating justified." Only about two-thirds of respondents in each of the other four categories (a few times a month, monthly, rarely, or never) agreed cheating was never justified. This finding, too, was significant at the .05 level. (See Table 18.)

Table 18: The Effect of Church Attendance on the Opinion that "Under no circumstances is cheating justified." (Column = 100%)

Item	How often attended religious services				
	Weekly	A few times a month	Monthly	Rarely	Never
Percentage of respondents who agree or disagree that cheating is never justified					
Agree	94.3	62.5	66.7	71.0	67.1
Disagree	0.3	0.0	16.7	13.2	13.4
Not sure	0.7	37.5	16.7	15.7	19.5

A parallel finding indicated that respondents who attended religious services weekly or a few times a month were less likely to have used crib notes to cheat on a test than respondents in other categories. A last finding was hard to interpret, but nonetheless fascinating: respondents who reported attending religious services monthly were the most likely to have reported that they

wrote a paper for another student. These findings were significant at the .05 level. (See Table 19.)

Table 19: The Effect of Church Attendance on the Use of Crib Notes During a Test and on Writing a Paper for Another Student

Item	How often attended religious services				
	Weekly	A few times a month	Monthly	Rarely	Never
Percentage of respondents who used crib notes during a test					
Never	94.2	91.7	76.5	67.8	75.0
At least once	5.8	8.3	23.5	32.2	25.0
Percentage of respondents who wrote a paper for another student					
Never	98.1	82.6	76.5	90.9	94.0
At least once	1.9	17.4	23.5	9.1	6.0

Findings indicated that the anticipated occupation that respondents planned to enter had some effect on the outcomes of analysis by modes of cheating. The differences across planned occupations that were significant at the .05 level included: copied during test without permission; copied during a test with permission; and used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given. (See Table 20.)

Table 20: The Effect of Anticipated Occupation on the Percentage of 1993 Respondents Indicating They had Used a Particular Mode of Cheating At Least Once. (Percent of each occupation category)

	Arts	Business	Education	Engineer/ Science	Public Service	Other
Copied during test without permission*	26.7	49.2	62.3	31.1	46.2	43.5
Copied during test with permission*	40.0	45.8	34.4	4.4	39.2	26.1
Used crib notes during test	13.3	25.4	19.4	22.7	27.5	28.3
Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given*	20.0	32.2	13.1	2.2	31.4	19.6
Helped someone else cheat on test	40.0	44.1	39.3	20.0	42.9	26.1
Cheated on test in any other way	26.7	18.6	13.1	15.6	22.4	8.9
Copied material, almost word for word, and turned in as own	6.7	13.6	16.1	15.6	24.5	28.3
Fabricated or falsified a bibliography	26.7	23.7	27.4	17.8	28.0	30.4
Turned in work done by someone else	6.7	20.3	4.9	4.4	12.2	8.7
Received substantial, unpermitted help on assignment	20.0	19.0	18.0	8.9	30.0	21.7
Collaborated on assignment when individual work was assigned	60.0	49.1	40.3	44.4	42.0	43.5
Used unfootnoted material in a paper	46.7	55.9	47.5	38.6	58.0	44.4
Written a paper for another student	0.0	11.9	6.5	2.2	8.0	17.4
Copied computer program	0.0	13.6	14.8	11.4	12.0	11.1

*Findings significant at the .05 level

One last study of the data was undertaken to see if it would be possible to decipher whether cheaters actually benefited or not. On the survey, respondents were asked to report their estimated grade point average (gpa). Although this figure was self-reported and not the actual gpa taken from Registrar records, all respondents were at least reporting in the same manner; thus, while the figures themselves may be either inflated or shrunk, the differences between them might still evoke some useful findings. The computation itself was relatively straight forward: two groups were identified, one that reported never having cheated in a particular mode, and those that had cheated in that same mode at least once. The average gpa's of each group were computed, then compared statistically with a test called an analysis of variance. The limitation of this analysis was, of course, that there was no way to know what a cheater's gpa might have been had they *not* cheated. Yet however limited in scope, the findings were definitely interesting enough to report.

For all but two modes of cheating (fabricating or falsifying a bibliography and writing a paper for someone else) the gpa's of cheaters were always *lower* than that for non-cheaters, with the differences in gpa in many cases having statistical significance.⁴ Which does not mean that cheating doesn't work--far from it. In fact, cheaters probably still earn higher grades than they would have had they not cheated. Just because cheaters do not generally attain the highest gpa's, the fact of the matter is they are still attaining grade points they did not earn, which undermines gpa credibility for all. Smart cheaters might very well *never* shoot for A's, but rather B's, or even high C's, in hopes that this supposed "easy" way through college might be sustained without suspicion. Moreover, the most cynical of cheating students might believe, and probably with some degree of truth, that once out in the workforce an employer will be only fractionally less impressed with a job applicant with a college degree and a respectable gpa than that of a job applicant with a college degree and a slightly higher gpa.⁵ (See Table 21.)

