

1-4-2013

Promoting a Culture of Integrity: A Study of Faculty and Student Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty at a Large Public Midwestern University

Tanisha Nicole Stevens
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://irl.umsl.edu/dissertation>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stevens, Tanisha Nicole, "Promoting a Culture of Integrity: A Study of Faculty and Student Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty at a Large Public Midwestern University" (2013). *Dissertations*. 327.
<https://irl.umsl.edu/dissertation/327>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the UMSL Graduate Works at IRL @ UMSL. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of IRL @ UMSL. For more information, please contact marvinh@umsl.edu.

PROMOTING A CULTURE OF INTEGRITY: A STUDY OF FACULTY AND
STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AT A LARGE PUBLIC
MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY

by

TANISHA N. STEVENS

M.A., Human Development Counseling, Saint Louis University, 2002
B.A., Psychology, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1999

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School of the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST. LOUIS

In partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

EDUCATION

with an emphasis in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

December, 2012

Committee

Shawn Woodhouse, Ph.D.
Chairperson

Patricia Boyer, Ph.D.

Margaret Barton-Burke, Ph.D.

Cody Ding, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE APPROVAL PAGE

ABSTRACT

Research reveals that reducing academic misconduct requires an understanding of factors that influence the two key stakeholders in the epidemic: students who engage in academically dishonest behaviors and faculty who are charged with the responsibility of reporting and deterring the behavior (e.g., Prenshaw, Straughan & Albers-Miller, 2000). In response, a body of research reveals that in order to alter the environment in which academic dishonesty occurs, an understanding of how individuals perceive dishonesty and its severity is of great importance (Roberts & Rabinowitz, 1992). Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to examine faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty.

The study involved 561 undergraduate students and 112 faculty members who primarily teach undergraduate courses at a large public Midwestern institution during the Fall Semester 2011. Participants completed an anonymous, online questionnaire that was composed of three preexisting scales: the Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale (Davis et al., 1992; Bolin, 2004), the Academic Dishonesty Scale (McCabe & Trevino, 1997c) and the Academic Integrity Survey (McCabe, 2008d).

Utilizing a series of frequency counts, mean scores and one-way ANOVAs, similarities and differences were found within faculty perceptions and student perceptions for the dependent variables under study. Results of the study revealed statistically significant differences within faculty responses to student engagement in behaviors identified as academically dishonest and within student responses and faculty responses to perceptions of institutional policies and procedures that address dishonesty. Further, the results of the study support research that reveals students may not perceive certain behaviors as constituting dishonesty (e.g., Brown, 2002; Carpenter, Harding & Finelli,

2006; Godfrey & Waugh, 1998; Rabi, Patton, Fjortoff & Zgarrick, 2005; Rakovsky & Levy, 2007) and that faculty perceptions of student engagement in specific behaviors identified as academically dishonest may be more negative than student self-reports of engagement (e.g., Nolan, Smith & Dai, 1998; Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2002).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

“May the LORD now show you kindness and faithfulness, and I too will show you the same favor because you have done this.” 2 Samuel 2:6

This process would not be complete until I acknowledge and thank those who have supported me on this “roller coaster” of a journey.

My family...this accomplishment would not have been attainable if it was not for each one of you. To my husband, Ladarrius Stevens, thank you for being my strength during this process and for believing in me even in those moments in which I did not believe in myself. To my mother, Cynthia Smith and sister, Ebony Smith, I thank you for your encouragement, your prayers and your love. To my grandmother, Dorothy Emsweller, whose prayers were heartfelt and answered. To my daughters, Lanisha, Laniya, Lanora and Lanivia, this process should not only serve as a test of endurance and perseverance but also a testament to what hard work, faith and determination will bring you in this life.

To my dissertation committee, I am truly honored that you all agreed to assist me on this journey. To my Chairperson, Dr. Shawn Woodhouse, I thank you for believing not only in my research but also for believing in me. To Dr. Pat Boyer, I thank you for your words (and revisions 😊) of encouragement. To Dr. Margaret Barton-Burke, I thank you for challenging me to think “outside of the box.” To Dr. Ding, I thank you for your knowledge and insight.

Lastly, I would like to thank my friends, (my sisters in Christ) Cora Grandberry, Dr. Orinthia Montague and Natissia Small and my “partner in crime”, Dr. D’Andre Braddix. A special thank you to Barbara Trauterman for not only listening to my rants but also in sharing my joyous moments. And so it is written...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Research Questions.....	8
Hypotheses.....	9
Significance of the Study.....	10
Delimitations.....	11
Limitations.....	12
Assumptions.....	13
Definitions.....	13
Summary.....	15
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	17
Research on Academic Dishonesty.....	18
Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty.....	18
Ambiguity in Definitions.....	19
Ambiguity in Academically Dishonest Behaviors.....	21
Student Cheating Methods.....	24
Characteristics of Students who engage in Academically Dishonest Behaviors...25	
Motivational Factors.....	26
Decision Making.....	26
Self-Efficacy.....	27
Perceived Opportunity.....	27
Grades.....	28
Diminishing Sense of Integrity.....	29
Lack of Self Control and Deviant Behavior.....	30

Individual/Demographic Factors.....	31
Age.....	31
Gender.....	32
Race/Ethnicity.....	32
Contextual/Situational Factors.....	33
Peers.....	34
Fraternity/Sorority Membership.....	35
Student Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty.....	36
Value Systems.....	36
Student perceptions and Academic Majors.....	38
Business.....	38
Engineering.....	40
Healthcare.....	41
Student Perceptions and Peers.....	44
Cross-Cultural Studies of Student Perceptions.....	45
Faculty Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty.....	47
Faculty and Student Perceptions.....	48
Responses to Academic Dishonesty.....	55
Honor Codes/Institutional Policies.....	56
Consequences of Reporting.....	58
Moral Development and Reasoning.....	60
Kohlberg.....	61
Theory of Moral Reasoning.....	62
Gilligan.....	65
Moral Development Theory.....	65
Rest.....	66
Four Component Model of Morality.....	67
Moral Reasoning and Academically Dishonest Behaviors.....	69
Summary.....	74
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	76
Research Design.....	76

Research Questions.....	78
Hypothesis.....	78
Sample Setting.....	79
Sample Participants.....	80
Sampling Procedures.....	81
Selection of Participants.....	81
Online Survey Instrument.....	81
Delivery of the Survey Instruments.....	82
Data Collection.....	82
Instrumentation.....	83
Measures.....	84
Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale.....	84
Academic Dishonesty Scale.....	85
Academic Integrity Scale.....	86
Data Analyses.....	87
Conclusion.....	88
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS/DISCUSSION.....	89
Introduction.....	89
Survey Instruments.....	89
Participants.....	90
Demographics: Student Survey.....	91
Engagement in Academic Dishonesty.....	93
Demographics: Faculty Survey.....	94
Results.....	95
Responses to ATAD Survey.....	95
Student Responses.....	95
Faculty Responses.....	96
Research Question One.....	97
Responses to ADS Survey.....	99
Student Responses.....	100
Faculty Responses.....	102

Research Question Two.....	105
Responses to AIS.....	112
Student Responses.....	113
Faculty Responses.....	116
Research Question Three.....	120
Summary.....	131
CHAPTER 5-SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS.....	133
Discussion.....	133
Problem Statement and Purpose of the Study.....	133
Discussion of Results.....	135
Demographics.....	135
Engagement in Academic Dishonesty.....	135
Faculty Perceptions of Student Engagement.....	140
Research Question One.....	142
Research Question Two.....	144
Research Question Three.....	147
Limitations.....	151
Implications.....	154
Recommendations.....	158
Institutional Efforts to Address Academic Dishonesty: Campus.....	158
Institutional Efforts to Address Academic Dishonesty: Faculty.....	160
Institutional Efforts to Address Academic Dishonesty: Students.....	162
Future Research.....	163
Conclusion.....	165
REFERENCES.....	168
APPENDICES.....	193
Appendix A: Letter of Introduction.....	193
Appendix B: Informed Letter.....	194
Appendix C: Instructional Script.....	196
Appendix D: Survey Instrument-Student.....	197
Appendix E: Survey Instrument-Faculty.....	206

Appendix F: Consent to use Subscale Instruments.....214
Appendix G: Definitions.....216
Appendix H: Institutional Demographics.....217
Appendix I: IRB Approval Letter.....218

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1: Demographic Information for Student Participants
- Table 2: Frequency of Engagement in Academic Dishonesty
- Table 3: Demographic Information for Faculty Participants
- Table 4: Frequency Counts and Percentages of Student Responses to Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale
- Table 5: Frequency Counts and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale
- Table 6: Mean Scores for Student (by standing) Responses to the Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale
- Table 7: Mean Scores for Faculty (by rank) Responses to the Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale
- Table 8: Frequency Counts and Percentages of Student Responses to Academic Dishonesty Scale
- Table 9: Frequency Counts and Percentages of Faculty Responses to Academic Dishonesty Scale
- Table 10: Mean Scores for Student (by standing) and Faculty (by rank) Responses on the Academic Dishonesty Scale
- Table 11: ANOVA for Student Perceptions on the Academic Dishonesty Scale
- Table 12: ANOVA for Faculty Perceptions on the Academic Dishonesty Scale
- Table 13: Frequency Counts and Percentages of Student Responses to Academic Integrity Scale
- Table 14: Frequency Counts and Percentages of Faculty Responses on Academic Integrity Scale
- Table 15: Mean Scores for Student (by standing) Responses on the Academic Integrity Scale
- Table 16: Mean Scores for Faculty (by rank) Responses on the Academic Integrity Scale

Table 17: ANOVA for Student Perceptions on the Academic Integrity Scale

Table 18: ANOVA for Faculty Perceptions on the Academic Integrity Scale

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Academic integrity is fundamental to the mission of higher education institutions and provides a foundation for responsible student conduct that transcends graduation (Center for Academic Integrity, 1999). Traditionally, institutions of higher education have focused on the intellectual, moral, social, and cultural development of college students. However, with recent studies documenting the increase in academic dishonesty cases across college campuses nationwide, honest student behavior appears to be declining (e.g., McCabe & Trevino, 1997c; William & Hosek, 2003). Research reveals that 80% to 90% of students admit to engagement in academic dishonesty at least once during their undergraduate years (e.g., McCabe, 1993a; Schmelkin, Gilbert, Spencer, Pincus & Silva, 2008). Further, reports on faculty response to the academic dishonesty problem and perceptions of specific behaviors that constitute dishonesty between faculty and students are oftentimes dissimilar (e.g., Fass, 1998; Nolan, Smith & Dai, 1998; Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2003).

Cheating behavior is not a new phenomenon. Reports on cheating date back as early as the 1920s and have continuously increased since that time (Crittenden, Hanna & Peterson, 2009). Herman (1996) characterized cheating as the “illegitimate child of the educational system, conceived in secrecy and fear, born in the police state of big Education, and raised to haunt its parents, the students, and the educational system” (p. 260). In a society consumed with corporate corruption and deceit, cheating, once considered a taboo issue, is now “an exception to the norm.” As an example, in 2007, Duke University’s School of Business reported that 34 of its first-year MBA students

faced expulsion, suspensions and were awarded failing grades for their participation in a cheating scandal (Boston Globe online, 2007). In the same year, *NY Newsday* (2007) reported that at the University of Virginia, over 100 students in an introductory physics course faced possible expulsion after it was discovered that those students had plagiarized term papers over the course of several semesters. As society follows the current media portrayals of the academic dishonesty “scandal” at Harvard University, it is apparent that cheating is a pervasive and persistent problem that impacts all institutions of higher education (Bolin, 2004).

Highly publicized cases, such as the ones illustrated above, continue to negatively impact institutions of higher education. Not surprisingly, with the increase in reported cases of academic dishonesty, criticisms of the role institutions play in the development of moral, ethical and honest students have become widespread (e.g., Decoo, 2002; McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 2001c). Research reveals that institutions are partially to blame for the prevalence of the academic dishonesty problem (McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 2001c). In today’s competitive education market, institutions face pressures to maintain quality academic standards. As a result, institutions may ignore the existence of cheating or, when recognized, inadequately sanction students in order to maintain a facade of academic excellence. The inability of institutions of higher education to effectively prevent academic dishonesty as well as the use of inappropriate policies and procedures to address the problem when it does occur further leads to a mistrust and lack of faith in the educational system (Singhal, 1982).

However, despite the role that institutions play in the prevalence of academic dishonesty, placing blame does not remedy a problem that has been present since the

early development of colleges and universities. Beginning with the first documented cases of academic dishonesty by Brownell in the 1920's, research on the topic has been ongoing for almost 100 years (e.g., Bowers, 1964; McCabe, 1993a; McCabe & Trevino, 1997c) with an increasing intensity in the field within the last two decades (e.g., Davis, Grover, Becker & McGregor, 1992; Diekhoff et al., 1996). Research studies have documented that during the time frame from the 1940's-1980's reports of cheating on American college campuses increased from 23% to 84% (Ogilby, 1995). Similar increases in reports were observed in Drake's (1941) study of cheating behavior during the 1930-1940's and Goldsen, Rosenberg, William and Suchman's (1960) studies during the late 1940-1950's. Although the number of reported cases varies across research studies, what remains constant is that cheating is a consistent problem that exists within institutions of higher education worldwide (e.g., Caruana, Ramaseshan & Ewing, 2000; Hughes-Christensen & McCabe, 2006).

Increasing concerns regarding the prevalence of academic dishonesty have spawned a significant amount of research on what variables may be associated with engagement in the behavior. However, despite Bowers' (who conducted the first large scale study of academic dishonesty) conclusions regarding the powerful influence of the institution in whether a student engages in academic dishonesty, the body of research conducted since the 1960's has focused heavily on the role of individual and contextual factors (e.g., McCabe, 1993a; McCabe & Trevino, 1997c; McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999b; Murdock & Anderman, 2006). An area of importance that has received limited attention in the research literature pertains to faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty and behaviors identified as academically dishonest.

This area of research is of increasing importance because studies have revealed significant differences in perceptions of the problem from the viewpoints of faculty and students (Nolan et al., 1998). 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 perceive cheating and its seriousness” (p. 189).

Statement of Problem

Promoting academic integrity is central to the mission statements of academic institutions. As such, policies and procedures have been established that require students to exhibit ethical and honest behavior and appropriate conduct at all times (Sileo, 2006a, 2008b). However, despite the seriousness of academic dishonesty, institutions of higher education continue to struggle with developing and implementing strategies to alleviate the problem (McCabe, Butterfield & Trevino, 1999b, 2001c). Thus, addressing factors that contribute to why students may engage in academically dishonest behaviors and institutional responses to the problem when confronted are of great importance in efforts to reduce academic dishonesty from increasing (e.g., Hughes-Christensen & McCabe, 2006; Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2003).

Implications that result from academic dishonesty are tremendous. In a culture that values success and prestige, students are faced with the challenge to perform academically well while resisting the temptation to cheat (McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1996a, 1999b). College students, who may otherwise be honest, now observe classmates engaging in academically dishonest behaviors that are either not disciplined appropriately by the institution or go unreported by faculty. However, research reveals that faculty who ignore the existence of cheating not only affects student perceptions of

academic integrity within the classroom environment but also negatively impacts students' perceptions of the acceptance of academic dishonesty at their respective institutions (e.g., Gehring & Pavela, 1994, Nuss, 1984). Thus, college students who observe this dishonest behavior may begin to rationalize their own dishonest behavior as a means to level the playing field or as a justification to stay competitive (e.g., Crittenden et al., 2009; Keith-Spiegel & Whitley, 2001; Stephens, 2005; Stossel, 2004).

This mindset or lack of remorse becomes a persistent problem that does not end when students graduate from college. With the collapse of the housing market, corporate bankruptcy proceedings, and excessive spending of top executives, research indicates that dishonest behaviors exhibited by students may continue within the workplace (e.g., Harding, Carpenter, Finelli & Passow, 2004; McCabe & Trevino, 1995b). Research reveals that the exhibition of unethical and dishonest behavior by college students does not end upon receipt of the degree but instead, those attitudes and behaviors are brought with them into the workplace (Rakovski & Levy, 2007). According to Sims (1993), there exists a positive correlation between students who engage in academic dishonesty in college and the level of dishonesty exhibited in the workplace. Furthermore, the researcher indicated that students' engagement in dishonest behaviors were not only a function of the situational attributes of the working environment but also a function of generational attitudes and perceptions about dishonesty (Sims, 1993).

Academic dishonesty creates a disruption in the cooperative nature of higher education where students, faculty and administrators work collaboratively to help students reach degree attainment (Keith-Spiegel & Whitley, 2001). However, when dishonesty occurs, it creates a level of distrust among those involved in the adjudication

process. Although academic dishonesty is a problem that often eludes a universal solution, according to Kohn (2007a), if the purpose of the research on academic dishonesty is to identify and prevent the problem, then the variable(s) that could help us understand and make sense of why cheating occurs is being neglected. Unfortunately, in an era of technology, collaborative learning and companies whose purpose is to manufacture and sell research papers, the boundary between honest and dishonest student behavior has blurred, resulting in differences in perception of the problem by many (Higbee & Thomas, 2002).

Although there are studies that examine perceptions, attitudes and belief systems in relation to academic dishonesty, little research has examined the perceptions of academic dishonesty held by faculty and students (Volpe, Davidson & Bell, 2008). Research studies examining perceptions of academic dishonesty have revealed that how an individual views the actions of others is important in comparing the individual's own mindset when determining if an action is appropriate (McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Nolan et al., 1998). Thus, students learn about their own attitudes and perceptions by comparing themselves to what they observe in their interaction with faculty. However, because faculty and students' interpretation and understanding of events related to academic dishonesty are oftentimes influenced by personal experiences and expectations, a conflict may arise in how each group perceives, understands and responds to the severity of the dishonest act (e.g., Gerdeman, 2000; Graham, Monday, O'Brien & Steffen, 1994; Volpe et al., 2008). As an example, research reveals that when presented with a cheating dilemma, faculty perceptions of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors

was characterized as being more negative than students' perceptions of the same behavior (Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2003)

Faculty and students share the responsibility of maintaining a culture of integrity and as such, research needs to focus on examining both groups collectively in efforts to find solutions to address the academic dishonesty problem. Yet, although faculty and students both perceive academic dishonesty as a critical concern on college campuses, there is limited research that addresses the similarities and/or differences in perceptions of academic dishonesty held by both groups (Carter & Punyanunt-Carte, 2006). Thus, this study attempted to provide an understanding of faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty. In efforts to reduce the prevalence of academic dishonesty, the findings gathered from this study can be used to provide specific recommendations for faculty, students and administrators in institutions of higher education. Further, the results of this study can contribute to the growing body of research on academic dishonesty and on factors such as perceptions which may influence students' inclination to engage in academically dishonest behaviors and impact the manner in which institutions respond to the problem.

Purpose of the Study

The question arises as to why understanding perceptions of academic dishonesty amongst faculty and students is of great importance. According to Spaulding (2009), the power of perceptions to influence action is a strong phenomenon. Perceptions provide a reflection of the beliefs that individuals have about an event, and in this case, faculty and students beliefs about academically dishonest behaviors which further leads to action on the part of that individual (Pajares, 1996). According to Ashworth and Bannister (1977),

by bringing awareness to differences in perceptions, faculty are provided with a better understanding of how to address the problem at the institutional level and can understand how differences in their perceptions of academic dishonesty can impact student behavior. Without this understanding, it becomes difficult for a university to implement solutions that can adequately address the problem (Spaulding, 2009).