⁴The Eta², however, was low in each case. This means that while the differences in means was statistically reliable, many other factors besides the variable tested--whether respondents had cheated or not--may have had something to do with that difference.

⁵ Just for the record, cheating by writing a paper for someone else probably entails a very different sort of cheater than found in the other modes. Students looking to cheat for a good grade on a paper need to find a coconspirator already well-versed enough in a given field that they can write the necessary paper at the knowledge level which the seeker of the paper believes he/she can dare get away with.

Table 21: Grade Point Averages (self-reported) of 1993 Survey Respondents Who Never Used Various Cheating Modes and Those Who Did at Least Once.

	Never used this mode of cheating	Used this mode of cheating at least once	Statistical significance
Copied during test without permission*	3.18	3.09	no
Copied during test with permission*	3.18	3.06	yes, at .042 Eta ² = .014
Used crib notes during test	3.16	3.08	no
Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given*	3.17	3.01	yes, at .011 Eta ² = .023
Helped someone else cheat on test	3.18	3.07	yes, at .040 Eta ² = .014
Cheated on test in any other way	3.16	3.07	no
Copied material, almost word for word, and turned in as own	3.17	3.04	no
Fabricated or falsified a bibliography	3.13	3.17	no
Turned in work done by someone else	3.15	3.11	no
Received substantial, unpermitted help on assignment	3.17	3.02	yes, at .018 Eta ² = .019
Collaborated on assignment when individual work was assigned	3.19	3.09	yes, at .050 Eta ² = .013
Used unfootnoted material in a paper	3.18	3.10	no
Written a paper for another student	3.14	3.19	no
Copied computer program	3.14	3.16	no

Discussion

Regardless that some findings indicate attitudes and incidents of cheating have been part of college life at Western in at least two eras, and regardless that compared to national findings from the same survey series that cheating at Western is never more than and often less pronounced than cheating patterns found nationally, the rather high percentages of current Western students who either have cheated themselves or witnessed cheating and done nothing about remains disturbing. While survey respondents purported to hold high moral standards in regards to cheating, gray areas as to what constitutes 'serious' cheating and waffling when friends cheat undermine the seriousness with which one can make of those purported standards, as does the finding that indicates students are less ashamed of their cheating than they have been in the past.⁶ Moreover, while respondents report that turning someone in for cheating is philosophically acceptable, very few respondents report that they would actually do so.

What is not found in the survey data are students' reasons for cheating, although rationalizations do abound in the open-ended student comments. Comments are, of course, only the subjective views of individual respondents and not raw statistical data from which firm objective conclusions can be drawn. If we assume that respondents did not fill out the survey

⁶ Nearly four times as many respondents in the 1993 cohort learned of cheating from the offenders themselves than in the 1962 cohort.

forms with the intention of misleading researchers intentionally, then we know for a fact that 46.0% of the survey respondents did indeed copy from another person during a test at least once, but we can only conjecture as to *why* they did so. Conjecture, however, may help us open a dialogue and from a dialogue possible solutions may be developed--if the Western community feels that the cheating attitudes and patterns presented in this report need to have anything done at all.

In this regard, selected student comments will be presented and subjective analysis by the report's authors will be made of them. And to that task, the authors found the following analysis of cheating quite revealing: "The way I view cheating is that we (students) are all in this together and we should all try to give each other a hand, as we try to push through the trials which are overwhelming on a daily basis. I don't feel guilty if someone cheats off my work or exam as I hope we can all beat the monster known as college, if that requires a bending of the rules, added with the element of risk, so be it!"

The 'students versus the system' mentality described above assumes that if the system is unjust, or even unnecessarily 'difficult', then breaking its rules is a morally acceptable act--if not an outright commendable one. Although flawed logically, it's strength as a rationalization is powerful, drawing as it does from the Robin Hood myth of the morally righteous individual forced by a corrupt society to live outside the law. This particular mythology was given rather extraordinary import, as well as a vivid contemporary setting, in the sixties, when television brought into American homes the pictorial images of groups battling the 'establishment' in order to right obvious wrongs--for instance, the mobilization against the war in Vietnam, and the Civil Rights Movement. By the time the Hollywood movie industry had completed embracing the concept, however, relatively quickly an important social construct was reduced to the image of Warren Beatty as Clyde Barrow. This and other commercial media embodiments of moral outlawhood were utter perversions of the civil disobedience tenets advocated by Ghandi, Martin Luther King and other truly moral social thinkers--one doubts, for instance, that Robin Hood would have considered crib notes a critical blow against the powers of the Sheriff of Nottingham--but nonetheless entered the mainstream of popular American culture, where it appears their original intent and context has been frighteningly desiccated.

Yet a criminally inefficient system is not only to blame for the above student's rationalization of cheating, but also the idea of the overwhelming burden of college. This theme is also evident in the following statements: 1) "Sometimes students are placed in a position to cheat because of pressure to keep GPA's above 3.0 in order to qualify for financial aid or other help such as scholarships. This doesn't make it right, but the pressure is there."; and 2) "In no cases do I believe cheating to be justified; however, punishment should consider the circumstances of the amount of stress & pressure on student & other environmental factors."

The system, in other words, expects too much and sometimes forces students to cheat; even those who condemn cheating can understand that those who do may have done so reluctantly in the face of overwhelming pressure. This particular rationalization is an example of cheaters 'condemning the condemner.' Unable to accept the attendant shame of an unacceptable social behavior, cheaters look elsewhere for blame, and what place easier than stress and

pressure--chimeras whose evils in recent years have been well covered in popular literature and cited as the cause of everything from shortened life spans to spastic colons. Yet again, the leap of logic needed to excuse cheating because of stress and/or pressure can appear rather absurd: it's one thing to cite stress as a cause of high blood pressure, quite another to accuse it of bringing on an uncontrolled case of unfootnoted text reproduction.

Another interesting rationalization for cheating takes the philosophy of enlightened consumerism and twists it unrecognizably strange. For instance, one student concludes that: "We are paying for these classes, we should be allowed a little lee-way about things. If we don't learn the material then that's our problem. If I'm paying \$700+ for the quarter, of course I'm going to want to do whatever possible to get good grades for my \$."

In this case there is no overt blame laying, only the pragmatic assessment of value for dollar taken to an absurd length. Yet another student goes even one step further: "The most important thing college does for young people... is to teach them 'systems manipulation strategies.' One of these strategies is cheating. It's simply a part of life..." This attitude gets straight to the heart of the sort of current social attitudes that embrace cynicism over irony, egoism over altruism, and nihilism over belief. Many of the messages sent through popular culture today imply that nothing is serious, everything is a joke. Indeed, it may be that if college is still considered a challenge, what is being challenged may have changed dramatically. The challenge of learning, for instance, appears to have been replaced by the challenge to get one's money's worth; the challenge of the intellect replaced by the challenge to remain defiantly, even proudly, nonintellectual.

Yet another student states that cheating is none of the University's business. "I am an adult," the comment reads. "I pay you a lot of money, and am therefore responsible for my own education. If I cheat, I do not learn. This is my problem, not yours." A student with an opposing view states, "I guess I don't value the system very much because I know of someone who plagiarized a paper and lied to a professor so she could make up an exam she missed because she forgot about it. Her excuse wasn't verified."

On the one hand, then, the system should care no more about its students than to provide a place for professors to impart practical knowledge to them while leaving the morality of such issues as cheating in the hands of those being educated; on the other, the system is devalued because it does not care nearly enough about the morality of cheating, nor appear to want to pursue courses of action that might address the problems. What these conflicting comments seem to point to is the general ambivalence people have nowadays towards their societal institutions. They expect much from them, yet trust them very little. They stand remote from them, but desire that they function in a more humane and personal way.

In this regard, the issues developed in this discussion of cheating actually encompass more general, if not equally important societal attitudes. How much or little, for instance, do we want our institutions to intrude in our lives? When it comes to cheating, for instance, is the student who claimed that cheating was an individual's problem correct in assuming so, or just rationalizing? Should the University have *more* aggressive cheating policies or--keeping in mind

that the findings in this report show Western's cheating problem to be slightly less pronounced than for the nation generally--are current policies enough?

To further extend this line of inquiry, presented below are a few proactive measures that could help any institution sustain a high level of academic integrity. These recommendations are taken from the brief *Academic Dishonesty Among College Students* prepared by Sheilah Maramark and Mindi Barth Maline.⁷

- Unclear definitions, vague policies, and poorly implemented detection strategies may send messages to students that cheating is not serious enough to warrant enforcement of the institution's position against dishonesty. Academic dishonesty policies must be clearly stated, universally understood, and strictly enforced.⁸
- More researchers are saying grade penalties are no longer adequate and are proposing stronger sanctions appropriate to the severity of the offense.⁹ Since punishment through grade reductions or expulsions may not reform behavior, institutions are advocating programs to specifically address dishonest behavior, such as required counseling or attendance at a seminar about cheating.¹⁰
- Students will not internalize ethical values if they believe faculty are apathetic or uninformed about the process of detecting and sanctioning offenders. Faculty must clearly understand institutional policies on academic dishonesty for students to understand what is appropriate and inappropriate behavior. Administrators must ensure clear policies and guidelines are in place to support faculty.
- Institutions need to emphasize to students the basic tenets upon which higher education was founded--academic honesty and scholarship. Research clearly shows that we can no longer assume students will understand or unequivocally accept institutional statement reflecting these values.¹¹

When pondering the issue of how to respond/not to respond to the findings in *this* report, the findings from another OIAT report might be kept in mind: after four years at Western the

⁷ Division of Higher Education and Adult Learning, Office of Research. For further information, please call (202) 219-2243 or write to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 555 New Jersey Avenue NW, Room 615, Washington, DC 20208-5647.

⁸ A report sponsored by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, *Issues and Perspectives on Academic Integrity* (Gehring, et.al, 1986) is a practical guide institutions can use to stimulate discussion of academic dishonesty on their campuses and subsequently develop policy.