Perceptions of an event have a profound influence on an individual's reaction and course of action (Spaulding, 2009). Thus, the purpose of this research study was to examine faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty. As indicated previously, studies on academic dishonesty have focused on individual, situational and contextual characteristics of students who engage in cheating but relatively few studies have examined faculty perceptions and student perceptions of dishonesty. This study was designed to address perceived gaps in the existing body of knowledge regarding factors that may influence perceptions about and engagement in academically dishonest behaviors. Therefore, knowing what behaviors faculty and students perceive as dishonest and the frequency of student engagement in behaviors deemed academically dishonest can help colleges and universities find effective solutions to address dishonesty at an institutional level.

Research Questions

In this research study, a questionnaire was administered to undergraduate students and faculty at a large, public Midwestern institution. For the purpose of the study, the following research questions were investigated.

Research Question One: What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty?

Research Question Two: What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions of the frequency in which students engage in behaviors classified/categorized as academically dishonest?

Research Question Three: What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions regarding the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures that address academic dishonesty?

In order to answer the research questions listed above, data was collected from a random sample of undergraduate students and faculty who primarily teach undergraduate courses at a large public Midwestern institution. Student perceptions and faculty perceptions were the independent variable of interest in this study and were further investigated on the three dependent variables of interest: general views regarding academic dishonesty, frequency in which students engage in academic dishonesty, and the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures to address dishonesty.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses guided the research study as well as the research design and methodology that followed.

Hypothesis One: Faculty and students will exhibit similarities within their perceptions of academic dishonesty.

Hypothesis Two: Students will admit to engagement in behaviors that can be classified/categorized as academically dishonest in higher frequency than faculty perceptions of that engagement.

Hypothesis Three: Faculty and students will exhibit similarities within their perceptions regarding the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures that address academic dishonesty.

Significance of the Study

Although the academic dishonesty epidemic is not a new phenomenon, the alarming rates of increase illustrate the need for institutions to find more effective ways to address the problem. Thus, there are several significant implications posed by the research study. The results of the research study can provide insights into what specific behaviors are seen as academically dishonest and the severity of those behaviors. For example, research indicates that although there is agreement by faculty and students that cheating on exams is a severe form of academic dishonesty, those perceptions differ for behaviors such as unauthorized collaboration on assignments (Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2003). With this knowledge, individual institutions can promote a better understanding of their institution's definition of academic dishonesty and educate the campus community on specific behaviors deemed as dishonest. Secondly, from an institutional perspective is the idea of promoting a culture of integrity that involves the entire campus community. Studies indicate that if students feel connected to an institution and have personal vested relationships with faculty, then they are less likely to engage in academic dishonesty (Volpe et al., 2008). Further, faculty must also have a sense of connectedness to their respective institution as research reveals that faculty participation in institutional efforts to deter academic dishonesty can ultimately change the culture of a campus (Gallant & Drinan, 2006). Thirdly, the findings of the research study can contribute on an academic level by examining faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty.

Prevalent in the research literature are studies that have examined individual and contextual variables related to academic dishonesty. However, limited research has examined differences and/or similarities within faculty perceptions and student perceptions. Thus, the more information that is found in the research literature that addresses determinants for students' inclination to engage in dishonesty, the better prepared an academic institution can become in combating and effectively addressing the problem.

Delimitations

There were several delimitations that limited the scope and defined the boundaries of this study. The following delimitations were applicable to this study:

- 1) The study was conducted at a specific campus within a four campus university system. The specific institution was chosen due to the accessibility of a large student and faculty sampling population in a geographically convenient location.
- 2) The participants were selected during the Fall 2011 semester. A random sampling procedure through the Institutional Research Office of the institution under study was utilized to obtain a population that was diverse and representative of both the undergraduate student and faculty bodies of the institution.
- 3) The participants in this study volunteered to participate. There was no compensation and/or incentives provided to those who completed the survey. Additionally, participants were informed that they had the right to refuse participation which may have resulted in potential participants opting out of the research study and/or not completing the survey in its entirety.

Limitations

There were several limitations of the research study that must be considered in order to gain a full understanding of the context of the findings and implications.

- 1) The study was designed to examine a specific large, public research institution located in a geographical “mid-western” state. Thus, the findings of the study should not be generalized to other types of educational institutions (i.e. private, liberal arts, for-profit) nor similar institutions throughout the United States.
- 2) The population for this study consisted of all classifications of undergraduate students. Students classified as “graduate” and students under the age of 18 were excluded during the random sampling procedure employed by the Institutional Research Office. Secondly, the faculty population was limited to tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track professors that primarily teach undergraduate courses. Because of this, it would be inappropriate to generalize the results to all student populations and to faculty members who may only teach graduate courses.
- 3) The purpose of this study was to examine student perceptions and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty and behaviors identified as academically dishonest. As such, data was collected utilizing an online, electronically submitted survey instrument. Students and faculty may have declined to participate in the study, yielding responses that may not adequately reflect a representative sampling of the population. Further, due to the nature of the topic, students and faculty participants may have been reluctant to share personal information and/or their experiences regarding academic dishonesty at the institution under study.

Assumptions

The study was based on several assumptions related to the design methodology and the behavior and perceptions of the participants.

- 1) It was assumed that participants would answer the survey questions in an open and honest manner to the best of their abilities.
- 2) It was assumed that participants would be able to comprehend the questions contained in the survey instruments. The particular instruments were selected for inclusion due to the wording of each question, which could be easily understood by participants and the applicability of surveys to the institution under study.
- 3) It was assumed that the participants selected for the study would be representative of the undergraduate and faculty populations of the institution under study. Likewise, a random selection of the participants was employed to ensure representation of students and faculty across disciplines and majors.

Definitions

A pressing concern that emerges from the research on academic dishonesty is in the general lack of knowledge about academic dishonesty in the campus community and the inconsistencies in defining and dealing with academically dishonest behaviors (Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003). Although attempts have been made to define academic dishonesty, the definitions are oftentimes broad and ambiguous (e.g., Gehring & Pavela, 1994; Maramark & Maline, 1993). For the purpose of this study, the definitions were derived from the Student Standard of Conduct of the institution under study.

Academic Dishonesty is “any form of cheating, plagiarism or sabotage which results in students giving or receiving unauthorized assistance or receiving credit for

work which is not their own” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.010 Standard of Conduct, 2011, p. 1).

Cheating is the “(a) use of any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes, tests, or examinations; (b) dependence upon the aid of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments; (c) acquisition or possession without permission of tests or other academic material belonging to a member of the University faculty or staff; (d) knowingly providing any assistance to another student on quizzes, tests, or examinations” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.010 Standard of Conduct, 2011, p. 1).

Non-Tenure Track Faculty are “(1) full-time, ranked, non-regular faculty (non-tenure track (NTT) faculty); (2) full-time, unranked, non-regular faculty; and (3) part-time, non-regular faculty (adjunct faculty)” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 310.035 Non-Tenure Track Faculty, 2011, p. 2).

Plagiarism is the “(a) use by paraphrase or direct quotation of the published or unpublished work of another person without fully and properly crediting the author with footnotes, citations, or bibliographical reference; (b) unacknowledged use of material prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic materials; (c) unacknowledged use of original work/material that has been produced through collaboration with others without the release in writing from collaborators” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.010 Standard of Conduct, 2011, p. 1).

Regular Faculty are “tenured and tenure track faculty, or the traditional faculty of the institution” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 2011).

Sanctions: “imposed upon any student found to have violated the Student Conduct Code” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.020 Rules of Procedures in Student Conduct Matters, 2011, p. 2).

Student is “a person having once been admitted to the University who has not completed a course of study and who intends to or does continue a course of study in or through one of the campuses of the University” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.020 Rules of Procedures in Student Conduct Matters, 2011, p.1).

Summary and Overview of Remaining Chapters

The dissertation is divided into five chapters and each section describes the contents of the chapter. Each chapter begins with an introductory section which identifies the primary function and purpose of the chapter.

Chapter One provided an introduction of the research project, including an overview of the topic of academic dishonesty. An identification of the topic and its impact on higher education and society as a whole provides the reader with the background of the problem and the rationale of the study. In addition, a description of the purpose of the study, significance, the research questions, brief design description, key definitions, limitations and boundaries of the study were introduced.

Chapter two provides an examination of the applicable body of research literature related to academic dishonesty and variables that may influence students’ decisions to engage in academic dishonesty. The chapter is divided into research on cheating behaviors, individual, motivational and contextual factors that influence academic dishonesty and research related to the focus of the study, perceptions of academic

dishonesty and specific cheating behaviors as well as the theoretical framework for the study.

Chapter three describes the methodology of the study, the process of data collection and the data analysis techniques utilized in the study. The chapter also describes the survey instruments, the reliability and validity of those instruments as well as the researcher's rationale for utilizing those specific measures.

Chapter four provides an overview of the results obtained at the conclusion of the study. The research questions will be examined in relation to the data results collected and a description of that data will be discussed in great length.

In the final chapter, Chapter 5, the conclusion, implications, key findings and recommendations for future research on the topic of academic dishonesty will be discussed. Concluding thoughts and observations will be presented in relation to the research study and the results of the study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In order to create a culture of integrity, faculty, students and administrators must be engaged in the process (Hendershott, Drinon & Cross, 2000). However, in discussions of academic integrity, research reveals that differences in definitions of behaviors classified as academically dishonest and perceptions of the severity of those behaviors can hinder the progression of an institution to effectively address the problem (e.g., Hudd, Apgar, Bronson & Lee, 2009; Pincus & Schmelin, 2003). Further, the disparities in understanding the complexity of academic dishonesty may lead to a crisis within institutions in which a “we” versus “them” mentality may arise, thus serving as a major roadblock in the creation of an institutional culture of acceptable standards of integrity (Hudd et al., 2009). Thus, the purpose of this research study was to examine underlying perceptions that are held by faculty and students about academic dishonesty and to gain a better understanding of those perceptions in efforts to provide solutions to effectively address the problem at an institutional and academic level.

Bisping, Hilde, and Roskelley (2008) indicate that in reviewing the research literature on academic dishonesty, the problem is not only widely studied by researchers but also widely practiced by students. Although estimates on the number of students who admit to cheating varies across studies, research indicates that 80% of students admit to cheating at least once during their college years, 95% of students indicate that they were not caught, while 90% of students believe that individuals found guilty of cheating are not adequately disciplined by their respective institution (e.g., Iyer & Eastman, 2006;

Johnson & Martin, 2005). Thus, as concerns for the academic dishonesty problem increase, so has the amount of research on the topic.

Efforts to address academic dishonesty can be seen within research from psychological perspectives, criminological approaches, and organizational research to the fields of education, philosophy and studies on moral judgment and reasoning (e.g., Ercegovic & Richardson, 2004; Gallant & Drinan, 2006; Kibler, Nuss, Paterson & Pavela, 1988; Kohlberg, 1976b; Michaels & Mieth, 1989). Further researchers have attempted to narrow the scope of research on dishonesty by examining specific behaviors identified as academically dishonest, to research on the prevalence of the problem and factors that may influence academic dishonesty (e.g., Anderman & Murdock, 2007; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2006; Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003).

This chapter provides an overview of research on academic dishonesty, characteristics of students who engage in academic dishonesty, as well as examines the research literature on student perceptions and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty. Further, research on moral development and reasoning and how the theory can be utilized to understand perceptions of academic dishonesty will be explored.

Research on Academic Dishonesty

Prevalence

In reviewing the research literature on academic dishonesty, a number of studies have been conducted on the pervasiveness of the problem (e.g., Desruisseaux, 1999; Jendrek, 1992). Studies have consistently demonstrated that a disturbing number of students engage in behaviors identified as academically dishonest and have been for decades (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2006). Further, reports on academically dishonest

behaviors indicate that cases are now reaching epidemic proportions (Desruisseaux, 1999). Estimates on the prevalence of the problem range from one-half to two-thirds of students who admit to engaging in academic dishonesty during their academic career (e.g., Haines, Dierkhoff, LaBeff, & Clark, 1986; Tang & Zuo, 1997). Comparable reports on the prevalence of the problem show a variance of 40-90% of students who admit to engaging in academically dishonest behaviors at least once during their undergraduate years (Jendrek, 1992).

Variations in the research on the prevalence of the problem have created concern amongst researchers leading some to ponder whether actual reports are increasing (Brown & Emmett, 2001). To address the disparity in the research, attempts to explain the differences have focused on the level of academic dishonesty to operational definitions of cheating to examining the difficulties in the comparison rates across research studies (e.g., Baird, 1980; Cole & McCabe, 1996; McCabe, 1993a; McCabe & Bowers, 1996; Spiller & Crown, 1995).

Ambiguity in Definitions

Researchers indicate that within higher education there is a lack of knowledge about academic dishonesty (Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003). A major component is in the lack of a clear definition of academic dishonesty (Nuss, 1984). In reviewing the literature on academic dishonesty, researchers differ in their opinions as to what behaviors constitute or characterize dishonesty (e.g., Carpenter, Harding & Finelli, 2006; Cizek, 2003b; Hoff, 2000; Howard & Davies, 2009). A number of research studies refer only to the definition of cheating, a term that encompasses different interpretations by different individuals (e.g., Hoff, 2000; McCabe & Trevino, 1993a). According to Hoff (2000),

oftentimes individuals define cheating based on a standard or an “I know it when I see it” ideology. However, cheating only represents one form of academic dishonesty (e.g., Carpenter et al., 2006; Pavela, 1978).

Cheating is defined as the act of being dishonest or deceitful (cheat, 2009). An alternative definition of cheating includes three categories: (1) “giving, taking, or receiving information”; (2) “using any prohibited materials”; and (3) “capitalizing on the weaknesses of persons, procedures, or processes to gain an advantage” on academic work (Cizek, 2003b, p. 42). Although the second definition encompasses a broader scope than the dictionary definition of the term, the literature indicates that the term reflects the language of most institutional academic dishonesty policies (Garavalia, Olson, Russell, & Christensen, 2001).

In addition to cheating, academic dishonesty may also involve unintentional violations that may be a result of a student’s lack of knowledge about the behavior (Broeckelman-Post, 2008). Similar to cheating, definitions of plagiarism range from the “wrongful appropriation and publishing of one’s own, the ideas or expressions of another” (plagiarism, 2009) to “a writer who fails to give appropriate acknowledgement when repeating another’s wording or particularly apt term, paraphrasing another’s argument, or presenting another’s line of thinking” (MLA Handbook for Writers, 2009). Unfortunately, the term plagiarism is oftentimes perceived as a black and white issue similar to behaviors identified as cheating. According to Howard and Davies (2009), an initial discussion of plagiarism usually occurs at the beginning of a course, with an assumption made by faculty that students understand the definition and provide no additional information regarding plagiarism until a student has been found guilty of the

violation. However, research indicates that inadequate modeling by faculty members and an overall lack of knowledge by students may lead to unintentional acts of plagiarism (e.g., Marsh, Landau & Hicks, 1997; Park, 2003; Roig, 1997a, 1999b; Walker, 2008).

Consistent with the research on definitions of cheating and plagiarism, a universally accepted definition of “academic dishonesty” was not found in the literature (e.g., Gehring & Pavela, 1994; Ikupa, 1997; Kibler et al., 1988; Pavela, 1978). A number of researchers have defined academic dishonesty as any form of cheating and/or plagiarism that involves the process of students giving or receiving unauthorized assistance or receiving credit for work that is not of their own accord (Kibler et al., 1988).

Alternatively, academic dishonesty has been defined as illegal or unethical behavior that occurs during the process of examining an individual’s ability or knowledge (Ikupa, 1997). Further, Gehring and Pavela (1994) define academic dishonesty as an intentional act of fraud in which students take credit for the work of an individual without attribution or utilize unauthorized information in the completion of an academic exercise. For the purpose of this study, academic dishonesty is defined as “any form of cheating, plagiarism or sabotage which results in students giving or receiving unauthorized assistance or receiving credit for work which is not their own” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.010 Standard of Conduct, 2011, p. 1).

Ambiguity in Academically Dishonest Behaviors

There is agreement in the literature that engaging in academically dishonest behaviors is unethical. However, with differences in definitions of academic dishonesty, confusion and miscommunication on what types of behaviors constitute dishonesty can arise (Barnett & Dalton, 1981). In response, Kohn (2008b) indicates that a deep analysis

of academically dishonest behaviors may lead to an investigation of not only structures or situations that may give rise to dishonesty but also the process in which we determine what behaviors are classified as dishonest.

The degree of ambiguity in behaviors that constitute dishonesty has been identified in several research studies (e.g., Barnett & Dalton, 1981; Lambert, Ellen & Taylor, 2003; Pavela, 1978). According to Pavela (1978), there are four general areas that comprise academically dishonest behaviors:

- 1) cheating by using unauthorized materials on any academic activity, such as an assignment, test, etc.;
- 2) fabrication of information, references, or results;
- 3) plagiarism; and
- 4) helping other students engage in academic dishonesty (i.e., facilitating), such as allowing other students to copy their work, maintaining test banks, memorizing questions on a quiz, etc. (p. 45)

This lack of consistent knowledge on behaviors identified as being academically dishonest has been furthered studied in research examining students' inclination to engage in academic dishonesty (e.g., Burrus, McGoldrick & Schuhmann, 2007; Franklyn-Stokes & Newstead, 1995). Studies indicate that the discrepancy in identifying specific academically dishonest behaviors adversely affects students' inclination to engage in dishonesty. Franklyn-Stokes and Newstead (1995) found an inverse relationship between the perception of a behavior as academically dishonest and the increased likelihood that students would engage in that behavior. The researchers concluded that presenting a clear and consistent definition of acceptable behaviors to students would decrease the likelihood that students would engage in dishonest behaviors.

In a study of 384 students at two institutions, one with a formal integrated honor system, researchers examined the relationship between clear definitions of behaviors identified as academically dishonest and students' inclination to engage in dishonesty (Burrus et al., 2007). Overall, the researchers found that students' understanding of behaviors regarded as academically dishonest were incomplete, that students reported significantly more cheating behavior when a formal definition was provided and that surveys that do not provide a clear definition of behaviors identified as academically dishonest may lead to an underreporting of such behavior.

Although copying and pasting information, cheating on examinations, and forging university documents are seen as obvious forms of academic dishonesty, unauthorized collaboration on assignments and reusing research papers are questionable behaviors that bring great debate amongst faculty, students and administrators (Pinkus & Schmelkin, 2003). Kohn (2008b) indicated that cases regarded as cheating may be in actuality a failure to abide by arbitrary institutional procedures that may be difficult for students to distinguish. As an example, the researcher provided the case at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the early 1990's. In that case, 70 students were found guilty of cheating because they collaborated on individual work with the rationale being to help each student remain in good academic standing. Unfortunately, although the students believed that their collaboration was permitted, the act was perceived as dishonest by the faculty and administrators of the institution resulting in disciplinary action being taken against the students (Kohn, 2008b).

However, even when a clear definition of academic dishonesty and specific behaviors characterized as academically dishonest are identified by the institution, some

students will still fail to consider the full range of behaviors that constitute dishonesty (Burrus et al., 2007). For the purpose of this study, the definitions of academic dishonesty and the specific behaviors associated with academic dishonesty are taken from the Collected Rules and Regulations of the institution under study and are listed in *Appendix G*.