⁹ Gehring, Donald, Nuss, Elizabeth, and Pavela, Gary, *Issues and Perspectives on Academic Integrity* (Washington DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1986);

Oakes, Harold R., *Cheating Attitudes and Practices at Two State Colleges*, *Improving College and University Teaching* 23(1975): 232-235;

Gail, Tom, and Borin, Norm, *Cheating in Academe*, *Journal of Education for Business* 63(1988): 153-157.

¹⁰ Kibler, William, *Cheating*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (November 11, 1992): B1-2.

¹¹ Fass, Richard A., *Cheating and Plagiarism*, *Ethics and Higher Education*. Ed. William W. May (NY: American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, 1990): 170-184.

most dramatic effects reported by students were not clearer career goals or intellectual development, but philosophical attitudes.¹² Whether or not they are a part of the University's written mandate, issues of philosophy, morality and ethics become large part of the legacy passed on by the University to its students. When examining cheating policies, this legacy should be carefully considered.

¹² McKinney, G.R., Trimble, J.E. (February, 1994). *The 1993 College Student Survey: A Longitudinal Study of 1989 CIRP Participants* (Report 1994-01). Bellingham, WA: Office of Institutional Assessment and Testing.

APPENDIX A:
Survey Respondents' Comments

Open-ended Student Comments

Western Washington University

I guess I don't value the system very much because I know of someone who plagiarized a paper and lied to a professor so she could make up an exam she missed because she forgot about it. Her excuse wasn't verified. (77-001)

Regardless of the fact that heating isn't fair, I think it is solely the loss of the student cheating which is why I don't consider it a threatening situation. We're paying to learn and if we choose to waste our money & fly through school, too bad for that student. If a student cheats once or twice, whatever, so be it. I think there are more important issues to focus on. (77-005)

I would examine the cheating done by the school in taking preference to out of state tuition to that of in state before I would point a finger outward at students. The administration of this school is guilty of a far more serious crime! (77-008)

..... seems to have no epidemic of cheating from what I've seen, only an arrogant faculty. (77-012)

I am an adult. I pay you a lot of money, and am therefore responsible for my own education. If I cheat, I do not learn. This is my problem, not yours. (77-019)

I don't feel I've done this survey justice as I'm a Fairhaven student and we don't have tests etc. Sorry. (77-021)

This is not a topic that I participate in in personal ways and I am usually unaware of the actions of others while testing. Instructors have allowed longer testing times for individuals while telling the class that a test time limit was set. (People left at the designated time only to find out that others worked 30-45 minutes longer.) I think this is a form of cheating on the instructors' part!!! (77-030)

It would better serve students if a study of administrative effectiveness were undertaken. (77-034)

From what I've seen at this University cheating is not a problem here. Compared to other schools is one of the most honest. (77-040)

I, quite frankly, have no idea how much cheating goes on. I do not cheat myself, nor do I condone cheating by others. Yet, I do not believe I would have the courage to turn a cheater in. (77-041)

It angers me to work so hard for something and then have somebody else get a better grade due to cheating. I'm being cheated also. Thank you for this survey. I hope more will be done. (77-045)

People should be 'trusted' for the most part because in the "real world" they may be the only ones who must be honest with themselves. In other words they know if they earned that grade or cheated themselves out of learning what they should have. But once caught they should be reprimanded same as "real world." (77-048)

Sometimes you might not have intentions to cheat - e.g., not know about bibliography or forget to include a footnote. Getting help on assignments is good. It's better to learn than fail. Profs do a good job of explaining cheating rules & disciplinary action at beginning of quarter. (77-050)

Wouldn't it be funny if I cheated on the survey? (77-051)

I have no basis for judgment on many questions. As far as I know, if a student is caught cheating, they are expelled from class and fail that class. I suppose that a note is made in their file, but have no idea about that. (77-054)

This survey asked for a lot of conjecture on topics totally foreign to me. It also was cut and dried on many grey areas. I feel like cheating is mainly hurting the person who cheats. (77-057)

The way I view cheating is that we (students) are all in this together and we should all try to give each other a hand, as we try to push through the trials which are overwhelming on a daily basis. I don't feel guilty if someone cheats off my work or exam as I hope we can all beat the monster known as college, if that requires a bending of the rules, added with an element of risk, so be it! (77-060)

I know little of the frequency or punishments associated with cheating as I am extremely rarely exposed to it. (77-062)

I am transferring after this quarter because I feel that is not a place for me and my experience here first quarter was not enjoyable. Including my roommate and academic advising. (77-069)

I personally am not very observant w/ cheating that goes on around me. In the end, the cheater will be put to justice - in some way or another. I understand that I should report cheaters but don't feel comfortable doing so - so I am probably just as guilty. (77-077)

I'm only a freshman, so I'm not completely familiar with college. I'm probably not a good person for this survey. (77-079)

Because I don't cheat and am against it, I'm afraid I don't know a lot of the rules concerning cheating at (77-081)