Cheating Methods

In order to adequately address behaviors identified as academically dishonest, there exists a need to understand the modes of operation or methods that students use to engage in academic dishonesty (Davis et al., 1992). Research indicates that students have traded the cheating techniques of yesterday such as writing answers on body parts and whispering answers from person-to-person to more sophisticated methods such as cell phones, mp3 players, invisible ink pens, water bottles and even M & M's, where the colors of the candy represent an answer on multiple choice exams (e.g., Garavalia et al., 2001; Jones, 2007). To provide an overview of cheating methods, Cizek (1999a) developed a taxonomy of cheating techniques, in which the researcher identified approximately 60 methods by which students engage in academic dishonesty and further divided the methods into three categories: (1) giving, taking or receiving information, (2) using forbidden materials and (3) taking advantage of the testing process. Similarly, in a study conducted by Davis et al. (1992), it was found that although 80% of the students surveyed admitted to cheating by observing another student's exam or utilizing crib notes, 20% provided alternative "food for thought" techniques such as tape recorded answers, reflecting a culture that has adapted methods to engage in dishonesty.

Hetherington and Feldman (1964) defined four distinctive cheating methods: individualistic-planned, individualistic-opportunistic, social-active and social passive. According to the researchers, individualistic-planned behavior is characterized by the utilization of crib notes during an exam in comparison to individualistic-opportunistic behavior which is characterized as changing answers when self-grading an assignment or utilizing information when a professor leaves the classroom. On the other hand, social-active cheating is characterized as copying information from another individual's work in comparison to social-passive behavior which occurs when a student allows another individual to copy from his or her own work.

In their study of cheating behavior amongst college students, Hetherington and Feldman found that 59% of student participants admitted to exhibiting one of the four methods identified by the researchers. Additionally, 41% of the student participants admitted to individualistic-opportunistic behavior, 27% of the participants admitted to individualistic-planned behavior, 16% admitted to social-active behavior and 14% of the student participants admitted to engaging in social-passive cheating behaviors (Hetherington & Feldman, 1964). With current research focusing on cheating methods and the utilization of online resources, understanding the different methods by which students engage in dishonesty is also important in finding ways to counteract the behavior (e.g., Baird, 1980; Garavalia et al., 2001; Sileo, 2008b).

Characteristics of Students Who Engage in Academically Dishonest Behaviors

In reviewing the research literature on academic dishonesty, a considerable amount of research has been conducted to understand contributing factors that may influence students' engagement in academically dishonest behavior (e.g., Baird, 1980;

Buckley, Wiese & Harvey, 1998; Graham et al., 1994; McCabe & Trevino, 1997c; Williams & Hosek, 2003). According to Anderman and Murdock (2007), cheating involves a “diverse array of psychological phenomena, including learning, development and motivation” (p. 2). Further, in regards to learning outcomes, cheating is a cognitive shortcut that is based on the students’ level of cognition in which students engage in the behavior because either they do not know how to effectively utilize learning strategies or because there is no desire to invest in the utilization of those strategies (Anderman & Murdock, 2007). In the next section, a review of research on motivational attributes, the diminishing sense of academic integrity, lack of social control and deviant behavior, demographic characteristics and contextual factors that may influence student engagement in academic dishonesty will be explored.

Motivational Factors

Research on factors that may influence a student’s decision to engage in academic dishonesty have examined the impact of motivational factors. Research supports the ideology that students who have a desire to learn are less likely to engage in academically dishonest behaviors than students who are highly focused on extrinsic factors such as grades or peer acceptance (Anderman & Murdock, 2007). In this section, research on four motivational factors: decision-making, self-efficacy, perceived opportunity and grades will be examined.

Decision-making. A student’s decision to cheat is not an impulsive act but rather a conscious decision in which the student weighs the benefits of cheating against the consequences of being caught (Williams & Hosek, 2003). During the decision making process, students externalize their rationale for cheating to outside forces such as the

faculty member or the classroom environment instead of internalizing their own actions and behaviors (Forsyth, Pope & McMillan, 1985). Theories such as attribution theory, derived from the social psychology literature, have been utilized by motivational theorists to explore why individuals “attribute” causes to their behaviors and how this cognitive perception can impact their motivation to commit acts of academic dishonesty (Williams & Hosek, 2003).

Self-efficacy. Self-efficacy or the ability of an individual to execute actions required to bring about a particular result has been identified as a motivational factor associated with engagement in behaviors identified as academically dishonest (Bandura, 1986). Students who exhibit higher levels of academic self-efficacy are more confident within their own abilities to perform a task and can persist more effectively when confronted with a difficult situation. On the other hand, students who are less confident in their abilities to be successful are more likely to engage in dishonesty (Pajares, 1996). Further, studies on self-efficacy suggest that students cheat more frequently when there is evidence to support a fear of failure, when there is social isolation, test anxiety, procrastination and when there is an overwhelming sense of worry about one’s own academic performance (e.g., Calabrese & Cochran, 1990; Malinowski & Smith, 1985; Roig & DeTommaso, 1995).

Perceived opportunity. Buckley et al. (1998) indicated that the most effective predictors of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors are the probability of being caught and penalized, possession of high hostility or aggression characteristics, and being a male student. Thus, given the opportunity to cheat, students will behave according to the costs and benefits associated with the behavior similar to an individual

weighing the pros or cons of committing a crime (Mustine & Tewksbury, 2005).

Unfortunately, for some students the attraction of significant rewards is worth the risk of engaging in academic dishonesty. Further, according to Landon (1999) “while there are both individual and situational determinants of academic dishonesty, the historical psychological literature has documented that dishonesty is mostly a function of opportunity . . . rather than a consistency of personality” (p. 441).

Brown (1995) indicated that the likelihood of not being caught may be a motivating factor for students to commit acts of academic dishonesty. In a study of perceived opportunity and severity of punishment, Michaels and Miethe (1989) found that cheating varied with the extent in which students’ perception of the gains of cheating exceeded the consequences of being caught. Research reveals that even when students are aware that consequences of being caught exist, they have reported that the perceptions of those consequences are relatively low (Whitley, 1998). This may be due in part to research that indicates that although student self-reports of engagement in academic dishonesty range from 75-87%, the detection and reporting rates for academically dishonest behaviors are as low as 1.3% (e.g., Baird, 1980; Haines et al., 1986).

Grades. The desire to make good grades has been of interest in research studies conducted on students’ inclination to engage in academically dishonest behaviors (Graham et al., 1994). Stress and pressures associated with making good grades have been identified in research as two key determinants of academic dishonesty (Drake, 1941). According to Keller (1976), 69% of students indicated that pressure to obtain good grades was the major reason for why they engaged in academic dishonesty. Similar to the work by Keller, studies have reported that the desire to improve grades as well as a lack

of time management are the most common motivators for engagement in academically dishonest behaviors (e.g., Davis & Ludvigson, 1995; Partello, 1993). Further, in reviewing research conducted over the last ten to fifteen years, studies consistently yielded similar results regarding grades as the single most important motivator to engagement in academic dishonesty (e.g., Barnett & Dalton, 1981; Davis & Ludvigson, 1995; Partello, 1993).

Diminishing Sense of Integrity

Educating students about academic integrity requires individual and collective efforts by educational institutions (Academic Achievement Center, nd). However with the increase in reports of academic misconduct, students are becoming desensitized to the cultural norm of institutions in promoting academic integrity (Harding et al., 2004). An emerging body of research is examining what Davis et al. (1992) identified as a diminishing sense of academic integrity. This body of research reveals that the diminishing sense of academic integrity in institutions of higher education may be a strong motive behind why students not only engage in academic dishonesty but also are not afraid of the consequences associated with being caught (Pullen, Ortloff, Casey & Payne, 2000). According to Pullen et al. (2000), the diminishing sense of academic integrity is affected by “causal factors that run the gamut from large classrooms, to impersonal relationships with professors, to a culture that appears to accept cheating readily as a normal part of life” (p. 616). This information is consistent with research that suggests students are more likely to engage in academically dishonest behaviors if they feel detached from the institution or if there is a lack of community involvement within the institution (e.g., Buckley et al., 1998; Pulvers & Diekhoff, 1999).

Additional research on the diminishing sense of academic integrity suggests that academic dishonesty may be reinforced within the campus community with punishments for students found guilty of dishonesty being non-existent or inadequate (Davis et al., 1992). Haines et al. (1986) have identified the concept of “neutralizing attitude” which is characterized by students’ justification of their engagement in cheating behavior by placing blame towards others such as the institution’s failure to adequately discipline students found guilty of dishonesty and not attributing the blame to themselves. In self-reports conducted by Corradini Goodwin (2007), students indicated that cheating behavior is acceptable in the campus community, commonplace amongst peers and inadequately addressed by the institution. Further, Singhal (1982) criticizes the role of educational institutions by indicating that institutions do not adequately pay attention to cheating behavior, do not develop appropriate procedures to deal with academic dishonesty when it occurs and may be perpetuating the idea that dishonest student behavior is tolerated within the institution.

Lack of Self-Control and Deviant Behavior

If students believe that they will not be punished for their dishonest actions then an increase in the engagement of academically dishonest behaviors will occur (Landon, 1999). Individuals who engage in academically dishonest behavior seek to obtain a rewarding outcome that is motivated by external behaviors and intrinsic desires to achieve despite the risk of detection and consequences similar to engagement in deviant behavior (Micheals & Mieth, 1989). In reviews of general crime theories, characteristics such as lack of self-control and perceived opportunity are two potential causes for not only engagement in academically dishonest behaviors but also for deviant behaviors.

Individuals who have a lack of self-control are predisposed to engage in deviant behaviors and are unable to resist the temptation to be dishonest (Arneklev, Grasmick, Tittle, & Bursik, 1993). Bolin (2004) examined academic dishonesty within the context of deviant behavior and delinquency and hypothesized that the relationship between self-control and perceived opportunity to engage in academic dishonesty was consistent with research on deviant acts. What the researcher found is that the attitude that a student exhibits towards academic dishonesty combined with levels of low self-control played a significant role in engagement in academically dishonest behaviors.

Individual/Demographic factors

Although research on academic dishonesty is relatively new, a considerable number of studies have examined individual and demographic factors such as age, gender and race/ethnicity as factors that may impact student's inclination to engage in academically dishonest behaviors (McCabe et al., 2001c). In this section, an overview of research on individual characteristics will be examined.

Age. In studies examining the relationship between individual differences, demographic characteristics and academic dishonesty, most studies indicate that cheating practices are equally distributed amongst college students of different age groups, socio-economic status and gender (Tang & Zuo, 1997). Research studies indicate that younger and more immature students commit academic dishonest behaviors more so than older, more mature students (e.g., McCabe & Trevino, 1997c; Park, 2003). Moreover, Franklyn-Stokes and Newstead's (1995) comparison of upper level and lower level undergraduate students found that cheating behavior actually declined with age. Although there is a body of research that indicates that there is a connection between age and cheating

behavior, there are a number of studies that indicate that additional variables may account for the connection (Miller, Murdock, Anderman, & Poindexter, 2007).

Gender. A number of studies have examined the role of gender and academic dishonesty (e.g., Davis et al., 1992; McCabe, 2001c; McCabe & Trevino, 1997c; Newstead, Franklyn-Stokes, & Armstead, 1996). In relation to gender, studies have consistently concluded that a correlation exists between academic dishonesty and male students (McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999b), although there is disagreement with this finding (e.g., Fischer, 1970; Houston, 1977; Jacobson, Berger & Millham, 1970). McCabe and Trevino (1997c) indicated that male students are slightly more likely than females to commit an act of academic dishonesty. Buckley et al. (1998) concurred with previous research and found that men had a higher probability of engaging in unethical behavior than women. Men typically possess lower levels of self-control than women which can make them more likely to engage in academic dishonesty (Tibbetts, 1999). On the other hand, women exhibit higher levels of anticipated shame than men which may make them less likely to commit an act of academic dishonesty. However, Calabrese and Cochran (1990) indicated that females may admit to engagement in academically dishonest behaviors as much as their male counterparts especially when the behavior is for altruistic reasons or when work is collaborative in nature (McCabe & Trevino, 1997c).

Race/ethnicity. Studies addressing cultural characteristics attempt to create what researchers define as a “portrait of a cheater” (Miller et al., 2007, p. 13). Cheating is a universal epidemic that occurs across educational institutions, although perceptions of the severity of the epidemic, behaviors that are specific to cheating and the consequences

associated with being caught varies according to cultural and societal differences (Miller et al., 2007). Calabrese and Cochran (1990) found that Caucasian students were more likely to engage in cheating behaviors than their Hispanic or Asian counterparts.

However, in a research study examining race and perceptions amongst Caucasian and African American students, the study found no significant differences in perceptions of academically dishonest behavior between the two groups (Sutton & Huba, 1995).

A growing body of research has focused on comparing the frequency of engagement in academic dishonesty amongst international and American students. Studies comparing international and American student populations have found significant differences in attitudes, perceptions, and frequency of engagement in academic dishonesty (e.g., Hughes-Christensen & McCabe, 2008d; Luptan, Chapman & Weiss, 2000). In a study of international students, Williams and Hosek (2003) concluded that although the population only represented 10% of the institution's total population, the students accounted for 47.2% of the reported dishonesty cases. Further, in a cross-cultural comparison study of dishonesty amongst American and Australian students, Davis, Noble, Zak and Dreyer (1992) found that American students exhibited higher levels of dishonesty than their Australian counterparts. The researchers hypothesized that the differences in engagement in academically dishonest behaviors reflected cultural differences of value learning versus the reward of grade attainment.

Contextual/Situational factors

A number of large, multi-institutional studies have documented that contextual or situational factors such as peer behavior and fraternity/sorority membership have a profound influence on students' inclination to engage in academic dishonesty (e.g.,

Bowers, 1964; McCabe & Trevino, 1993a, 1997c; Roig & Ballew, 1994; Storch & Storch, 2002).

Peers. Although research indicates that contextual or situational factors may have a profound impact on college students' intentions to commit acts of academic dishonesty, relatively few studies have examined their association (Storch & Storch, 2002). The pivotal study on contextual factors was conducted by McCabe and Trevino during the early 1990's. McCabe and Trevino (1993a) surveyed more than 6,000 students at 31 institutions to investigate institutional variables that influence cheating behaviors. Based on the earlier work of Bowers (1964), the researchers investigated variables such as peer behavior, which was attributed to being the most significant relationship factor associated with student cheating behavior (McCabe & Trevino, 1993a). According to the researchers,

the strong influence of peers' behavior may suggest that academic dishonesty not only is learned from observing the behavior of peers, but that peers;' behavior provides a kind of normative support for cheating... Thus cheating may come to be viewed as an acceptable way of getting and staying ahead. (p.533)

What the researchers concluded is that student perceptions of dishonesty are greatly influenced by the attitudes of their peer groups (McCabe & Trevino, 1993a). Students who observe their peers engage in academic dishonesty are in turn more likely to engage in academically dishonest behaviors (e.g., McCabe, 1997b; McCabe & Trevino, 1993a, 1997c). In a study conducted by Chapman, Davis, Toy and Wright (2004), the researchers' findings were consistent with McCabe and Trevino (1993a, 1997c). The researchers reported that 75% of students indicated that they were more likely to engage

in academic dishonesty with a friend compared to 45% who indicated they would cheat with an acquaintance.

In a follow-up study, McCabe and Trevino (1997c) examined the influence of peer cheating behavior, peer disapproval of cheating and perceived severity of penalties for cheating. Additionally, the researchers hypothesized that participation in extracurricular activities would increase students' propensity to engage in academically dishonest behaviors (Miller et al., 2007). Results of the study were consistent with the researchers' hypotheses. Participation in extracurricular activities was significantly more influential on students' inclination to commit academic dishonesty than individual factors such as age and gender (McCabe & Trevino, 1997c).

Fraternity/sorority membership. Although limited research exists in the area of fraternity and sorority membership and student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors, Storch and Storch's (2002) found a positive correlation between involvement in social organizations and engagement in academic dishonesty. In a study of 1,793 students across seven institutions, McCabe and Bowers (1996), found that the influence of fraternity and sorority membership has a profound influence on students' inclination to engage in academic dishonesty. Academically dishonest behaviors were found to be more prevalent among fraternity members (58%) than individuals who were not affiliated with a sorority or fraternity (51%) (Stannard & Bowers, 1970). Additionally, Roig and Ballew (1994) found in their study of 244 undergraduate students at the University of Florida, that members of fraternities and sororities admitted to higher reports of academic dishonesty and the more involved the students were in the organization, the higher the rates of academic dishonesty. The researchers attributed the findings to the notion that the

more involved a student becomes in a fraternity or sorority, there is a reduction in the amount of time the student can dedicate to their academic performance.

Student Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

When students perceive academic dishonesty as present on their respective campuses, research studies suggests that the propensity to engage in the behavior increases (e.g., McCabe, 1993a; Michaels & Miethe, 1989). Researchers have found that when presented with the question of engagement in academically dishonest behaviors and the perception of the severity of those behaviors, a negative relationship existed between behaviors seen as dishonest and the frequency in which students engaged in those behaviors (Bisping et al., 2008). Thus, a growing body of research indicates that understanding student perceptions of dishonesty is of great importance in reducing academic dishonesty in institutions of higher education (e.g., Gehring, Nuss & Pavela, 1986; Newstead et al., 1996). In this section, an overview of research studies on student perceptions of academic dishonesty will be examined.

Value Systems/Religious affiliations

According to research, an underlying factor to why students engage in dishonest behaviors may be due to misconceptions and/or negative perceptions on what constitutes those behaviors (Gehring et al., 1986). According to Newstead et al. (1996), the very nature of cheating is a complex issue making it difficult for students to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate behavior. Cheating, thus, is not a “do or don’t do” issue but rather a decision making process that exists on a continuum, allowing students to interpret behaviors based on the severity of the act and in the context of their particular value system (Newstead et al., 1996). Within this continuum model, Roth and McCabe

(1995) hypothesized that student behavior is strongly influenced by the value systems that students possessed prior to entering an institution. The higher the student's value system, the less likely those students are to engage in academic dishonesty. In comparison, dishonest students may perceive the classroom environment as less personal and less satisfying than honest students and may attribute their dishonest actions based upon that classroom perception instead of internally (Pulvers & Dierkhoff, 1999).

Research has examined the impact student value systems have on perceptions of academic dishonesty at religious institutions in which values and ethical decision-making are at the core of the institution's mission (Godfrey & Waugh, 1998). Godfrey and Waugh investigated the perceptions of academic dishonesty amongst Australian students at institutions that form a religious school system. Utilizing a sample of 694 students, the purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which students at religious institutions engaged in academic dishonesty, their overall perceptions of behaviors characterized as cheating, why cheating occurs, preventative measures and the overall attitudes of students who admit to cheating (Godfrey & Waugh, 1998). Results from the study indicated that approximately 46-67% of students in the survey admitted to engaging in "lesser" forms of academically dishonest behaviors such as copying homework that are more difficult to detect by faculty more frequently than more "serious" acts of dishonesty, although 66% of the students admitted to looking at another student's exam at least once (Godfrey & Waugh, 1998). Although the researchers found no significant differences in perceptions of academically dishonest behaviors in students who attended religious institutions compared to students who did not, variables such as perceptions of

the actual behavior may play a large role in student's engagement in dishonesty, especially when the students do not perceive certain behaviors as being severe.

Examining perceptions of academic dishonesty among undergraduate students who participate in religious activities, Sutton and Huba (1995) surveyed an equal number of African-American and Caucasian students about perceived dishonest behavior. Results yielded no significant differences in perceptions of behaviors by ethnicity, although students with higher level of religious involvement were more likely to identify dishonest behaviors and were less inclined to believe student justifications for cheating than students with low involvement in religious activities.

Student Perceptions and Academic Majors

Research on student perceptions of academic dishonesty have examined specific student majors such as business, engineering and more recently healthcare in which ethics and values are central to the missions of the professions (Finelli, Sutkus Carpenter & Harding, 2007).