I think that a cheater cheats himself and isn't getting much out of college. It's their choice to cheat. (77-083)

We are paying for these classes, we should be allowed a little lee-way about things. If we don't learn the material then that's our problem. If I'm paying \$700+ for the quarter, of course I'm going to want to do whatever possible to get good grades for my \$. (77-088)

Cheaters usually don't make that much difference unless they are really good at it. (77-091)

I try never to cheat. I have not since I came here, I only cheated at junior college. (77-096)

I think cheating does occur. It's been my experience that I'll catch people glancing at another's test, but never saw someone copy word for word or anything. (77-099)

The most important thing college does for young people, besides further socializing them, is to teach them "systems manipulation strategies." One of these strategies is cheating. It's simply part of life. Although I have never cheated on a test at this college, there are lots of things I would manipulate if I felt I had to, i.e. a urine test. (77-103)

Cheating is absolutely unacceptable - I refuse to compete for grades against anyone who is cheating. However, it would be nice if there was more consistency between the clarity of what the professors want and more consistency in feedback on my work. I have had excellent professors, but I've also had exams returned to me with NO grade or comments and when I spoke with the professor I still got NO feedback (none that was tangible). Needless to say my grade was unexpected and unsatisfactory (C). (77-104)

Cheating is a serious problem! Although I feel students who cheat are usually the ones who tend to be unsuccessful and unrespected members of society. In a sense they are just "digging their own grave," thus, as a student, cheaters do not bother me much. (77-113)

I've never actually heard of someone who has gotten in trouble for cheating here, although I've been in classes where the professor explains what will happen if you do. I guess I'm not too sure how many people actually get caught, but I'm assuming there are some who do. (77-114)

Many of these questions are reasonable though others are in regards to the faculty. I myself do not know for certain where professors, instructors, stand in regards to particular events. From my point of view many students are not quite aware of actual university policies (referring to this particular topic - integrity). (77-119)

I suggest you ask people other than freshmen! Is this survey just to evaluate student opinion toward cheating or to evaluate whether there is a problem with academic integrity, how severe it is, and to decide remedies for it? Maybe you should ask people to relate personal experiences, how they were treated by profs, what they did, etc.? (If you can trust them not to get someone else to fill out this survey for them!) (77-133)

I really haven't been here for long, but so far I haven't heard barely anything about people cheating. Most of the people that I am surrounded with are Christians, though, so maybe I just don't see it because I'm not around it much. (77-135)

I have at one time verbally compared answers with a friend during a test. I was not a mid-term or a final. I don't believe I changed any of my answers. (77-140)

Having only been here since the beginning of Fall quarter, I don't really know how much cheating goes on or how it is handled. I think, though, that it would be very easy for students to cheat, especially with take-home quizzes, classes in large lecture halls, and programmable calculators (the ones required for math classes - very simple to store notes in.) (77-141)

Cheating only seems to be a problem in very large lecture classes, where it is hard for the instructor to catch them. (77-142)

I've never seen anyone get caught, so I don't know how seriously it is taken by profs. (77-149)

If I was in a class and people around me were cheating I would probably write a note to the instructor on top of my test saying they need to watch the class more carefully because there is cheating taking place. I've also known that much of the cheating that I've seen has been in Antien Hall 100. (77-150)

Cheating is a concern, but I think the quality of teachers is a much bigger concern. It would be better to spend your money on better teachers and more classes. (77-151)

You gotta do what you gotta do. Today's world won't let 2nd best pass by anymore. (77-153)

Cheating is not always overt. I see many students who "help" each other w/ homework, etc. just to find a way to pass - without always learning or understanding the material. (77-160)

I wish the university would focus less on retribution/punitive action and appeal to the higher conscience of its students - I would prefer to see a system where students agree to a code of honor and are respected - such as what is commonly found at Ivy League schools - for example students taking tests without a professor or T.A. present. I think this can be very effective. In this case, I believe strong action could be justified if students break this code. I find the competitive nature of the classroom hard to accept also. (77-164)

Cheating is probably only a problem at the lower division classes with their Scantrons. The upper division classes deal with aspects and problem solving essay questions, to which I don't see how one can cheat. As for plagiarism, only a fool thinks he/she can sneak one past a prof. However, I do believe that the teaching of citing sources is not done adequately at the English 101 or beginning classes. (77-167)

In no cases do I believe cheating to be justified; however punishment should consider the circumstances of the amount of stress & pressure on student & other environmental factors. (77-168)

Some students do not get financial assistance from their parents, even if they're 24. It is not fair that students who can't afford a TI85 calculator suffer in tests where calculators can be used just because they are not able to program a calculator to give them equations, conversions, and any other helpful notes. The most cheating I have seen is done on these calculators. In one Chem class I even saw 2 students hook up to each other and exchange answers. (77-181)

I'm really not certain about cheating - I've never done it or seen anyone cheat. However, as far as the instructors I've had so far, it's as if they're free to do whatever they want resulting in them presenting poor class instructions, wasting my time and money. Also, the cost of education is ridiculous. (77-182)