Business. Research supports the idea that the percentage of students who report engaging in academic dishonesty is highest amongst students who are enrolled in vocationally-oriented majors such as business (McCabe, 1997b). Academically dishonest behavior, particularly by business students, is an ethical concern in both the academic institution and in the business community (Rakovski & Levy, 2007). Wood, Longnecker, McKinney and Moore (1988) state that business students are career-focused individuals who exhibit difficulty in reasoning beyond Kohlberg's fourth stage of moral development, *law and order*. Unfortunately, business students have existed within a society where the line between acceptable behavior is blurred and unethical behavior is

oftentimes ignored or even expected (Kidwell, 2001). As a result, research indicates that business students are more tolerant of cheating and internalize the idea that the end result justifies the dishonest means (e.g., Crown & Spiller, 1998; Timiraos, 2002).

McCabe and Trevino (1995b) and McCabe et al. (1999b), found a link between academic dishonesty and business students that is consistent with research that indicates business majors have lower ethical values and more negative perceptions of academically dishonest behaviors than students in other majors (Harris, 1989). Caruana, Ramaseshan and Ewing (2000), found that 87% of business students admitted to engaging in academic dishonesty in comparison to students majoring in engineering, natural sciences and the humanities. Further, in a study of 1,900 students across 16 institutions, McCabe and Trevino (1997c) found that 91% of business students admitted to engaging in academically dishonest behaviors compared to 82% of engineering students, 73% of social sciences students, and 71% of students in the natural sciences. Not surprising, in a report on perceptions of academic dishonesty amongst business students, only a small percentage of the students surveyed expressed remorse for their actions leading to what researchers referred to as neutralization, or an acceptance of dishonesty as a normal occurrence within the student culture (e.g., Ahrin & Jones, 2009; Kidwell, 2001; Stephens, 2005).

Rakovski and Levy (2007) examined business student perceptions toward the severity of academic dishonesty, specific behaviors identified as dishonest, punishments appropriate for academic dishonesty and the frequency in which students engage in dishonest acts. Utilizing a sample of 1,255 business students the researchers hypothesized that students would perceive classroom dishonest behaviors, active dishonest behaviors

(i.e. coping from an exam) and exam-based dishonest behaviors more severely than dishonest behaviors that occur outside of the classroom environment. Secondly, in regards to behaviors that are passive in nature (i.e. receiving an exam answer) and coursework-based behaviors (i.e. assignments), students would recommend higher sanctions for behaviors perceived as “serious” and would engage less frequently in those behaviors. Results from the research study were consistent with previous research examining business students’ perceptions of academic dishonesty. Students attributed more severity to punishment for behaviors that they believed were more severe such as stealing an exam or submitting another student’s work but attributed less severity to dishonest behaviors identified as “passive” such as copying homework or sharing assignments (Rakovsky & Levy, 2007). Further, more than 60% of the student participants admitted to engaging in behaviors they perceived as less severe (i.e. copying homework answers) despite knowing the consequences associated with dishonesty.

Engineering. Academic dishonesty exists across academic disciplines and research studies indicate that students majoring in engineering are among those most likely to engage in academically dishonest behaviors (e.g., Harding, Carpenter, Montgomery & Steneck, 2002; McCabe & Trevino, 1997c). According to McCabe’s (1997b) study of undergraduate engineering students, nine out of ten respondents admitted to engaging in academic dishonesty and 23% admitted to repeat engagement in academically dishonest behaviors. Further, research indicates that engineering students who engage in academically dishonest behavior are more likely to engage in unethical decisions in their professional practice (Harding et al., 2004).

Carpenter, Harding and Finelli (2006) conducted a research study investigating engineering students' perceptions of cheating. Utilizing a survey instrument called, the PACES-1 Survey, 643 engineering and pre-engineering undergraduate students across eleven institutions (ranging from community colleges to large research institutions) were surveyed to examine their perceptions and attitudes about cheating. Results of the study yielded two significant findings. First, the researchers found that although students knew that an act was academically dishonest, they still engaged in the act. As an example, students indicated that copying from another student's exam as a form of cheating but did not attribute the same perception or meaning to copying off of another student's homework. The researchers attributed the students rationalization of the cheating behavior to external factors such as the instructor (i.e. "The instructor did not do an adequate job" or "The instructor assigned too much work") as a justification for their behavior, while not accepting responsibility for their own actions (p. 192). Secondly, the most significant finding in the research study was in the frequency of student engagement in cheating which the researchers indicated was greatly influenced by the students' perception of the severity of the behavior (Carpenter et al., 2006).

Healthcare professions. Recent studies on student perceptions of academic dishonesty have examined students in healthcare professions. In a study on the perception of pharmacy students, Rabi, Patton, Fjortoff and Zgarrick (2005) indicated that academic dishonesty is a growing concern within the field because their career as healthcare professionals is founded upon ethical and honest conduct. Students in the healthcare profession who engage in academically dishonest behaviors are more likely to fabricate clinical data such as laboratory values, patient histories, and physical examination results

(Hilbert, 1988b). Although there is relatively limited research on perceptions of academic dishonesty amongst healthcare students, Rabi et al. (2005) investigated 296 third year pharmacy students at four universities. The researchers examined factors that may influence pharmacy students' willingness to cheat, perceptions regarding methods of cheating, prevalence of cheating committed or witnessed by pharmacy students, and situations that may assist in preventing academic dishonesty (Rabi et al., 2005). Research yielded results that indicated that students did not perceive a number of behaviors as academically dishonest. As an example, over 50% of the student respondents admitted to engaging in activities traditionally defined as dishonest such as working on an individual take-home examination with another student yet only 16.3 % of the students answered yes to cheating in the past or currently while in the program. Further, the researchers concluded that students perceived academic dishonesty as a natural part of life, supporting the research literature that suggests that the prevalence and acceptance of dishonesty occurs in all majors including healthcare (e.g., Hardigan, 2004; Rabi et al., 2005).

In a 2003 and 2006 Gallop poll, nursing was identified as being the most honest and highly ethical profession (e.g., Rollett, 2004; Saad, 2006). With this recognition, an assumption could be made that academic dishonesty in the nursing profession is nonexistent (Arhin & Jones, 2009). Yet, with recent studies documenting negative student reports on perceptions of behaviors identified as academically dishonest (Ahrin & Jones, 2009) academic dishonesty is an area of increasing concern within the nursing profession (e.g., Gaberson, 2007; Jeffreys & Stier, 1998). As a result, researchers question the impact of dishonest behavior on future nursing practice (Schmidt, 2006).

According to Hilbert (1985a, 1988b), there exist a relationship between unethical classroom behaviors exhibited by students and unethical clinical behaviors in the field.

Kolanko et al. (2006) indicate that nursing students are using more sophisticated methods to engage in academic dishonesty such as unauthorized use in calculating medication dosage and sharing of clinical reports. In a study on frequency rates of engagement in academically dishonest behaviors, Hilbert (1985a) reported 27% of the nursing students admitted to copying sentences without citation, 19% admitted to collaboration on assignments, and 19% admitted to falsely recording medications, treatments or observations. A small increase was seen in 1988 where 33.3% of the respondents admitted to obtaining an exam or quiz from another student, 39.7% admitted to copying sentences without citation, 25.4% admitted to collaboration and 15.9% admitted to falsely recording medications, treatments, or observations (Hilbert, 1988b).

Although research indicates that self-reports of engagement in academically dishonest behavior amongst nursing students is relatively low, a level of concern still exist (Hilbert, 1985a). Brown (2002) investigated student cheating and perceptions of specific behaviors regarded as cheating by 253 nursing students and found that 20% of the students admitted to cheating, with 39% of the freshman respondents reporting the highest incidents of dishonesty. Additionally, although 53% of the senior nursing students surveyed admitted to thinking about cheating, only 27% indicated that they would cheat if they knew they would not be caught. However, results from the study also reported that 69%-94% of the student respondents admitted to observing their classmates engage in academic dishonesty, reflecting the research that indicates that students underreport their engagement in dishonesty and may not perceive certain behaviors such

as obtaining past exams as dishonest (Brown, 2002). Further, despite the highly ethical nature of the nursing profession, nursing students are no different than students in other majors in regards to academic dishonesty and in their perceptions of behaviors identified as academically dishonest (Schmidt, 2006).

Similar to the studies of nursing and pharmacy students, research indicates that dental schools must also examine academically dishonest behaviors amongst their students. Andrews, Smith, Henzi, and Demps (2007) examined the frequency of student cheating, methods by which students engage in cheating and the role of faculty in deterrence of cheating. The researchers found that 74.7% of students admitted to cheating on examinations while 68.4% admitted to cheating on preclinical exams and assignments. Additionally, when student and faculty perceptions were compared, the researchers found that student perceptions of the severity of punishments (56.4%) were higher than faculty members perceptions (28.4%) and that students perceived faculty as having more knowledge on university policies (63.6%) than students. Further, perceptions on the effectiveness of institutional policies to address dishonesty was reported as relatively low (37.9%) by both faculty and student respondents (Andrews et al., 2007).

Student Perceptions and Peers

According to research, a strong predictor for student engagement in academically dishonest behavior is the perception of peer engagement in dishonesty (McCabe & Trevino, 1993a). The social norms literature states that individuals use their own beliefs about the behaviors of others to make decisions in regards to their engagement in similar behavioral acts (Perkins, 2003). Thus, in regards to academic dishonesty, the perception of an institutional culture of cheating can have a strong influence on a student's

propensity to engage in academically dishonest behaviors (Engler, Landau & Epstein, 2008). Engler, Landau and Epstein (2008) investigated undergraduate student perceptions of college cheating and the role honor codes may have on academically dishonest behaviors. Fifty-six undergraduate students at a small private liberal arts institution were surveyed to estimate the likelihood that they, their peers and the average college student would engage in academically dishonesty. Results from the study indicated that undergraduate students reported more engagement in dishonesty by the average student and less engagement by themselves and their friends.

Cross-Cultural Studies

A growing body of interest in student perceptions of academic dishonesty involves cross-cultural comparisons of the behavior (e.g., Diekhoff et al., 1999; Lupton et al., 2000). Comparative studies emphasize the importance of understanding cultural differences in self-reported incidences of academic dishonesty as well as in student perceptions of academic dishonesty. Comparing Polish and American business students, Lupton, Chapman and Weiss (2000), investigated the differences between attitudes, perceptions and overall beliefs regarding academic dishonesty. Utilizing a sample of 443 surveys from Colorado State University and 192 surveys from Wyzaza Szkoła Biznesu in Poland, the researchers found significant differences in the student attitudes and perceptions of cheating behaviors. For example, 54% of the American student population reported engagement in academic dishonesty in comparison to 84% of Polish students. Further, the results of the study indicated that Polish students were more likely than American students to believe classmates engaged in dishonesty, that cheating on one

exam is not considered bad and that sharing answers with students in later class sessions was not considered an act of dishonesty (Lupton et al., 2000).

Similar results were found in a cross-cultural comparison study of American and Lebanese university students. McCabe, Feghali and Abdallah (2008) investigated the influence of peer behavior on students' inclination to engage in cheating, to report peer academic behavior and in the understanding of institutional academic dishonesty policies and severity of punishments associated with those policies. Results from the study yielded a positive relationship between perception of peers' behavior and a significant inverse relationship with students' certainty of being reported, perceived understanding of university policies and perceived penalties associated with the policies for both groups of students. More important to note is in self-reports of academic dishonesty, Lebanese students reported higher engagement in behaviors identified as academically dishonest especially if those behaviors were collective or collaborative in nature (58% of Lebanese students compared to 10% of American students) than behaviors characterized as individualistic such as utilizing crib notes (21% of the Lebanese respondents compared to 8% of American students). Results from these studies emphasize the importance of examining cultural differences in perceptions of academic dishonesty and how those differences may impact institutional measures to address dishonesty (McCabe et al., 2008).

Perceptions of academic dishonesty are a growing concern in the research literature in identifying variables that may lead to engagement in academically dishonest behaviors. Studies indicate that student perceptions of academic dishonesty are influenced by the students' value systems (e.g., Gehring et al., 1986; Roth & McCabe, 1995), academic

major (e.g., Finelli et al., 2007; McCabe, 1997b) and may vary across cultures (e.g., Lupton et al., 2000; McCabe et al., 2008). An equally important area of research examines faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty. Research indicates that student perceptions of faculty members' knowledge and acceptance of university's integrity policies decreases their likelihood to engage in academic dishonesty (e.g., McCabe & Trevino, 1993a, 1997c; McCabe et al., 2001c). However, despite institutional policies that require faculty members to report incidences of academic dishonesty, research reveals that faculty members prefer to handle dishonesty within the classroom environment and may exhibit a lack of trust in senior administration (Nadelson, 2007). In the next section, an overview of research that examines faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty will be presented.

Faculty Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

Faculty can exude a great deal of influence over students which can have a positive or negative impact on student behavior. Research indicates that addressing academic dishonesty is an ethical obligation of an institution and a product of effective instruction and curriculum set by faculty (Markie, 1994). According to the Collected Rules and Regulations of the institution under study, "Faculty members have a special obligation to expect high standards of academic honesty in all student work" and should report all suspected cases of academic dishonesty to the appropriate administrator (University of Missouri-system website, 2009). As the first individuals to encounter academic dishonesty, faculty response can set the tone for future classroom interactions and discussions. Ultimately, the extent to which faculty accept the responsibility of addressing academic dishonesty will determine the likelihood that an educational

institution can combat the problem (Flint, Clegg & Macdonald, 2006). However, a review of the literature indicates that although academic dishonesty is a prevalent problem across college campuses, relatively few studies have examined the viewpoints of faculty on student dishonesty (Flint et al., 2006). Research studies examining faculty perceptions indicate that faculty members may not perceive academic dishonesty as a serious concern at their respective institutions and that certain acts seen as dishonest by faculty may not be perceived in the same manner by students (e.g., Bisping et al., 2008; Burke, 1997; Marcoux, 2002).

In the next section an overview of studies examining faculty perceptions of dishonesty will be reviewed. In reviewing the literature, research has focused on examining the similarities and differences in faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty, faculty responses to institutional policies to address dishonesty and faculty perceptions of consequences associated with reporting.

Faculty and Student Perceptions

Social comparison theory states that an individual will compare the actions of others to determine if their own perception of societal reality is appropriate (Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2003). Research on faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty reveal that both groups share similar viewpoints on behaviors regarded as academically dishonest with reports indicating that students may appear more stringent in defining a variety of actions associated with the behavior than faculty (e.g., Ballew & Roig, 1992; Livosky & Tauber, 1994; Nuss, 1984). However, an opposing body of research reveals a number of significant differences in faculty and student perceptions of the problem and specific behaviors identified as academically dishonest (e.g., Andrews et al., 2007;

Graham et al., 1994; Liddell & Fong, 2003; Smith et al., 1998). In an investigation of student perceptions and faculty attitudes, results indicate that although there were similarities in students' perceptions of the actual attitudes of faculty, faculty reported that students were more tolerant of cheating behavior than what the student participants reported in the study (Ballew & Roig, 1992). Thus, this area of research is important because understanding differences exhibited by faculty and students may enable institutions of higher education to develop effective policies to address dishonesty (Livovsky & Tauber, 1994).

Institutions of higher education require faculty members to include a statement about academic dishonesty in their syllabi, encourage a discussion about behaviors deemed dishonest and require faculty to report incidents when they occur (Broeckelman-Post, 2008). However, adherence to institutional policy is rarely monitored, leading to inaccurate reports of academic dishonesty and an underestimation of the problem (Volpe et al., 2008). Further, research studies indicate that faculty members may not fully understand the academic integrity policies of their respective institution and oftentimes since students' first knowledge of the policies is drawn from faculty, they themselves fully do not understand the extent of academic dishonesty (Jendrik, 1992).

In a study conducted by Graham et al. (1994), students and faculty were surveyed to compare their perceptions and attitudes regarding cheating. Results of the study indicate that 20% of faculty participants admitted to not watching students while taking examinations and 26% of the faculty respondents reported not having a cheating clause written into the course syllabus. Further results from the study showed that although 79% of faculty reported catching a student engaging in cheating only 9% reported penalizing

the student. This number is even more disturbing when 89% of the students in the same survey admitted to cheating in some capacity during their college career (Volpe et al., 2008).

Discrepancies within faculty attitudes and actual classroom behaviors may send conflicting messages to students that may, in turn, influence engagement in academically dishonest behaviors (Volpe et al., 2008). In a study of 52 faculty members at a small private university, Volpe et al. investigated the relationship between faculty statements of cheating in course syllabi and actual stated beliefs about student cheating amongst faculty. Data from the study revealed faculty members underestimate the amount of cheating that occurs in higher education (30-40%) and this underestimation was reflected in course syllabi in which 20% of the faculty respondents admitted to not having a written statement on cheating. Although the data reflected lower numbers than previous research on faculty perceptions, more important to note is that actual classroom behaviors perceived by faculty as dishonest were incongruent with students' perceptions of similar behaviors (Smith, Nolan & Dai, 1998).

Faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty and behaviors identified as academically dishonest are oftentimes more negative than actual self-reports by students. An investigation of faculty perceptions of students' academic honesty in several academic departments at Louisiana State University was conducted by Smith, Nolan and Dai (1998). Utilizing a sample of 50 faculty members and 160 undergraduate students, the researchers examined faculty perceptions of students' propensity to engage in academic dishonesty, students' response to cheating scenarios, students' propensity for academic honesty, and if differences in perceptions existed based on academic rank and

college affiliation. Results indicated that professors' perceptions of student behavior on the questionnaires were more negative than what was reported by student respondents (Smith et al., 1998). As an example, 80% of faculty respondents believed that students would not take a copy of an exam if the opportunity presented itself in comparison to 93% of the student respondents. Further, although 71% of the students surveyed indicated that they would not resubmit a paper, 50% of faculty respondents believed students would engage in the behavior (Smith et al., 1998). The researchers concluded that differences in perceptions could be attributed to the personal belief systems held by students compared to faculty who may base their perceptions on previous classroom experiences.

Pe Symaco and Marcelo (2003) investigated faculty perceptions of student academic honesty, student variables and faculty variables that may affect academic honesty in a sample of 48 faculty members. Similar to previous research (e.g., Kennedy, Nowak, Raghuraman, Thomas & Davis, 2000; McCabe et al., 2001c; Smith et al., 1998), results yielded significant differences between the perceptions of student behavior by faculty and self-reported behavior by students. When students were asked if they would look at the exam of another student, 67% indicated that they would not compared to 62% of faculty participants who believed students would engage in the behavior. Further, when faculty and students were asked if they believed students would resubmit an assignment for a grade, 42% of faculty members believed that students would in comparison to 21% of the student respondents (Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2003).

Increases in technological advances in higher education have created an unique challenge for administrators particularly in the lack of interaction between faculty

members and students in online and distance learning courses. Kennedy, Nowak, Raghuraman, Thomas and Davis (2000) examined faculty perceptions of online courses and the likelihood that students in those courses would commit academic dishonesty. With a sample of 172 undergraduate students and 69 faculty members, data yielded results that indicated similarities in the beliefs of both faculty and students in regards to the accessibility of committing academic dishonesty in on-line courses. However, differences in perceptions were found in reports that indicated faculty members perceived the academic dishonesty problem as greater than the students, and faculty concerns that cheating was easier online were higher amongst faculty members who had no previous experience teaching in an online course (Kennedy et al., 2000).

Differences in faculty and student perceptions of academically dishonest behaviors deemed as ambiguous such as copying and pasting information from the Internet and unauthorized collaboration on assignments have been examined in the research literature (e.g., Higbee & Thomas, 2002; McCabe et al., 2001c; Sileo, 2006a). Faculty members may hold more stringent views on academically dishonest behaviors than students and believe students are dishonest when they collaborate on assignments without authorization and submit identical papers during consecutive semesters (Sileo, 2006a). Research investigating ambiguous academically dishonest behaviors indicate that 85% of faculty members believed that cutting and pasting plagiarism was seen as moderate or serious cheating compared to only 50% of student respondents. Further, 85% of faculty members believed that unauthorized collaboration was seen as moderate or serious cheating compared to only 35% of student respondents who held that belief (McCabe et al., 2001c).

Higbee and Thomas (2002) yielded similar results in their research study investigating differences in faculty and students perceptions of academic dishonesty. In a random sample of 50% of the faculty at a large southeastern public research university and a nonrandom but representative sample of 227 students enrolled in undergraduate courses, the researchers investigated whether faculty and students would consider specific behaviors as academically dishonest and the rationale behind their perceptions. Higbee and Thomas' study differed from previous research because the study focused specifically on less obvious forms of cheating such as plagiarism and collaboration. Results from the study indicated that there existed a great deal of confusion and disagreement amongst students and faculty on acceptable behavioral practices. Less obvious behavioral practices of plagiarism and collaboration were perceived as being "lazy" and "foolish" behaviors by faculty in comparison to what was perceived as actual cheating behaviors such as copying on an exam (Higbee & Thomas, 2002).

Research on similarities and/or differences in perceptions of academic dishonesty has also focused on the methodology utilized in the research studies. Utilizing a multidimensional scale to investigate faculty and student perceptions, Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) and Schmelkin et al. (2008), investigated how faculty and students conceptualized academic dishonesty. Further, the researchers were interested in knowing whether that conceptualization was one-dimensional or existed on a multi-dimensional scale. In a sample of 300 faculty members and 560 students, data yielded results indicating that both faculty and students perceived academically dishonest behaviors on two continuums: the seriousness of the behavior and/or the degree of severity of the behavior. Although the researchers found similarities within defining behaviors on a

continuum, behaviors identified as being more severe by faculty such as forging documents and sabotage yielded different results in perceptions of the severity of those behaviors by students (Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003).

Liddell and Fong (2003) found that when reviewing identical behaviors, perceptions of academic dishonesty by faculty differed from students as well as significantly from the reality of the epidemic even in their own classrooms. Kidwell, Wozniak and Laurel (2003) examined both faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty and cheating behaviors in a two part study conducted over an 18 month period. In the initial study, undergraduate students were asked to report the frequency of engagement in academically dishonest behaviors, pressures associated with academic dishonesty and their perceptions of how faculty would respond to cheating. In the second part of the study, faculty members were asked to indicate their perceptions of student engagement in academic dishonesty, factors that may influence student engagement, and faculty responses to cheating in their respective classrooms. Results from the study indicated that faculty perceptions of behaviors identified as academically dishonest was consistent with student perceptions of the behaviors. However, more than 23% of students admitted to copying information from other students, a behavior that faculty respondents perceived as occurring infrequently (Kidwell et al., 2003).

Further, an interesting note about the Kidwell et al. study is that the university utilized was cited by the John Templeton Foundation as exhibiting exemplary character development as an integral aspect of the undergraduate experience. Despite this recognition, the results of the study indicated that over 70% of the students surveyed indicated that they were habitual cheaters (i.e. cheating on exams, plagiarizing papers, or

other forms of academic dishonesty on multiple occasions) and that faculty members indicated that they were reluctant to report academically dishonest behaviors (Kidwell et al., 2003).

Responses to Academic Dishonesty

Research indicates that although faculty members' stress that dishonest behavior is not tolerated, oftentimes their responses to the behavior does not reflect that ideology (Schmelkin et al., 2001). Research examining the types of academic misconduct faculty members' suspect, methods to deter misconduct, and factors that influence faculty members' inclination to act on suspected dishonesty found that although faculty members perceive academic dishonesty as a large problem on their college campuses, there was apprehension and anxiety by faculty in acting upon suspected behaviors (Nadelson, 2007). Data on reporting practices by faculty show that 6% of faculty respondents indicate that they "often" report cases to the appropriate individuals compared to 40% who "never" report and 54% who report "seldomly" (McCabe, 1993a). Further, in the majority of dishonesty cases, the number of faculty members who "do nothing" is relatively small, yet faculty members who indicate that they do "little" in regards to academic dishonesty reflects significantly larger numbers (Schneider, 1999).

Research has documented that faculty members may be reluctant to follow the necessary measures to document dishonesty due to the amount of time involved in the adjudication process, disagreement with institutional academic dishonesty policies, lack of acceptable student consequences, fear of retaliation and academic freedom (e.g., Graham et al., 1994; Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, Whitley & Washburn, 1998). However, with research indicating that students' perceptions of faculty members responses to

dishonesty will affect their decision to cheat (Fass, 1986), faculty members have an unique opportunity to help students understand the importance of academic integrity and deter dishonest conduct from increasing (Gehring & Pavela, 1994).

Honor codes/institutional policies. For over a century, honor codes have been utilized by institutions as a method to deter incidents of academically dishonest behaviors (Harding et al., 2002). In recent studies, there has been a push for a new honor code movement to address the needs of a new generation of students entering into higher education (McCabe & Pavela, 2005). However, investigations of the use of institutional honor codes and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty have demonstrated that although the assumption would be that at institutions that utilize honor codes faculty members would report academically dishonest behaviors, data yielded results to the contrary (e.g., McCabe, 1993a; McCabe & Trevino, 1993a). According to McCabe (1993a), the presence of an honor code did not result in a significantly greater likelihood that faculty members would report violations in comparison to institutions that do not have an honor code, although there was a greater willingness by faculty respondents to utilize established institutional policies and procedures.

In a similar study investigating academic integrity and honor codes, McCabe, Trevino and Butterfield (2001c) studied faculty at institutions with and without an honor code to reexamine if the presence of an honor code affected faculty perceptions of suspected academic dishonesty. Results from the study indicated that faculty at institutions with honor codes were more likely than faculty members at institutions without honor codes to indicate that students should be held accountable for peer monitoring. Secondly, the researchers concluded that faculty at institutions without honor

codes were more likely to take actions to catch students and to confront them than at institutions that utilized honor codes. Further, at institutions with honor codes, faculty were more likely to perceive their institution's academic integrity policies to be fair and effective (McCabe et al., 2001c). However, when researchers asked faculty how they handle academically dishonest behaviors, responses ranged from "quietly and quickly" to stern warnings to failing grades on assignments. Thus, when confronting a student's engagement in academic dishonesty, faculty prefer to handle cheating incidents in the privacy of their own classrooms instead of through an institution's adjudication process (Schneider, 1999).

An emerging body of research indicates that academic freedom and the role of autonomy in the classroom greatly influences faculty members' perceptions of academic dishonesty. Faculty members report that they value the autonomy of their classroom more so than any institutional methods to address academic dishonesty (Ritter, 1993). Research indicates that faculty members believe that it is their sole right and responsibility to address classroom incidents as they see appropriate and that by being forced to report academic dishonesty is seen as a violation of their freedom (Fass, 1986). Further, in a study of 257 chief student affairs officers, 60% of the respondents indicated that they believed that faculty members were more likely to handle incidents of academic dishonesty than to follow institutional adjudication guidelines (Gallant & Drinan, 2006).

McCabe (2001c) indicates that 47% of students believe that instructors ignore academically dishonest behaviors altogether. Research shows that dishonest transgressions are often overlooked or treated lightly by faculty who do not want to become involved in what they perceive as bureaucratic procedures used to adjudicate

allegations of academic dishonesty (McCabe, 1993a). Thus, the adjudication process for academic dishonesty cases is oftentimes a deterrent for faculty members. Wright and Kelly (1974) found that although 65% of faculty members admitted to confronting a student about cheating, only 15% of those faculty members reported the incident to the appropriate administrators. Even when blatant cases of cheating are discovered, research indicates that faculty members will recommend course-related actions, such as lowering a grade on an assignment but remain reluctant to report suspected incidents and/or recommend harsher sanctions for students found guilty of academic dishonesty (e.g., Decco, 2002; Robinson-Zanartu et al., 2005).

Consequences of reporting. In the literature on faculty perceptions, research indicates that the potential consequences assigned to students found guilty of academic dishonesty may be a deterrent for faculty members to report incidences of misconduct. Faculty members express concerns with the potential long-term effects of penalties imposed on students and the possibility that a guilty charge could ruin a student's academic record (Davis, 1993). Research studies indicate that faculty may be more reluctant to report academic dishonesty because the punishment may be too severe for the actual offense. The concern is even greater at institutions that utilize honor codes in which the punishment for a violation of academic dishonesty could be expulsion from the university (Holcomb, 1992). McCabe (1993a) further stresses that penalties that are seen as too harsh for the infraction and, on the opposite spectrum, too lenient, negatively affect faculty perceptions of the institution's academic dishonesty policies.

Another body of research examines the consequences to faculty members who report incidents of academic dishonesty. Mathur and Offenbach (2002) found that 10% of

faculty members did not report student misconduct due to fears of retaliation. In a qualitative study of nursing perceptions of academic dishonesty, Fontana (2009) found that the process of confronting and reporting academic dishonesty resulted in damaged relationships and took tremendous courage on the part of the faculty member. Further, 71% of faculty members reported that confronting student cheating was one of the most negative experiences associated with the teaching profession (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998).

Faculty members may be unwilling to collect evidence to adjudicate an academic dishonesty charge because of a fear of “retaliation by the student, the loss of students, being accused of harassment or discrimination, and even being sued for these offenses for defamation of character” (Decoo, 2002, p. 152). However, according to Keith-Spiegel et al. (1998), the fear factor identified in the research study is a reflection of concerns that should be the least warranted by faculty members. In a review of case law over the course of 30 years, there were no cases found in which members of the academic community were assessed damages for accusations of dishonesty, even when the student was exonerated from the charges (Gehring & Pavela, 1994).

Although institutions of higher education have developed policies and procedures to address academic dishonesty, discrepancies regarding behaviors identified as academically dishonest continue to exist between faculty and students (e.g., Graham et al., 1994; Higbee & Thomas, 2002; Smith et al., 1998; Volpe et al., 2008). For institutions with implemented academic integrity policies and honor codes, research reveals that faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty and the consequences associated with reporting are seldom taken into consideration and as such, faculty may be reluctant

to become involved in the adjudication process (e.g., McCabe & Pavela, 2005; Nadelson, 2007; Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003).

Theoretical Framework for Study: Moral Development and Reasoning

Addressing academic dishonesty can be a complex and enduring challenge. Dishonesty is so embedded in the culture of institutions that the task of promoting integrity can seem almost impossible (Gallant & Drinan, 2006). Students continue to engage in academic dishonesty even when knowledge about the severity of the punishments is known (McCabe et al., 2001c). Further, research reveals that there are differences in how faculty respond to allegations of academic dishonesty and to the severity of behaviors deemed dishonest (e.g., Gallant & Drinan, 2006; Schneider, 1999; McCabe, 2001c). In attempts to understand and provide solutions for the academic dishonesty epidemic, a number of theoretical approaches and applications have been utilized (e.g., Gallant & Drinan, 2006; Kibler, 1993; Michaels & Mieth, 1989). However, moral development and moral reasoning may be key to understanding why students engage in academically dishonest behavior and may help to explain why discrepancies exist within faculty and students' perceptions of behaviors identified as academically dishonest (Hardigan, 2004).

According to Eastman, Iyer, and Reisenwitz (2008), for faculty to address ethical behavior amongst students, there first needs to be a full understanding of the student's moral reasoning and rationale to engage in academic dishonesty. In reviewing theories of moral development, there are a number of common characteristics. For example, moral development occurs through a developmental stage progression in which each stage builds upon the previous stage and movement occurs when an individual is confronted

with a conflict or ethical dilemma such as engagement in academic dishonesty (Kohlberg, 1976b). Secondly, in order to address moral conflicts, an individual has to make a determination or chose an appropriate course of action that may be morally right or wrong dependent upon the circumstances (Rest, Edwards & Thoma, 1997). Thirdly, moral development is unique to the individual and in order to understand moral reasoning, research must take into account the role that gender plays in that development (Gilligan, 1977a).

The theoretical foundation for this research study was based on the ideology that moral reasoning can be utilized to understand student perceptions of academic dishonesty and student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors. In this section, Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning, Gilligan's moral development theory and Rest's four component model of morality will be explored. Additionally, the section concludes with research studies that have examined moral reasoning to explain student engagement in academic dishonesty.

Kohlberg

Kant's book entitled *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* marked the ground work on the study of morality and moral development (Corradini Goodwin, 2007). However, it was the work of Piaget that greatly influenced Kohlberg's theory of moral development (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004). Piaget (1963) believed that development occurs as individuals interact with their environment and that maturation coupled with an individual's environment are important to that individual's moral development. As the first to illustrate a detailed, sequential model of development, Piaget

laid the foundation for Kohlberg's research on moral development and the formation of his developmental stage model of moral reasoning (Corradini Goodwin, 2007).

Ercegovic and Richardson (2004) contend that utilizing Kohlberg's work on moral reasoning can provide a strong theoretical framework in understanding academic dishonesty and in designing initiatives to effectively address the problem. The underlying notion of Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning is that development occurs in sequential stages in which individuals move from lower to higher stages of moral development when confronted by disequilibrium or a moral conflict (Kohlberg, 1976b). In the theory, the focus is not on individual behavior but rather on the individual's process of reasoning that is used to explain a particular behavior (Corradini Goodwin, 2007).

Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning was developed through his use of hypothetical moral dilemmas which were originally presented to young male participants in the city of Chicago (Crain, 1985). Kohlberg's "Heinz Dilemma", introduced the case of Heinz who was presented with a moral dilemma: to allow his wife to die because he could not afford a drug that could potentially save her life or to steal the drug to save his wife's life. Consequently, Heinz made the later decision and participants were asked to determine if his actions were morally right or wrong. Ultimately, Kohlberg was less interested in knowing if the participants believed that Heinz was right or wrong in his actions but instead, the reasoning behind why the participants came to their decision (Kohlberg, 1976b).

Theory of moral reasoning. Kohlberg (1969a, 1976b) identified six stages of moral reasoning: *punishment-obedience orientation* (stage one), *instrumental relativist orientation* (stage two), *good boy-nice girl orientation* (stage three), *law and order* (stage

four), *social contract orientation* (stage five) and *ethical principle orientation* (stage six).

Believing that moral development is a continuous process that occurs throughout an individual's lifetime, Kohlberg further grouped each stage into three levels of higher order: *pre-conventional*, *conventional* and *post-conventional* (Kohlberg, 1976b).

Movement from one stage to the next indicates an increase in the moral maturity and level of reasoning by an individual which, according to Kohlberg, is seen as the "most powerful and meaningful predictor" of one's action (Kohlberg, 1969a, p. 397). The underlying premise in Kohlberg's stages of moral development is that society does not dictate what is considered morally right or wrong, but instead that decision depends upon the individual (Rest, 1983b). Thus, differences in perceptions of academic dishonesty and behaviors identified as academically dishonest between faculty and students may occur because their moral reasoning about dishonesty may exist in different stages of moral development.

In Kohlberg's (1976b) *pre-conventional level*, individuals are centered on self and focused on determining if their actions are perceived by others as being right or wrong. In the first stage of the *pre-conventional level* or the "*punishment-obedience orientation*", receiving punishment for one's actions is of great concern and thus, behavior is conducted in a socially acceptable manner to avoid punishment. In the second stage or the "*instrumental relativist orientation*", what is considered right or acceptable behavior is determined by what is in the best interests of the individual. Although there is concern for the needs of others in the *pre-conventional level*, that concern is demonstrated by the extent to which one's own individual interests are furthered.

However, there is a greater concern for the welfare of others that characterize the *conventional level* of moral development (Kohlberg, 1976b). Individuals begin to judge the morality of their actions by comparing themselves to their perceptions of what is socially acceptable. In the third stage of the conventional level or the “*good boy-nice girl orientation*”, individuals seek the approval of others and judge the morality of an act not based on the consequences associated with that act but instead on the individual’s relationship with others. Further, in stage four, the “*law and order orientation*” an individual moves from being concerned with the approval of others to a greater concern with law and order, the importance of obeying societal rules and on becoming contributing members of society.

According to Kohlberg (1976b), although a highly desirable stage to reach, the majority of individuals will not progress beyond the *conventional level* of moral reasoning. However, if an individual continues to develop morally into Kohlberg’s final level, *post-conventional*, the focus of moral reasoning becomes determined by universal principles of fairness and justice for all (Kohlberg, 1976b). In stage five or the “*social contract orientation*” there is an identification with group norm for the establishment of rules, individuals possess their own set of morally acceptable practices, which may or may not conform to universally acceptable societal practices (Kohlberg, 1976b). Individuals determine what is of great importance of society despite an understanding that their actions may not be socially acceptable. In the final stage, the “*universal ethical principle orientation*”, individuals follow a set of principles that they believe are right and ethical rather than what society may deem as being ethical.

Gilligan

Kohlberg's theory of moral development came at a time of major political unrest (i.e. the Vietnam War, the Civil Rights Era and the Women's movement) which helped to popularize his studies on moral judgment and reasoning (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau & Thoma, 1999). However, one of the biggest criticisms of his work is that although it occurred during the time of social movement towards equal treatment for minorities and women, the theory was male-driven and excluded the moral development of other groups.

Gilligan (1982b) asserts that gender plays a major role in the development of ethical thinking and rejects Kohlberg's linear model as representing males exclusively. In her book, *"In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development"*, Gilligan (1982b) criticizes Kohlberg's theory of moral development as being biased against women and that focus should be on the idea of morality of caring instead of focusing on a morality of justice. Central to Gilligan's theory is the notion of "caring" that women inherently possess when faced with handling ethical dilemmas. Gilligan indicates that where the moral development of males is focused on self, women base their development on a sense of connectedness to others (Donleavy, 2007). In this regard, Gilligan asserts that women prefer the caring of others and that although they can think and behave through the ethics of justice and individualistically, they find themselves exhibiting feelings of isolation (Gilligan, 1977a).

Moral development theory. Although critics have found that evidence for her theory on gender differences in moral development have been largely narrative and phenomenological, Gilligan maintained that females moral development is different (Donleavy, 2007). By attempting to understand the women's "voice" in initial interviews

with women who were facing a life-altering situation, Gilligan created a moral development theory that includes three perspectives based on the work of Kohlberg's theory (Gilligan, 1982b). In the pre-conventional level: *individual survival*, women's moral development is centered on the survival of oneself. In this level, the individual moves from a stage of selfishness to being more responsible for the needs of others. In the conventional level: *self-sacrifice is goodness*, there is the notion of self-sacrifice with goodness in which the individual places themselves within the predetermined structure of society. In this stage, when individuals care more for others and less on themselves, disequilibrium occurs that can create difficulties within relationships. In the final stage, post-conventional level: *principle of non-violence*, the individual discovers truth in understanding oneself and in the realization of the consequences associated with one's actions (Gilligan, 1982b). Thus, according to Gilligan's moral development theory, relationships are of great importance and are central to how individuals frame their own morality (Gilligan & Wiggins, 1987).

Rest

Moral judgment is defined by Rest, Edward and Thoma (1997) as a "psychological construct that characterizes the process by which people determine that one course of action in a particular situation is morally right and another course of action is wrong" (p. 5). Researchers have indicated that there is a developmental progression involved in making moral judgments in which an individual moves from making decisions based solely on oneself to an understanding and appreciation of the welfare of others (e.g., Kohlberg, 1976b; Rest et al., 1997). However, moral concerns of the late 1960's and 70's shifted the focus of moral development from the creation of moral

philosophers to addressing pressing societal concerns such as drug abuse, teenage pregnancy and delinquency (Rest et al., 1997).