I felt some of these questions were a little difficult to answer because I don't cheat and I never really thought about it so I'm not very aware or pay attention to what might happen if I did. (77-186)

In the larger lecture halls, TA's should be assigned to help look out. It's not fair when I study hard and the idiot next to me looks at the person below them. You should definitely outlaw hats for all exams and quizzes, and have more people look for cheaters during them. (77-188)

I don't think this questionnaire is going to help you. (77-189)

Interesting survey. I do think cheating is somewhat of a problem at But with such large classes I know it's hard to control. (77-205)

It would be interesting to do a study on the integrity of college professors with tenure and non-tenure taken into consideration. I think that a student's academic integrity reflects the integrity of their institution. The institution reflects the system it exists in. Wouldn't that be a long grant proposal? (77-219)

I admit I have cheated but the number of students who cheat in courses in my major is so high, it only makes people cheat more to stay competitive. Even though I don't cheat now it's sad to watch students cheat during exams right under the professor's nose. It's also sad to know that most of the people I see cheat are the ones with the high grades and they're

the ones that end up getting accepted to Dental or Med schools. Once they've done good on entrance exams and get accepted, all of their cheating at the undergraduate level will go unnoticed and they will move on to be professionals. I guess that's the way it goes - right? I bet you yourself know what I'm talking about! (77-220)

This survey is insulting, vague and useless. Generalizations run "amuck" and cheating on tests does not equal unethical behavior in our society - it starts much before and runs deeper. Keep up the superficial bureaucratic paycheck justifying work. (77-222)

There is much less reason or chance for art students to cheat, in comparison to say Math majors. (77-229)

I don't feel that I know enough information about cheating on campus. I do not think that there are enough publications and information exposed to students. (77-230)

I don't think cheating at is a great concern because 1) it's not the easiest thing to do and 2) the farther you get in college the less cheaters there are because they eventually flunk out. Maybe one reason people feel the need to cheat is because the teacher lacks the talent to teach and has unreasonable tests. I have encountered many instances w/ this. But I really cheat, none the less. (77-232)

I didn't feel that I could really answer some of these questions because since I haven't really heard, seen or experienced cheating and what happens here at (77-234)

I wonder how many people will cheat on this survey.... kidding. (77-236)

I haven't been exposed to cheating since I've been at, but I do feel that a lot of students aren't interested in getting good grades - they're interested in having fun and getting a degree. (77-238)

I thought that, like many surveys, the questions were, in some cases, a little general and contradictory. Most questions are not able to be answered with 1 answer. (77-239)

Why do you spend the money for such an inconsequential survey? Why don't you do a survey on how unsatisfied students are with the courses offered and how impossible it is to get into them. You'd get a lot of frustrated responses from people sick of all the budget-cuts & red tape bull___! (77-241)

I truly believe cheating is a big problem on 's campus and it should be handled much better than it is. (77-243)

Isn't law in the U.S. based on the theory of innocent until proven guilty? I have never cheated (my definition of cheating) in four years of college and I feel as though I am being targeted as a criminal by this survey. I filled it out because as a future teacher, I believe something needs to be done! (77-244)

Some of these questions are really vague. (77-245)

I have found most of’s faculty to be of high quality, but overcrowding is a serious problem now facing this institution. (77-260)

There is probably a higher pct. of cheating on exams than on papers. There’s more cheating in lower level classes. Teachers do not monitor tests the way they should. (77-262)

Is cheating that big of an issue right now? I think there are plenty of other issues to have surveys about: political, gay/lesbian rights, class availability, registration, etc. (77-268)

I really have not witnessed a serious cheating problem here, and I feel most students are serious and mature enough to accept academic responsibility. (77-270)

Cheating doesn’t seem to be a problem at but it’s hard to evaluate as a student. When I take tests I’m usually so engrossed in my work I rarely have a chance to look around to see what others are doing. (77-273)

Sometimes students are placed in a position to cheat because of pressure to keep GPA’s above 3.0 in order to qualify for financial aid or other help such as scholarships. This doesn’t make it right, but the pressure is there. I also feel that ineffective teaching can also contribute to cheating. (77-275)

I don’t think cheating is that big of a deal. It only hurts the person cheating because they don’t learn anything (unless there’s a curve). Besides, usually, when as long as you learn the important useful skills of your trade who cares about trivial facts, statistics, etc. (77-276)

The classes are too large for the teachers to catch someone cheating. Also, I believe that the admission requirements aren’t high enough - letting too many people in that expand class size and heighten cheating. Higher admission standards or get more teachers! (77-278)

Cheating is a difficult matter to examine, and some of these questions had various answers not given on the sheet. While cheating is frowned upon by the majority I think it is necessary to understand the circumstances which led him/her to cheat. While we are all in school striving for perfection so we have the perfect answers for the imperfect world, I believe we often lose sight of the fact that school helps us learn. It doesn’t help us take tests. Students are taught in school that the outside world is cut throat - look out for #1. But in the class we are taught to be morally courageous upright individuals who should strive for their best. The kicker is that in the class we are taught not to cheat but in the real world it seems at times as though cheating and running over the person ahead of you is the best way to excel. I just don’t understand it. (77-279)