Rest (1983b) indicates that alternative explanations may be as important to understanding moral behavior as moral judgment. According to Rest (1979a), individuals are presented with ethical dilemmas which require cognitive and developmental changes in how they determine a course of action. In determining that course, an examination of an individual's moral perceptions and moral judgment that impact behavior must be examined. Rest identified four aspects or processes in his *Four Component Model of Morality* that he believed must be present in order for moral behavior to take place. Unlike the linear sequential stages of Kohlberg's theory, Rest stresses that the four components are interactive in nature at that any one component may affect another. Further, Rest suggests that unlike other theories of moral function that focus on the three domains of cognition, affect and behavior, he believes that moral action is not the result of separate affective and cognitive processes but instead each of the four components encompasses a mixture of both processes that "co-occur" in every aspect of moral functioning (Bebeau & Thoma, 1999, p. 345).

Four component model of morality. Rest (1983b) identified four processes or components of morality: *moral sensitivity*, *moral judgment*, *moral motivation* and *moral character*. In the first component, *moral sensitivity*, moral behavior occurs only when the individual identifies a specific situation as being moral. In this component, the focus is on various actions that are available when an individual is determining if a situation is moral and how each action can impact themselves or others (Bebeau & Thoma, 1999). The second component, *moral judgment*, is characterized as the process in which an

individual judge the options available to him or her to determine which option is the most justified ethically. In the third component, *moral motivation*, the question arises as to why it is important to be moral. Individuals must prioritize what is most important: doing what is right and moral, against individual concerns such as academic pressures (Bebeau & Thoma, 1999). Further, according to Bebeau and Thoma, a number of the most memorable lapses in ethical judgment have occurred when individuals place a low priority on moral action, even when the moral choice is known and well understood. This notion is consistent with research on academic dishonesty that points out that even when students know it is morally wrong to engage in academically dishonest behaviors they continue to engage in dishonesty (e.g., Pullen et al., 2000; Williams & Hosek, 2003). In the final component, *moral character*, individuals develop an appropriate course of action, maintain the courage to complete the action and avoid potential distractions that may interfere with that process (e.g., Bebeau & Thoma, 1999; Rest, 1983b).

Although there is disagreement in some aspects of Kohlberg's theory of moral development, Rest concludes that there is sufficient support for his work in regards to the development of moral judgment (Thoma, Narvaez, Rest, & Derryberry, 1999). Moral judgment is believed to be a cognitive process where there is an understanding of social cooperation rather than on personal relationships with others (Thoma et al., 1999). Further, Rest et al. (1999) believe that moral judgment is an essential component of an individual's social development, especially the social development for adolescents and adults. To measure moral development, Rest (1983b) developed the Defining Issues Test (DIT), a multiple choice survey in which participants are asked to rate and rank a set of items in response to hypothetical dilemmas. A revised, shorter version, the DIT2, was

later created and reduced the number of dilemmas from six to five (Rest et al., 1999). In creating the DIT, Rest argued that reliable information in regards to inner processes that influence moral behavior could also be obtained through the use of alternative measures, such as a survey, instead of solely focusing on face-to-face interviews (Rest et al., 1999).

Moral Reasoning and Academically Dishonest Behavior

A number of attempts have been employed to address academic dishonesty by utilizing components of moral development/reasoning theories. According to Callahan (2004, p. 13), the pervasiveness of cheating across institutions of higher education is a “profound moral crisis”, reflecting deep economical and societal problems. In this section, an overview of studies that have utilized moral reasoning, judgment and development to understand behaviors deemed academically dishonest will be examined.

Chang (1994) indicates that an instructor’s level of moral reasoning impacts students’ perceptions of the moral climate of the classroom environment. Instructors with higher moral reasoning are in turn more likely to motivate student learning and responsible moral development than those with lower levels of moral reasoning. Thus, this ideology becomes problematic for students when faculty members make students accountable for their actions as in the case of students found guilty of dishonesty (Cooper & Lowe, 1977). Research on faculty-student communication and interpersonal relationships indicate that students who perceive their instructors as competent and moral individuals, will improve student motivation and learning outcomes and potentially decrease incidents of academic dishonesty from occurring (e.g., Chory, 2007; Frymier & Houser, 2000; Tata, 1999).

According to Leming (1979b), Kohlberg's studies on the development of moral thought lead to an increased understanding of moral behavior and thus, cheating behavior. Higher stages of moral reasoning, according to the research on Kohlberg, are more desired than the lower stages and moving individuals towards higher levels of reasoning is instrumental in moral education (Leming, 1979b). Further, according to Perry (1999), understanding students' moral development is as important to learning specific discipline related coursework. However, according to Leming (1979b) a greater concern in studying moral behavior is in identifying if the behavior is inherently a character trait or if it is situation-specific. In a study testing the level of principled moral reasoning, 152 undergraduate students were assessed utilizing the Rest's Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Leming, 1979b). Participants were presented a situation in which there were high incentives to engage in cheating (additional points toward final grade), where it would be easy for the participants to engage in the behavior (one highly supervised and one less supervised group) and where detecting cheating behaviors was easy for the researchers.

According to Leming (1979b), Kohlberg's "pre-conventional", "conventional" and "post-conventional" levels corresponded to the researcher's stages of moral reasoning ("low", "medium" and "high" stages). Data revealed that students identified as being in the "low" group (38%) cheated significantly more than individuals in the "medium" (16%) and "high" (19%) groups. Additionally, a relationship between participants' post-conventional moral reasoning and non-cheating behavior for those in the "high" category of moral reasoning in the highly supervised group was found. This finding is in comparison to participants identified in the "low" and "medium" categories

of moral reasoning, where both groups engaged in dishonesty more in the highly supervised group than in the less supervised group. Thus, according to Leming (1978a), principled moral behavior was found to be more situational-specific than a character trait of the participants.

Further results from the study indicate that variations in moral situations may influence participant behavior (Leming, 1978a). Despite warnings about the consequences of cheating and the threat of detection, awarding of additional points in a highly supervised situation deterred only those individuals who were “principled” or demonstrated high levels of moral reasoning. Thus, examining the impact of social situations such as the classroom environment, is also important in understanding moral behavior and moral reasoning (highly supervised faculty vs. less supervised faculty) (Leming, 1979b).

Malinowski and Smith (1985) hypothesized that the higher the moral maturity of participants, the lower incidences of cheating and greater latency of cheating. The researchers believed that the guilt associated with the cheating transgression should be a stronger deterrent for participants in stage four of Kohlberg’s stages than those in stage three. Further, the researchers believed that the introduction of a “confederate” who states that he/she engaged in cheating will increase cheating behavior for those in stage three than those in stage four of Kohlberg’s stages. The level of moral judgment for 53 male participants was measured utilizing the Defining Issues Test, which presents participants with six hypothetical moral dilemmas, each followed by twelve statements which exemplify Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning (Malinowski & Smith, 1985).

Participants were asked to rank the four issues they regarded as being the most important in reasoning surrounding a moral dilemma (Malinowski & Smith, 1985). Results of the study indicate that 77% of participants were found to have engaged in cheating in at least one of the trials. Moral judgment was found to be negatively related to the number of trials in which the participants engaged in cheating but positively related to latency. Further, the researchers found that students in stage three of Kohlberg's moral stages engaged in cheating behavior more than those in stage four although the results were not statistically significant. However, according to the researchers, although participants who exhibited low moral judgment admitted to engagement in academic dishonesty, individuals with high moral judgment also engaged in academic dishonesty when the temptation to cheat was strong (e.g., Eisenburg, 2004; Malinowski & Smith, 1985).

College attendance is recognized in the literature as being an important motivator in the moral development of students (Derryberry, Snyder, Wilson & Barger, 2006). Pursuant to Kohlberg's work in understanding moral reasoning in an educational atmosphere, is the concept of the "hidden curriculum" in which characteristics of crowds, praise and power (authority) have a major impact on the development of moral judgment and reasoning (Ercegovic & Richardson, 2004, p. 309). According to the researchers, the school setting is the first social situation in which an individual is forced to handle him/herself in the presence of strangers. Building upon that information, Kohlberg believes that the role of a teacher is thus, to "translate the moral ideology into a working social atmosphere in which students understand the meaning of the hidden curriculum

based on the universal principle of justice underlining respect for all people” (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004, p. 309).

In a study conducted by Cummings, Dyas, Maddux and Kochman (2001), the researchers administered the Defining Issues Test (DIT) and the Academic Misconduct Scale (AMS) to 145 pre-service teacher education students. The study examined students’ moral reasoning, compared moral reasoning across academic disciplines, and measured student propensity to engage in academically dishonest behaviors to determine if a relationship between moral reasoning and engagement in academic dishonesty existed. Participants were asked to review six hypothetical moral dilemmas, rate the twelve accompanying items according to their importance (great-no importance) and then rate the four most important items. According to Cummings et al. (2001), it was not the rating of the items that was important but the selection of the items which reflected the students’ level of principled moral reasoning.

Participants were also given the AMS, to measure self-reports of academically dishonest behaviors such as copying exam answers to determine if there was a relationship between academic misconduct and moral reasoning. What the researchers found is that participants’ scores on the AMS were significantly lower than in other studies involving college students (Cummings et al., 2001). Additionally, in relationship to moral reasoning and academic misconduct, a small but significant negative correlation was found, suggesting to the researchers that there may exist a relationship between lower levels of principled moral reasoning and academic dishonesty which is consistent with previous research (Dewberry et al., 2006). Further, according to Rest (1979b),

although moral reasoning may be a good predictor for action, reasoning alone cannot predict if an individual will engage in academically dishonest behavior.

Summary

In a commentary in *Carnegie Perspectives*, Stephens (2005) indicates that not only is there a large percentage of students who report engaging in behaviors identified as academically dishonest, only a small number of students express remorse for their dishonest actions. Existing research on academic dishonesty documents the prevalence of the problem, disagreement in definitions of academic dishonesty as well as individual, motivational and situational factors that may influence academically dishonest behavior (e.g., Anderman & Murdock, 2007; Jendrek, 1992; McCabe & Bowers, 1996; Nuss, 1984). Although a review of the academic dishonesty literature details the complexity of addressing academic dishonesty, the prevalence of the problem alludes to additional factors that may be important in understanding the epidemic (Kohn, 2007a). Therefore, reducing academic dishonesty in institutions of higher education requires an understanding of contributing factors that influence the behavior of those closely involved: the students, whose behavior determines if and how often dishonesty occurs and faculty, who can deter dishonesty from occurring (Hard, Conway, & Moran, 2006).

A potential contributing factor may rest in the perceptions that students and faculty have about academic dishonesty that oftentimes conflict with each other and to the problem overall (Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2003). Although research does exist on perceptions of academic dishonesty, relatively few studies have examined faculty perceptions and student perceptions of the topic. In research comparing faculty and student groups, studies have consistently documented that faculty and students have

differing perceptions of academic dishonesty and behaviors identified as academically dishonest and those differences in perceptions may be influenced by the level of moral reasoning of the individual (e.g., Andrews et al., 2007; Kidwell et al., 2003; Malinowski & Smith, 1985).

Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty. Research reveals that incidents of academic dishonesty are decreased when students believe that faculty are committed to academic integrity (Volpe et al., 2008). According to Chickering and Reisser (1993), student and faculty interactions revolving around academic integrity can help reduce conflicts between acceptable student behavior and personal value systems. Therefore, it is of great importance that institutions ask students about their behavior and perceptions of academic dishonesty and survey faculty to determine if there is a realistic understanding of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors (Kidwell et al., 2003).

With this knowledge, McCabe and Trevino (1993a) indicate that institutions should create an academic culture where academic dishonesty is deemed unacceptable and academic integrity is highly desired and regarded amongst all members of the campus community. Pursuant to Kohlberg, the researchers indicate that institutions create communities in which students, faculty and administrators are involved in the development of an institutional contract that outlines the norms, values and rights and responsibilities of all its members. The underlying assumption is that by promoting a culture of integrity, institutions will create conditions essential for moral development which may lead to a decrease in future incidences of academic dishonesty (McCabe & Trevino, 1993a).

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Introduction

With an increase in the number of reported cases of academic dishonesty in higher education, it is important to understand underlying causes that may impact student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors. Although a substantial amount of research has identified how individual, motivational, and situational factors may influence academic dishonesty, it is also important to understand how faculty and students view academic dishonesty and the similarities and differences that may exist within those perceptions. However, limited research has focused on perceptions of the problem and perceptions of behaviors identified as academically dishonest by faculty and students. Thus, the purpose of the study was to examine (1) faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty, (2) frequency of student engagement and faculty perceptions of the frequency in which students engage in academically dishonest behaviors, and (3) faculty perceptions and student perceptions of the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures. The chapter details the research design as well as provides information regarding the research questions, sample setting, sample population, sampling procedures, data collection, instrumentation, and methods of analysis.

Research Design

The quantitative research study utilized self-administered, anonymous online questionnaires as the primary method of data collection. Research studies reveal that the utilization of surveys and/or questionnaires as modes of data collection provides anonymity during the process and is considered the most standard method of data

collection in research on academic dishonesty (e.g., Carpenter et al., 2006; Spiller & Crown, 1995). Anonymous surveys continue to dominate the research literature on academic dishonesty because they provide the best way to access rates in which students admit to engaging in academically dishonest behaviors (Spiller & Crown, 1995). This was of importance in the research study because it examined perceptions of academic dishonesty and reported rates of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors at the institution under study.

Research on the utilization of questionnaires indicate that they are the most convenient method of data collection for obtaining information for large populations as well as for the collection of sensitive information (Fowler, 1996). Further, students who engage in academic dishonesty will admit to the behavior more often when questionnaires are utilized as a data collection method in comparison to face-to-face interviews (Karlins, Michaels, & Podlogar, 1988). Although research studies reveal that the usage of self-reports may create a normative expectation among students that can result in over-reporting of the behavior on questionnaires (Scheers & Dayton, 1987), additional evidence supports the idea that self-reports of dishonest behaviors can be accurate (Carpenter et al., 2006).

Three survey instruments were used to gather the data needed for this research study. Once the data was collected and entered into a statistical database, it was analyzed using a series of frequency counts analyses, mean score analyses and analyses of variances (ANOVA) statistical tests to determine participant responses to survey questions and participant perceptions on each of the dependent variables. The dependent variables of interest for the study were general views of academic dishonesty, frequency

in which students engage in academic dishonesty and knowledge and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures.

Research Questions

Although the research literature on academic dishonesty is substantial, a number of unanswered questions remain in finding solutions to effectively address the problem.

The research questions that guided this study were as follows:

Research Question One: What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty?

Research Question Two: What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions of the frequency in which students engage in behaviors classified/categorized as academically dishonest?

Research Question Three: What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions regarding the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures that address academic dishonesty?

Hypotheses

In an effort to fully investigate the research questions, the following hypotheses were utilized in the study.

Hypothesis One: Faculty and students will exhibit similarities within their perceptions of academic dishonesty.

Hypothesis Two: Students will admit to engagement in behaviors that can be classified/categorized as academically dishonest in higher frequency than faculty perceptions of that engagement.

Hypothesis Three: Faculty and students will exhibit similarities within their perceptions regarding the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures that address academic dishonesty.

Sample Setting

The site of this research study was an institution characterized as a large, four-year, primarily nonresidential institution in the Midwest (Carnegie Classification). With one professional degree program and over forty undergraduate and graduate degree programs, the university prides itself on providing excellent learning experiences and leadership opportunities for a diverse student population (website, 2009). Additionally, the institution boasts high rankings in several of its degree programs including Criminology and Criminal Justice, Information Systems, International Business and has been named among the nation's best research universities with fewer than 15 doctoral programs (website, 2009).

However, in institutional reports on the number of reported academic dishonesty cases from the Winter/Spring 2010 semester to the Winter/Spring 2012 semester undergraduate students were investigated in 89 cases of academic dishonesty relative to cheating and 187 cases of academic dishonesty relative to incidences of plagiarism. Data on the number of reported cases of academic dishonesty by academic department over the last eight years, shows that 66.5% of reported cases were in the College of Arts and Sciences, 13% in the College of Business Administration, 11.3% in the College of Fine Arts and Communication, 4% in the College of Education, 2.6% in the College of Nursing and 2% in the Honors College, respectively.

What is important to note is that the incidences of academic dishonesty represent reported cases of academic dishonesty, although research indicates that a major concern with research on the prevalence of dishonesty is in underreporting of the actual numbers (Brown & Emmett, 2001). University policy indicates that all suspected incidences of academic dishonesty should be reported to the Primary Administrative Officer/Designee. The faculty member has the authority to make an academic judgment in regards to the assignment in question, but additional disciplinary sanctions are handled within the Office of Academic Affairs when appropriate. Institutional guidelines require an investigation of the incident and the student in question will invoke their due process rights at this point. Further, if findings of misconduct are warranted, an appropriate disciplinary sanction will be informally disposed on the student. The student has the option to either accept the proposed discipline or invoke rights to formal hearing procedures before the Student Conduct Committee who will render a formal disposition. The final appeal in student misconduct matters is submitted to the Chancellor of the institution under study (website, 2009).

Sample Participants

The participants for the research study were drawn from the undergraduate student population and faculty population of the institution under study. To ensure significance for the statistical analyses utilized and to overcome the non-response bias that is common with questionnaires, a sufficiently large sample size was deemed necessary. Utilizing the institution's Fall 2010 Fact Book for the number of undergraduate students and tenured, non-tenure and tenure track faculty for the institution under study, the researcher decided that 6000 student participants and 370 faculty

participants would be asked to participate in the study (roughly 65% of the total student and faculty populations). The hope was that by including a larger number of participants in the study would help to ensure a more diverse and representative sample of the institution.

Sampling Procedures

The sampling procedures section identifies the steps the researcher used in this study. The steps for the research study included: (1) selection of participants, (2) online survey instruments, (3) delivery of the survey instrument and (4) data collection and security. Each step is described in more detail in the following sections.

Selection of Participants

The participants for this study were randomly selected from all undergraduate student populations and tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty who primarily teach undergraduate courses at the institution under study. The rationale for utilizing a smaller subset of these populations was to ensure a sample population that was representatively diverse as it pertains to the undergraduate and faculty populations of the institution. Although the use of a single institution will not produce results that can be generalized to all institutions of higher education nor larger geographic locations, the sampling procedures should be sufficient to make generalizations regarding the specific institution under study and possibly to similar types of institutions.

Online Survey Instruments

The student and faculty questionnaires were administered through *SurveyMonkey.com*, an online web-based survey instrument which allows for secure online distribution to participants through email (SurveyMonkey.com, 2011). The

question and response options were created utilizing one of the creation templates available through the website to maintain consistency in the survey design and to allow for a progress indicator to monitor survey completion and time. Additionally, *SurveyMonkey.com* was selected because of the SPSS integration analysis feature during the data collection process.

Delivery of the Survey Instruments

Electronic correspondence for the questionnaires were delivered from a University approved server address. The subject line provided a clear purpose for the email (i.e. "Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty Survey") and included a single address to personalize the survey as well as provide privacy protection for the participants.

Data Collection

The independent variables of interest in the study, faculty perceptions and student perceptions, were measured by the frequency in which students engage in academic dishonesty, behaviors defined as academically dishonest, and the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures that address academic dishonesty. Additionally, basic demographic questions such as academic level, academic rank (i.e. full faculty), gender, age, and race/ethnicity, were included. An example of the demographic questions are included in *Appendices D & E*.

After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the institution under study, the collection process began. A randomly selected group of student and faculty email addresses were obtained from the Office of Institutional Research, which collects and distributes institutional data. Participants received an email invitation on November 4, 2011 requesting participation in the research study. The email

correspondence included (1) a personalized cover letter which included information related to the nature of the study, (2) a link to the survey instrument through SurveyMonkey.com and the (3) contact information for the researcher, advisor and IRB office. A copy of the letter of introduction is included in *Appendix A*.

Participants who acknowledged the information in the letter and consented to participate in the study were directed to the secure survey site. A follow-up e-mail was sent approximately a week after the start date of the questionnaire (November 8, 2011) to thank participants who had completed the survey as well as served as a reminder to those who had not. A link to the survey was included in the second email correspondence as well. A final follow-up e-mail message was distributed approximately three weeks after the initial mailing to provide participants with a final opportunity to complete the questionnaire. The survey ended approximately four weeks after the initial contact on December 3, 2011. Responses submitted after the deadline were not accepted.

The data collected in the research study was stored in a secure password-protected database through *SurveyMonkey.com*. The privacy policies of the website indicate that data belongs to the researchers and will be utilized only for that purpose (SurveyMonkey.com, 2011). In order to ensure anonymity, no identifying information that can link participant responses to the survey questions was gathered by the researcher. Further, the researcher purchased a professional account through *SurveyMonkey.com* which allowed for encrypted responses to the questionnaires (SurveyMonkey.com, 2011).

Instrumentation

As indicated previously, the researcher utilized survey data that was collected from a random selection of undergraduate students and faculty at a large public

Midwestern research institution. Three Likert scale questionnaires were utilized for the research study and are included in *Appendices D & E*. The survey instruments were selected because they possessed specific criteria important to the proposed research study. For example, the use of the Likert scale response options is an effective method for obtaining consistent survey responses and the most appropriate for answering the research questions associated with the study (Dumas, 1999). Participants are given a broader range of response options for a Likert Scale questionnaire than one which does not employ this range of response options. According to Neumann (2000), the simplicity and ease of Likert scales demonstrate the scales true strength.

Secondly, the survey instruments have been consistently utilized with research studies involving academic dishonesty and have produced valid and reliable scores that are outlined in the descriptions below during their repeated usage in previous studies (e.g., Andrews et al., 2007; Bisping, 2008; Burke, 1997; McCabe & Trevino, 1995b, 1997c; McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1996a, 1999b, 2001c). Permission to utilize the survey instruments was obtained from the researchers prior to the study and are included in *Appendix F*.

Measures

Attitudes toward academic dishonesty scale. The first scale, the Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale (Davis et al., 1992; Bolin, 2004) consists of questions that attempt to measure participants attitudes and perceptions towards academic dishonesty. The scale measured the independent variables-*student perceptions and faculty perceptions* on the dependent variable *views of academic dishonesty* (RQ1/H1). Participants are provided with response options that range from “strongly agree” to

“strongly disagree”. Student participants indicated which behaviors they believed were academically dishonest and faculty participants indicated their perceptions of the students’ responses. Davis et al. (1992) found that the scale was a valid predictor for behaviors identified as cheating and highly reliable, as it was utilized in a survey sample of approximately 7,000 participants. Further, Bolin (2004) indicated that the questions associated with the scale were designed to deal with participants’ moral evaluations and ethical understanding of academic dishonesty. This is a key component in that the theoretical framework for the study is based on moral reasoning. For the purpose of the study, Bolin’s (2004) adaption of the original questionnaire (4 questions) was utilized. In Bolin’s (2004) replication of the survey, he estimated the internal consistency reliability to be $\alpha=.83$. However, in the current study, the internal consistency reliability was $\alpha=.045$ for the student responses and $\alpha=.440$ for the faculty responses, indicating a relatively lower internal consistency reliability than in previous studies that utilized the survey instrument.

Academic dishonesty scale. The second scale, the Academic Dishonesty Scale (McCabe & Trevino, 1997c) consists of eleven questions that attempt to measure the frequency in which participants engage in behaviors identified as academically dishonest. The scale measured the independent variables-*student perceptions and faculty perceptions* on the dependent variable *frequency in which students engage in academic dishonesty* (RQ2/H2) at the institution under study. Student participants indicated the frequency in which they engaged in behaviors identified as academically dishonest and faculty participants indicated their perception of the rate in which students engaged in those behaviors. The response options range from “not even one time” (1 on the Likert-

scale) to “many times” (5 on the Likert scale). Researchers who have utilized the scale indicate that adequate levels of reliability and content-related validity were demonstrated in the results when utilized in student self-reports (McCabe & Trevino, 1997c; Bolin, 2004). Additionally, to account for the highly skewed academic dishonesty variable in their earlier 1993 study, McCabe and Trevino (1997c) utilized a log transformation of the scale, with a mean of 2.88, standard deviation of .30 and a Cronbach’s alpha of .83. Similarly, in this study, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for student responses was $\alpha=.818$ and for faculty responses $\alpha=.922$, demonstrating relatively high internal consistency for the scale.

Academic integrity scale. The third scale, the Academic Integrity Scale (McCabe, 2008d) consists of forty questions that attempts to measure participants attitudes and perceptions regarding the academic integrity environment of the institution and specific behaviors identified as academically dishonest. The scale is divided into four subsections (1) academic environment, (2) behaviors identified as academically dishonest, (3) demographic information and (4) open response. For the purpose of this study, only the first subsection, academic environment, was utilized to measure the independent variables-*faculty perceptions and student perceptions* on the dependent variables-*institutional policies and procedures and the effectiveness of those policies and procedures* (RQ#3/H3). The academic environment subscale consists of questions designed to elicit participants’ perceptions on the environment of the institution under study. Student and faculty participants indicated their perceptions on the severity of punishments associated with academic dishonesty, understanding of the policies and procedures associated with academic dishonesty, support of the policies and procedures

and the effectiveness of the punishments utilized when students are charged with academic dishonesty. The alpha coefficient for the student and faculty responses to the Academic Integrity Scale were found to possess high internal consistency as was the case for the second scale ($\alpha=.868$, $\alpha=.773$).

Data Analyses

The research study examined faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty and how perceptions of behaviors may influence students' inclination to engage in academically dishonest behaviors. At the conclusion of the data collection process, the results from the survey instruments were recorded and entered using the statistical software package SPSS for further processing and analyses. The interpretation of the results, subsequent conclusions and recommendations for future research were derived from the data and are included in Chapter 4.

Demographic responses for gender, age, ethnicity/race, academic ranking/classification and academic department were analyzed through the use of basic descriptive statistics such as means and frequency distributions. To address the research questions and hypotheses, frequency count analyses and mean scores were utilized to determine if similarities and/or differences existed in faculty and undergraduate students 1) general perceptions of academic dishonesty, 2) perceived frequency of student engagement in behaviors characterized as academically dishonest and 3) perceptions of the effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures to address dishonesty. Additionally, a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was utilized to determine if statistically significant differences existed within faculty responses and student responses to the frequency of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors and on the

clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies to address academic dishonesty (RQ3/H3). The α for ANOVA was set at .05.

Conclusion

The purpose of the research study was to examine faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty. This chapter has described and justified the rationale for the methodology used in this study. Findings of the study can be used to implement institutional policy changes, to better understand the perceptions of faculty who are faced with academic dishonest behavior amongst students, and to identify preventative measures to address student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors. The survey instruments utilized in the research methodology have consistently yielded reliable and valid results in the literature on academic dishonesty and likewise are appropriate for the research study.

CHAPTER 4

Results

Academic dishonesty is of critical concern in institutions of higher education with reports indicating that engagement in academically dishonest behaviors is widespread and reaching epidemic proportions (e.g., Newstead, 1996; Prenshaw, Straughan & Albers-Miller, 2000). With this knowledge, it is imperative that institutions of higher education examine factors that may influence student engagement in dishonesty and impact institutional responses to the problem. An area of importance that has received limited attention in the research literature pertains to faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty. Research studies have revealed significant differences in perceptions of academic dishonesty and in behaviors identified as academically dishonest from the viewpoints of faculty and students (Nolan, Smith & Dai, 1998). Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to examine faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty, the frequency in which students engage in behaviors identified as being academically dishonest and perceptions of institutional policies and procedures to address dishonesty at a large, public Midwestern institution. In this chapter, the researcher will provide an overview of the survey instruments, study participants, participant demographics, and a summary of the results obtained by research question.

Survey Instruments

Three survey instruments, the Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty scale, the Academic Dishonesty scale, and the Academic Environment subscale of the Academic Integrity Survey were administered to faculty and undergraduate students as the primary method of data collection. Permission was granted by the researchers of each survey instrument prior to utilization in this study (See Appendix F). The three survey

instruments contained a total of thirty-six questions. The first instrument, the Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale (Davis et al., 1992; Bolin, 2004), a four-question Likert-scale questionnaire was utilized to measure participants' general perceptions of academic dishonesty. The second scale, the Academic Dishonesty Scale (McCabe & Trevino, 1997a), an eleven-question Likert-scale questionnaire was utilized to measure the frequency in which student participants engaged in behaviors identified as academically dishonest as well as faculty perceptions of student engagement in those behaviors. The third scale, the Academic Integrity (Academic Environment subscale) Scale (McCabe, 2008d), a twenty-one question Likert-scale questionnaire was utilized to measure participants' perceptions regarding the academic integrity environment and the effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures to address academic dishonesty at the institution under study.

Participants

Participants in this study were undergraduate students and faculty at a large, public Midwestern institution. Participants included in the study were classified as "undergraduate" students (i.e. freshman, sophomore, junior senior) and "faculty" (i.e. Tenure-track and Non-tenure track) who primarily teach undergraduate courses. Prior to selecting participants, graduate students and faculty members who only teach graduate courses were removed from the potential population sampling body. In addition to the selection criteria described above, students under the age of 18 were not included in the study so that parental consent was not required.

The original sample consisted of 6,000 randomly selected undergraduate students and 360 randomly selected faculty members. After obtaining IRB approval, the

participant population was contacted through their university-issued email addresses that were provided by the Director of the Institutional Research Office of the institution under study. Participants received an email invitation on November 4, 2011 requesting participation in the research study. Faculty and students who consented to participate in the study were provided with a survey link that was included in the original email message. Participants were then directed to the online survey host, *SurveyMonkey.com*, where they could read and print a copy of the informed consent and submit the self-reported questionnaire. Follow-up emails were sent to the participants approximately one week after the initial start date of the questionnaire (November 8, 2011) with a final follow-up email distributed three weeks after the survey open date.

Of the 6,000 student emails initially sent, twenty-seven students were excluded due to the recipient opting-out of receiving emails from the online survey site. From the 5,973 email invitations, 561 student questionnaires were returned, yielding a response rate of 9.3% for students.

Additionally, 360 email invitations were initially sent to faculty participants. However, of the emails sent, five faculty participants were excluded due to the recipient opting-out of receiving emails from the online survey host. As a result, 355 emails reached the target faculty participant population. Of the 355 email invitations, 112 faculty questionnaires were returned, yielding a response rate of 31% for faculty.

Demographics: Student Survey

As described in Table 1, data was collected regarding the respective academic college and academic standing of the student participants. Over fifty percent (50.1%) of the student participants included in this study were from the College of Arts and

Sciences, followed by the College of Business Administration (18.9%) and College of Education (13.2%). When asked about their academic standing, the majority of the respondents were seniors (46.2%) followed by juniors (29.6%). In regards to gender, 64.5% identified themselves as female and 35.1% identified themselves as male. Additionally, over half of the student respondents (55.5%) were between the age range of 18-24.

In addition to the previous variables, demographic information regarding race/ethnicity and residential status were collected. The majority of the student participants identified themselves as White (67.4%) followed by Black/African American (15.7%). Further, when asked about residential status, the overwhelming majority of student participants resided off campus (89.1%) which is consistent with the institution's classification as a "commuter campus." Table 1 summarizes the demographic information for the student participants.

Table 1 *Demographic Information for Student Participants (N=561)*

Variable	Number	Percent
Academic College		
Arts & Sciences	281	50.1
Business Administration	106	18.9
Education	74	13.2
Fine Arts & Communication	43	7.7
Joint Engineering	22	3.9
Nursing	34	6.1
Academic Standing		
Freshman	55	9.8
Sophomore	77	13.8
Junior	166	29.8
Senior	259	46.5
Gender		
Female	362	64.5
Male	197	35.1
Other	2	0.4

Table 1 (continued) *Demographic Information for Student Participants (N=561)*

Demographic	Number	Percent
Age		
18-24	309	55.5
25-34	161	28.7
35-44	56	10.0
45-54	21	3.7
55+	10	1.8
Ethnic Background/Race		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	0.2
Asian American/Pacific	19	3.4
Black/African American	88	15.7
Hispanic/Spanish/Latin American	16	2.9
White (non-Hispanic)	378	67.4
International Student	21	3.7
Multiracial Student	10	1.8
Other (please indicate)	7	1.2
Residential Status		
On-campus housing	61	10.9
Off-campus housing	497	89.1

Note. Students identified as "Other" in the Ethnic Background/Race category, identified themselves as "East Indian", "European", "Middle Eastern" and "Greek/Columbian."

Engagement in Academic Dishonesty

When students engage in academically dishonest behaviors, they compromise not only their personal integrity but also the academic environment of their respective institution (Engler, Landau, Epstein, 2008). When asked questions regarding engagement in academic dishonesty (Academic Integrity scale), 9.5% of the student participants in this study admitted to engaging in academic dishonesty although the majority of student participants (90.5%) indicated that they have not engaged in academic dishonesty. Of the participants who admitted to engaging in academic dishonesty, 34.6% indicated that they were caught. Further, of those student participants who indicated that they were caught, approximately 36% were disciplined-by faculty, 14% were disciplined under the university adjudication procedures and 50% were disciplined by both faculty and the

university adjudication procedures. Table 2 provides an overview of the frequency of engagement in academic dishonesty for student participants.

Table 2 *Frequency of Engagement in Academic Dishonesty* (n=53)

Variable	Number	Percent
Q7. Have you engaged in any form of academic dishonesty at the university (i.e. cheating on an exam, copying and pasting information without citation)?		
Yes	53	9.5%
No	504	90.5%
Q8. If you answered yes to question 7, were you caught?		
Yes	19	34.6%
No	34	64.4%
Q9. If you answered yes to question 8, were you disciplined by the faculty, university or both?		
Faculty	5	36%
University adjudication only	2	14%
Faculty and university adjudication	7	50%

Demographics: Faculty Survey

Data was collected regarding the respective academic college, academic appointment and academic rank for faculty participants. Almost half of the faculty participants were from the College of Arts and Sciences (49.5%) followed by the College of Education (18.0%). Faculty classified/appointed as Non-Tenure Track Faculty (64.2%) and those ranked as Adjunct Faculty (25.2%) represented the largest percentage of faculty participants in the study. Table 3 provides an overview of the demographic information for faculty participants.

Table 3 *Demographic Information for Faculty Participants (N=112)*

Variable	Number	Percent
Academic College		
Arts & Sciences	55	49.5
Business Administration	10	9.0
Education	20	18.0
Fine Arts & Communication	12	10.8
Honors College	3	2.7
Nursing	11	9.9
Academic Appointment		
Tenure Track Faculty	39	35.8
Non-Tenure Track Faculty	70	64.2
Academic Rank		
Assistant Professor/ Teaching Professor	23	20.7
Associate Professor/Teaching Professor	23	20.7
Full Professor/Full Teaching Professor	13	11.7
Adjunct Faculty	28	25.2
Lecturer	11	9.9
Other	13	11.7

Note. Faculty identified as “Other” in the Academic rank category, identified themselves as “Teaching Assistants”, and “Research Assistants.”

Results

Responses to the Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale (ATAD)

To determine what similarities and/or differences existed within student perceptions and faculty perceptions of general academic dishonesty statements, the Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale (ATAD) was utilized. The ATAD is a questionnaire designed to measure participants’ attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty on a five-point Likert-scale ranging from 1= “Strongly Agree”, to 5= “Strongly Disagree” (Davis et al., 1992).

Student Responses to ATAD Scale. Frequency counts and percentages were calculated on student responses to statements on the ATAD scale. Overall, 92.3% of student participants agreed or strongly agreed that it is wrong to engage in academic

dishonesty. When asked if “*Students should go ahead and cheat if they know they can get away with it,*” 88.0% of students disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

Additionally, 96.1% of students disagreed or strongly disagreed when asked if “*Students should try to cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are slim.*” As indicated in Table 4, 85.9% of students also disagreed or strongly disagreed when asked if students would “*...let another student cheat off my test if he/she asked.*”

Table 4 *Frequency Counts and Percentages of Student Responses to ATAD Scale (N=561)*

Variable	Likert-Scale Responses				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Q1.It is wrong to cheat.	319(58.5%)	184(33.8%)	30(5.5%)	10(1.8%)	2(0.4%)
Q2. Students should go ahead and cheat if they know they can get away with it.	4(0.7%)	19(3.5%)	42(7.7%)	188(34.7%)	289(53.3%)
Q3.Students should try to cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are slim.	3(0.6%)	1(0.2%)	17(3.1%)	157(28.8%)	367(67.3%)
Q4.I would let another student cheat off my test if he/she asked.	5(0.9%)	22(4.0%)	50(9.2%)	139(25.5%)	329(60.4%)

Faculty Responses to ATAD Scale. The Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale (ATAD) was also utilized to determine faculty perceptions of how students would respond to questions regarding general academic dishonesty statements. Frequencies and percentages were calculated on faculty responses to questions in the survey instrument. Based on responses to the survey questions, faculty perceptions of student responses were similar to self-reported responses by students at the institution under study. When faculty participants were asked about how students would respond to “*It is wrong to cheat,*”

89.3% agreed or strongly agreed that students would respond accordingly. Questions regarding student engagement in behaviors identified as academically dishonest revealed that 82.2% of faculty participants responded that students would disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that “*Students should go ahead and cheat if they know they can get away with it.*” As indicated in Table 5, 67.9% of faculty also believed that students would disagree or strongly disagree with the statement “*I would let another student cheat off my test if he/she asked.*”

Table 5 *Frequency Counts and Percentages of Faculty Responses for ATAD Scale (N=112)*

Variable	Likert-Scale				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Q1.It is wrong to cheat.	51(45.5%)	49(43.8%)	6(5.4%)	5(4.5%)	1(0.9%)
Q2. Students should go ahead and cheat if they know they can get away with it.	3(2.7%)	12(10.7%)	15(13.4%)	34(30.4%)	48(42.9%)
Q3.Students should try to cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are slim.	3(2.7%)	7(6.3%)	10(8.9%)	29(25.9%)	63(56.3%)
Q4.I would let another student cheat off my test if he/she asked.	3(2.7%)	14(12.5%)	19(17.0%)	28(25.0%)	48(42.9%)

Research Question One

Research Question One (RQ1) asked: “What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty?” In comparative studies of faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty, researchers have found congruence among faculty and students on general views of academic dishonesty (e.g. Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003). Thus, hypothesis one indicated

that undergraduate students and faculty would exhibit similarities within their responses to questions regarding their overall perceptions of academic dishonesty. Mean scores were analyzed to examine similarities and differences within student responses and faculty responses to questions on the Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Scale (ATAD). Higher mean scores on questions in the ATAD would reflect less accepting and less permissive perceptions of academic dishonesty statements held by undergraduate students and faculty in this study. In comparison, lower scores would represent more accepting and more permissive perceptions regarding academic dishonesty statements.

Mean scores for responses to questions on the ATAD revealed similarities within scores for students by academic standing. Students were more accepting of the statement “*It is wrong to cheat.*” Likewise, students were less accepting and less permissive of statements such as “*Students should try to cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are slim*” (See Table 6).