You ask people questions they might not have any experience with. They (or at least I) are guessing, speculation, not a real survey of what’s going on! - esp. Q’s #17, 20 & 21. (77-282)

I would be interest in finding out the results of this survey. Perhaps you can make an announcement in the school paper or post on bulletin boards around campus explaining how students can obtain the survey results. Thanks. (77-290)

A lot of people cheat, but part of the reason is because the information we are given to learn is so unsubstantial and not very interesting. I also think I learn a lot more when I'm making myself a "crib sheet." I don't think cheating on a college exam is as crucial as some might make it out to be. I do agree that plagiarism is bad. (77-291)

In my experience at, I have never seen or heard of anyone cheating on a major test. Most of the students I know would look down on cheating of this nature, but would not necessarily turn the person in if they happened to see them cheat. (77-296)

Why don't we ever see these survey results??? (77-300)

For the most part undergraduate classes at this University are just a bunch of silliness. Anyone that is halfway intelligent can cruise through these classes offered here. Once one realizes that a B.A. degree is worthless as far as getting a decent job (it's not what you know but who you know) you don't really care if people cheat or not. The few times I've cheated is because the course was too boring, and it was just quicker to copy someone's notes. It's just jumping through hoops. (77-302)

APPENDIX B:

Copy of Academic Integrity Survey Form

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY SURVEY

SECTION I - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is your present academic class standing? Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____

2. How many years have you been at Western Washington? _____

3. In what major or field of concentration do you expect to graduate? _____

4. Do you plan to pursue graduate work? Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

If yes or undecided, what degree do you think you will pursue?

M.B.A. _____ Other Master's _____ J.D., J.S.D., LL.B. _____

Ph.D., Ed.D. _____ M.D., D.D.S., D.O., D.V.M. _____ Other _____

5. What kind of occupation do you plan to enter?

Arts _____ Business _____ Education _____

Engineering/Science _____ Law _____ Medicine _____

Public/Government Service _____ Other _____

6. What is your current living arrangement?

Parents' or relatives' home _____ On-campus residence hall _____ Off-campus residence hall _____

Off-campus apartment/room _____ Fraternity/sorority house _____ Other (specify) _____

7. Do you live?

Alone _____ With a roommate _____ With more than one roommate _____

With spouse _____ With parents or other relative _____

8. How much does each of the following contribute to a student's standing in your eyes?

	A great deal	A fair amount	Not much	Not at all
An active social life - lots of parties/dates	_____	_____	_____	_____
Good personality - fun to be with	_____	_____	_____	_____
Interest in ideas and intellectual problems	_____	_____	_____	_____
Appreciation of the arts	_____	_____	_____	_____
Study habits	_____	_____	_____	_____

PLEASE TURN TO QUESTION 9 ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE

9. Check all of the following activities in which you have participated at Western Washington.

Intercollegiate athletics	_____	Student government	_____
College paper/other publications	_____	Fraternity or sorority	_____
Political/public affairs group	_____	A religious group on campus	_____
Campus cultural or literary group	_____	An honor society	_____
Musical or theatrical group	_____	Intramural athletics	_____
Other special interest group	_____	Club sports/other recreational group	_____

SECTION II - ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AT WESTERN WASHINGTON

10. How frequently do you think the following occur at Western Washington?

	Never	Very seldom	Seldom	Often	Very often
Plagiarism on written assignments	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Cheating during tests or examinations	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

11. How often have you seen another student cheat during a test or exam at Western Washington?

Never _____ Once _____ A few times _____ Several times _____ Many times _____

12. How did you learn about most of the cases of cheating and plagiarism you know about? (Check one)

Observing the instances yourself	_____	Hearing about them from the offenders	_____
Through official channels (school paper, Dean's office, faculty, etc.)	_____	Hearing about them from other students	_____

13. If someone asked you for help during a test or exam, what would you do?

1. Give him/her the answer _____
2. Say nothing but expose your paper so he/she can copy the answer _____
3. Ignore or turn down the request _____
4. Express disapproval informally but not report him/her _____
5. Report him/her to the appropriate authorities _____

What would you do if the student who asked you for help were: (Write in the number of the alternative you would choose from the above list)

A close friend _____ A campus leader _____

14. How likely is it that the typical Western Washington student would report an incident of cheating they observed?

Very unlikely _____ Unlikely _____ Likely _____ Very likely _____

PLEASE TURN TO QUESTION 15 ON THE NEXT PAGE

15. For students brought to the attention of faculty for cheating, estimate in what percentage of cases:

- No disciplinary action is taken _____%
- Disciplinary action is taken by the course instructor _____%
- The case is passed on to some other authority for disciplinary action _____%
- 100 %

16. Suppose you saw a student cheating. What would you do?

- 1. Report him/her to the instructor, proctor, or appropriate authority _____
- 2. Ask the student to report himself/herself and report them if they fail to do so _____
- 3. Express disapproval informally to the student but not report them _____
- 4. Mention the incident to other students but not report it _____
- 5. Ignore the incident _____

What would you do if the student you saw cheating was: (Write in the number of the alternative you would choose from the above list)

A close friend _____ A campus leader _____

17. How would you rate:

	Very Low	Low	High	Very High
The severity of penalties for cheating at Western Washington?	_____	_____	_____	_____
Chances of getting caught cheating at Western Washington?	_____	_____	_____	_____
The faculty's understanding of Western Washington's policies concerning student cheating?	_____	_____	_____	_____
The faculty's support of these policies?	_____	_____	_____	_____
The effectiveness of these policies?	_____	_____	_____	_____

18. If you had cheated in a course and the following individuals knew about it, how strongly would they disapprove?

	Very strongly	Fairly strongly	Not very strongly	Not at all
A close friend	_____	_____	_____	_____
One of the students you go around with	_____	_____	_____	_____
A faculty member	_____	_____	_____	_____
Your parents	_____	_____	_____	_____

PLEASE TURN TO QUESTION 19 ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE

19. We would like to ask you some questions about specific types of cheating. Please remember that this survey is completely anonymous and there is no way that anyone can connect you with any of your answers. Please circle one response for each question, using the following scales.

	How often would you estimate <u>you</u> have engaged in the following actions?	Are you likely to get caught if you do this?	Which actions do you consider to be cheating?
	1 = Never 2 = Once 3 = A few times 4 = Several times 5 = Many times	1 = Very unlikely 2 = Unlikely 3 = Not sure 4 = Likely 5 = Very likely	1 = Not cheating 2 = Trivial cheating 3 = Serious cheating
Copied from another student during a test (or exam) <u>without</u> his or her knowing it.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Copied from another student during a test <u>with</u> his or her knowledge.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Used unpermitted crib notes (or cheat notes) during a test.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Saw another student cheat on a test.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Helped someone else cheat on a test.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Cheated on a test in any other way.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Copied material, almost word for word, from any source and turned it in as your own work?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Fabricated or falsified a bibliography.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Turned in work done by someone else.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Received substantial, unpermitted help on an assignment.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Worked on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Copied a few sentences of material without footnoting them in a paper.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Written a paper for another student.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
In a math/computer course, copied someone's program rather than doing your own.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3

PLEASE TURN TO QUESTION 20 ON THE NEXT PAGE

20. Which of the following disciplinary measures is most likely to be taken at Western Washington when a student is caught cheating on:	Mid-term exam (Check one)	Final exam (Check One)	Major written assignment (Check one)
Reprimand the student and warn him/her not to do it again	_____	_____	_____
Make him/her re-do the exam or assignment, do a make-up, or complete an additional assignment	_____	_____	_____
Make him/her fail the exam or written assignment	_____	_____	_____
Make him/her fail the course	_____	_____	_____
Put written warning in file or place on probation	_____	_____	_____
Suspend him/her from school	_____	_____	_____
Expel him/her from school	_____	_____	_____

21. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? (Check one choice on each line)

	Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Not sure	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly
Under no circumstances is cheating justified	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Some faculty members condone cheating	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Faculty members show little uniformity in handling instances of cheating	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Cheating is a serious problem on this campus	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Faculty here do not devote adequate effort to their teaching responsibilities.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Students cheat more today than those who went to college in the 1960's and 1970's.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

22. Students learn campus rules in different ways. Which of the following were important sources of information about campus rules for you? (Rank them in order of importance to you, using one to denote the most important source and four the least important.)

Published sources (e.g., student handbook, college bulletin, school newspaper)	_____
Informal conversations with other students	_____
First year orientation program or meetings	_____
Trial and error	_____

PLEASE TURN TO QUESTION 21 ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE

SECTION III - PERSONAL DATA

23. Please provide the following information about yourself. It will be used to help us analyze the overall results of this survey. We remind you that all individual information will be kept strictly confidential.

Are you: Female Male Your age:
Your citizenship: U.S./Canada African Asian
Latin American European Other

If you are a U.S. citizen, how would you describe your ethnic background?

African American Asian American Chicano/Latino
Other Hispanic Native American Euro American (Caucasian)
Other (specify) _____

What is your estimated GPA or grade point average?

In what religion were you raised?

Baptist Buddhist Catholic Hindu
Jewish Protestant Other None

How often do you attend religious services?

Weekly A few times/month Monthly Rarely Never

24. How far did your parents go in school? (Check one in each column)

Your father		Your mother
<input type="checkbox"/>	Did not graduate high school	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	High school graduate	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Some college	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	College graduate	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Post graduate degree	<input type="checkbox"/>

25. What is the estimated family income of your parents (before taxes)?

Under \$25,000 \$25,000-49,999 \$50,000-99,999
\$100,000-149,999 \$150,000 and over

26. Thank you very much for your help! Please use this space for any comments you would like to make.