Table 6 Mean Scores for Student (by standing) on the ATAD

Variable	n	Questions			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Academic Standing		M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Freshman	52	1.53(0.851)	4.15(1.03)	4.42(0.956)	4.21(0.996)
Sophomore	73	1.64(0.805)	4.26(0.850)	4.63(0.540)	4.46(0.817)
Junior	162	1.54(0.731)	4.31(0.884)	4.59(0.573)	4.37(0.911)
Senior	257	1.45(0.648)	4.44(0.754)	4.67(0.559)	4.44(0.855)

Note. Strongly agree=1; Agree=2; Neutral=3; Disagree=4; Strongly disagree=5.

Mean scores on questions in the ATAD revealed similarities within responses for faculty by academic rank. Assistant/assistant teaching professors, associate/associate teaching professors, full/full teaching professor, adjuncts and faculty classified as “other” responded that students would be less accepting and less permissive of general academic

dishonesty statements such as “*students should go ahead and cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are slim*” and more accepting and more permissive of statements such as “*it is wrong to cheat.*” However, mean scores showed differences in responses for faculty classified as lecturer on questions one ($M_{q1}=2.09$, $SD=1.04$), two ($M_{q2}=3.36$, $SD=1.20$) and three ($M_{q3}=3.72$, $SD=1.27$). This finding may suggest that lecturers perceived student responses to the academic dishonesty statements would be less accepting and less permissive. Mean scores on question four for faculty classified as assistant professor/assistant teaching professor ($M_{q4}=4.21$, $SD=1.12$) and adjunct ($M_{q4}=4.07$, $SD=1.08$) were slightly higher, suggesting that they perceived student responses to the question would be less permissive and less accepting. Further discussion of the findings will be provided in Chapter 5.

Table 7 Mean Scores for Faculty (by rank) Responses on the ATAD

Variable	n	Questions			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
		M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Academic Rank					
Assistant Professor/Teaching	23	1.60(0.891)	4.21(0.998)	4.43(1.07)	4.21(1.12)
Associate Professor/Teaching	23	1.78(0.902)	3.91(1.34)	4.17(1.02)	3.69(1.18)
Full Professor/Full Teaching	13	1.61(0.650)	4.00(1.00)	4.30(0.947)	3.84(1.34)
Adjunct	28	1.71(0.854)	4.10(1.10)	4.42(0.920)	4.07(1.08)
Lecturer	11	2.09(1.04)	3.36(1.20)	3.72(1.27)	3.54(1.36)
Other	13	1.61(0.506)	4.07(0.954)	4.15(1.14)	3.92(1.03)

Note. Strongly agree=1; Agree=2; Neutral=3; Disagree=4; Strongly disagree=5. b. Mq=Mean score of question.

Responses to the Academic Dishonesty Scale (ADS)

To determine similarities and/or differences within student engagement and faculty perceptions of the frequency of engagement in behaviors identified as academically dishonest at the institution under study, the Academic Dishonesty Scale (ADS) was utilized. The ADS is a questionnaire designed to measure participant

engagement and perceptions of engagement in academic dishonesty on a five-point Likert-scale ranging from 1= “Strongly Agree”, to 5= “Strongly Disagree” was utilized (Davis et al., 1992). For the purpose of this study, student participants reported if they had engaged in behaviors deemed academically dishonest at the institution under study and faculty participants indicated their perceptions of student engagement in those behaviors.

Student Responses to ADS. Frequency count analyses and percentages were calculated on student responses to behaviors identified on the ADS. Results from the Academic Dishonesty Scale (ADS) showed that the majority of student participants indicated that they have not engaged in the behaviors identified in the survey. However, results revealed that although the majority of student participants responded that they have not engaged in behaviors identified as academically dishonest (i.e. cheating, plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration), engagement in the behaviors was occurring and to a large degree at the institution under study.

When students were asked questions regarding behaviors deemed cheating, 14.4% of students admitted to using unfair methods to learn information on an exam prior to the text being given at least one time. Students admitted to helping someone cheat on an exam (7.5%), copying from another student during a test (6.1%) and admitted to using a textbook or notes on an exam more than once (6.5%). Likewise, 7.3% of students admitted to turning in work completed by someone else at least once.

In regards to behaviors identified as plagiarism, over 10% of the students surveyed admitted to copying material and submitting that work as their own more than once (11.7%). As research on behaviors identified as academically dishonest has

revealed, even when students are informed about the seriousness of copying information without proper citation, students continue to engage in the behavior (Cohen, 2011). In this study, 13.6% of students admitted to copying a few sentences without attribution being giving to the author more than once. Additionally, when asked if they used information found on the Internet without giving credit to the source, almost thirty percent of the student participants admitted to engagement in the behavior at least once (29.7%). Further, over ten percent of student respondents admitted to engaging in the behavior a few times (13.4%).

When students were asked if they collaborated on an assignment when individual work was requested by the instructor, almost forty percent of the students surveyed admitted to engagement in the behavior at least once (39.5%). Of the forty percent who admitted engagement in the behavior, twenty percent admitted to engagement in the behavior a few times. As Table 8 indicates, although 79.8% of students responded that they have not received substantial help on an individual assignment without permission by the instructor, 11.3% of students did admit to engaging in the behavior and admitted to engaging in the behavior more than once.

Table 8 *Frequency Counts and Percentages of Student Responses to Academic Dishonesty Scale*

Variable	Likert-Scale Responses				
	Not even one time	One time	Two times	A few times	Many times
Q1. Copied material and turned it in as your own work.	422(80.4%)	42(8.0%)	11(2.1%)	45(8.6%)	5(1.0%)
Q2. Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given.	448(85.7%)	26(5.0%)	14(2.7%)	33(6.3%)	2(0.4%)

Table 8 (cont.) Frequency Counts and Percentages of Student Responses to ADS

Variable	Likert-Scale Responses				
	Not even one time	One time	Two times	A few times	Many times
Q3. Copied a few sentences of material from a published source without giving the author credit.	403(76.9%)	50(9.5%)	13(2.5%)	53(10.1%)	5(1.0%)
Q4. Helped someone cheat on a test.	458(87.4%)	27(5.2%)	8(1.5%)	27(5.2%)	4(0.8%)
Q5. Collaborated on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work.	316(60.5%)	64(12.3%)	27(5.2%)	94(18.0%)	21(4.0%)
Q6. Copied from another student during a test.	462(88.3%)	29(5.5%)	7(1.3%)	21(4.0%)	4(0.8%)
Q7. Turned in work done by someone else.	484(92.7%)	22(4.2%)	5(1.0%)	9(1.7%)	1(0.4%)
Q8. Received substantial help on an individual assignment without the instructor's permission.	416(79.8%)	46(8.8%)	13(2.5%)	38(7.3%)	8(1.5%)
Q9. Cheated on a test in any way.	425(81.7%)	50(9.6%)	9(1.7%)	24(4.6%)	12(2.3%)
Q10. Used a textbook or notes on a test without the instructor's permission.	451(86.7%)	35(6.7%)	8(1.5%)	19(3.7%)	7(1.3%)
Q11. Used information found on the internet without giving credit to the source.	366(70.2%)	63(12.1%)	12(2.3%)	70(13.4%)	10(1.9%)

Faculty Responses to ADS Scale. Research reveals that when faculty are presented with a cheating dilemma, their perceptions of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors has been characterized as being more negative than student perceptions of, and actual engagement in the same behavior (Pe Symaco &

Marcelo, 2003). As such, the Academic Dishonesty Scale was utilized to determine faculty perceptions of the frequency of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors at the institution under study. Frequency counts and percentages were conducted on faculty responses to questions contained within the survey instrument.

When asked how the average student would respond to questions regarding academic dishonesty involving cheating, over half of the faculty participants responded that students would admit to using unfair methods to learn information on an exam prior to the text being given at least one time (66.3%). Faculty participants in this study responded that students would admit to helping someone cheat on an exam at least once (70.5%) and believed that students would admit to copying from another student during a test more than once (43.2%). More surprising, more than forty percent of faculty believed that students would admit to turning in work completed by someone else and admit to using a textbook or notes on a test without instructor permission more than once.

Plagiarism is an increasing problem in institutions of higher education (Howard, 1995). When faculty were asked if students would admit to copying material and submitting the work as their own, more than seventy percent reported that students would engage in the behavior more than once (70.7%). Faculty also responded that students would admit to copying a few sentences of information without attribution being giving to the author more than once (84.2%). In this study, when asked if students would admit to using information found on the Internet without giving credit to the source, over ninety percent of faculty responded that students would admit to engagement in the behavior at least once (93.5%). Research reveals that increases in incidences of plagiarism may be

attributed to the accessibility of information found on the web as evident by the percentage of faculty who perceived student engaged in the behavior (Cohen, 2011).

In regards to behaviors identified as constituting unauthorized collaboration, when faculty were asked if students would admit to collaborating on an assignment when individual work was requested by the instructor, faculty responded that students would admit to engagement in the behavior at least once (93.4%). Similarly, 69.7% of faculty responded that students would admit to receiving substantial help on an individual assignment without permission by the instructor more than once as shown in Table 9.

Table 9 *Frequency Counts and Percentages of Faculty Responses for ADS Scale*

Variable	Likert Scale Responses				
	Not even one time	One Time	Two Times	A Few Times	Many Times
Q1.Copied material and turned it in as your own work.	14(13.2%)	17(16%)	8(7.5%)	51(48.1%)	16(15.1%)
Q2. Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given.	35(33.7%)	19(18.3%)	7(6.7%)	33(31.7%)	10(9.6%)
Q3.Copied a few sentences of material from a published source without giving the author credit.	9(8.4%)	8(7.5%)	2(1.9%)	45(42.1%)	43(40.2%)
Q4. Helped someone cheat on a test.	31(29.5%)	28(26.7%)	9(8.6%)	31(29.5%)	6(5.7%)
Q5. Collaborated on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work.	7(6.6%)	18(17.0%)	5(4.7%)	48(45.3%)	28(26.4%)
Q6.Copied from another student during a test.	24(23.1%)	35(33.7%)	10(9.6%)	30(28.8%)	5(4.8%)
Q7. Turned in work done by someone else.	25(24.0%)	30(28.8%)	13(12.5%)	30(28.8%)	6(4.8%)

Table 9 (cont.) *Frequency Counts and Percentages of Faculty Responses for ADS Scale*

Variable	Likert Scale Responses				
	Not even one time	One Time	Two Times	A Few Times	Many Times
Q8. Received substantial help on an individual assignment without the instructor's permission.	11(10.4%)	21(19.8%)	8(7.5%)	51(46.2%)	17(16.0%)
Q9. Cheated on a test in any way.	21(20.6%)	29(28.4%)	18(17.6%)	32(31.4%)	2(2.0%)
Q10. Used a textbook or notes on a test without the instructor's permission.	32(30.8%)	28(26.9%)	15(14.4%)	24(23.1%)	5(4.8%)
Q11. Used information found on the internet without giving credit to the source.	7(6.5%)	6(5.6%)	5(4.7%)	38(35.5%)	51(47.7%)

Research Question Two

Research Question Two (RQ2) asked: “What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions of the frequency in which students engage in behaviors classified/categorized as academically dishonest?” Research studies on student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors reveal that between 80-90% of students have admitted to cheating at least once during their undergraduate career (e.g., McCabe, 1993a; Schmelkin, Gilbert, Spencer, Pincus & Silva, 2008). As such, hypothesis two indicated that undergraduate students would admit to engaging in behaviors that can be classified/categorized as academically dishonest to a higher frequency than faculty perceive student engagement in those behaviors.

Mean scores were analyzed and a one-way analysis of variance was conducted to examine similarities and differences within student responses and faculty responses to questions in the Academic Dishonesty Scale. Prior to conducting the study, it was

anticipated that faculty and students would have significantly different scores on the frequency of student engagement on the ADS. Higher scores on the Academic Dishonesty Scale reflect more frequency in student involvement in the behaviors identified as academically dishonest. Therefore it was hypothesized that students would admit to engagement in academically dishonest behaviors at a higher frequency than faculty perceptions of that engagement. Despite the assumptions, the hypothesis was not supported. The majority of student participants denied engagement in behaviors identified as academically dishonest in the Academic Dishonesty scale.

Mean scores within student responses to questions in the Academic Dishonesty Scale revealed similarities on questions one, two, three, four, six, seven, eight, nine, ten and eleven. Students responded to engagement in behaviors such as copying material and submitting as one's own work (question one) and cheating on an exam (question nine) at a lower frequency. Mean scores for students classified as "Sophomores" on question five, "*collaborated on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work*" ($M_{q5}=2.07, SD=1.39$), revealed a small difference in scores with a slightly higher percentage of sophomores admitting to engagement in the behavior at least once.

Mean scores within faculty responses to questions of student engagement on the Academic Dishonesty Scale revealed similarities in scores for faculty by academic rank on questions four and six. Faculty responded that students would admit to engaging in behaviors such as helping someone cheat on an exam (question four) and copying from another student during an exam (question six) at a lower frequency. Mean scores showed a slight difference in scores for faculty on questions one, two, three, five, seven, eight, nine, ten and eleven. Mean scores for faculty classified as "Adjunct" were slightly lower

on questions one ($M_{q1}=2.96$, $SD=1.45$), three ($M_{q3}=3.51$, $SD=1.36$), seven ($M_{q7}=2.51$, $SD=1.34$), eight ($M_{q8}=2.77$, $SD=1.36$) and eleven ($M_{q11}=3.59$, $SD=1.42$), with adjuncts reporting that student engagement in behaviors identified by those questions occurred at a lower frequency at the institution under study. Additionally, mean scores for faculty classified as assistant professor/assistant teaching professor were slightly lower indicating that faculty perceived students engaged in the behavior identified in question seven, “*turned in work completed by someone else*” ($M_{q7}=2.54$, $SD=1.33$) at a lower frequency than faculty participants by academic rank. Further, mean scores for faculty classified as “Other” were lower on questions three ($M_{q3}=3.53$, $SD=1.39$), seven ($M_{q7}=1.84$, $SD=.987$), eight ($M_{q8}=2.69$, $SD=1.18$), ten ($M_{q10}=1.92$, $SD=1.92$) and eleven ($M_{q11}=3.92$, $SD=1.44$) suggesting that faculty classified as other perceived student engagement in the behaviors identified as academically dishonest also occurred less frequently at the institution under study.

As shown in Table 11, mean scores for faculty classified as assistant professor/assistant teaching professor ($M_{q5}=4.13$, $SD=.990$) and lecturers ($M_{q5}=4.09$, $SD=.539$) were slightly higher and thus had higher perceptions of frequency of student engagement in the behavior (“*Collaboration on an individual assignment*”). Further, mean scores to responses on question two (“*Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test*”) ($M_{q2}=3.54$, $SD=1.57$) and question eight (“*Received substantial help on an individual assignment*”) ($M_{q8}=4.36$, $SD=.504$) were higher for lecturers who perceived a higher frequency in student engagement in those behaviors. Results also revealed that faculty classified as full professor/full teaching professor perceived students engaged in academically dishonest behaviors such as “*cheated on a test in any way*” ($M_{q9}=3.09$,

$SD=.943$) more frequently than the remaining faculty groups by academic rank. Further analysis of the results will be presented in Chapter 5.

Table 10 Mean Scores for Student (by standing) and Faculty (by rank) Responses on the Academic Dishonesty Scale

Variable	Questions										
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
Academic Standing											
Freshman	1.52(1.10)	1.29(.855)	1.45(.923)	1.16(.650)	1.74(1.24)	1.31(.969)	1.08(.274)	1.32(.809)	1.26(.952)	1.25(.955)	1.68(1.10)
Sophomore	1.33(.827)	1.28(.864)	1.55(1.04)	1.21(.652)	2.07(1.39)	1.25(.670)	1.27(.832)	1.54(1.04)	1.47(1.00)	1.32(.874)	1.70(1.21)
Junior	1.46(.991)	1.27(.804)	1.56(1.12)	1.25(.782)	1.96(1.31)	1.24(.736)	1.11(.482)	1.45(.986)	1.30(.876)	1.22(0.747)	1.71(1.24)
Senior	1.39(.941)	1.32(.822)	1.41(.930)	1.29(.829)	1.91(1.31)	1.20(.698)	1.08(.412)	1.39(.953)	1.38(.885)	1.26(.730)	1.56(1.04)
Academic Rank											
Assistant/Teach Pr	3.59(1.33)	2.54(1.40)	4.54(.738)	2.59(1.36)	4.13(.990)	2.38(1.20)	2.54(1.33)	3.68(1.21)	2.77(1.37)	2.57(1.32)	4.54(.800)
Associate/Teach Pr	3.4(1.09)	2.57(1.50)	4.04(1.35)	2.75(1.27)	3.9(1.02)	2.78(1.08)	3(1.24)	3.66(1.01)	2.73(1.04)	2.78(1.39)	4.28(.956)
Full/Teaching Pr	3.66(1.15)	2.75(1.54)	4.08(1.08)	2.83(1.40)	3.75(1.13)	2.83(1.33)	3(1.18)	3.58(1.31)	3.09(.943)	2.66(1.07)	4.25(1.13)
Adjunct	2.96(1.45)	2.61(1.38)	3.51(1.36)	2.37(1.30)	3.14(1.40)	2.37(1.33)	2.51(1.34)	2.77(1.36)	2.32(1.14)	2.14(1.32)	3.59(1.42)
Lecturer	3.90(1.13)	3.54(1.57)	4.27(.904)	2.72(1.67)	4.09(.539)	2.90(1.37)	3.18(1.16)	4.36(.504)	2.81(1.32)	2.81(1.32)	4.45(.522)
Other	3.07(1.25)	2.23(1.48)	3.53(1.39)	2.23(1.16)	3.38(1.55)	2.39(1.31)	1.84(.987)	2.69(1.18)	2.61(1.12)	1.92(.862)	3.92(1.44)

Note. Strongly agree=1; Agree=2; Neutral=3; Disagree=4; Strongly disagree=5. b. Mq=Mean of question. c. Survey questions: 1=Copied material and turned it in as your work; 2=Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given; 3=Copied a few sentences of material from a published source without giving the author credit; 4=Helped someone cheat on a test; 5=Collaborated on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work; 6=Copied from another student during a test; 7=Turned in work done by someone else; 8=Received substantial help on an individual assignment without the instructor's permission; 9=Cheated on a test in any way; 10=Used a textbook or notes on a test without the instructor's permission; 11=Used information found on the internet without giving credit to the source.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted at the item scale level to examine if differences within student responses on the Academic Dishonesty Scale were significant. There were no statistically significant differences observed within student responses to engagement in behaviors deemed academically dishonest.

Table 11 ANOVA for Student Perceptions on the Academic Dishonesty Scale

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Question 1					
Student type	1.551	3	0.517	0.563	0.640
Error	477.920	520	0.919		
Total	479.471	523			
Question 2					
Student type	0.314	3	0.105	0.153	0.0928
Error	353.862	518	0.683		
Total	354.176	521			
Question 3					
Student type	2.741	3	0.914	0.902	0.440
Error	525.798	519	1.013		
Total	528.539	522			
Question 4					
Student type	1.038	3	0.346	0.572	0.634
Error	313.529	518	0.605		
Total	314.567	521			
Question 5					
Student type	3.274	3	1.091	0.629	0.597
Error	897.655	517	1.736		
Total	900.929	520			
Question 6					
Student type	0.564	3	0.188	0.347	0.792
Error	280.923	518	0.542		
Total	281.487	521			
Question 7					
Student type	1.938	3	0.646	2.590	0.052
Error	128.670	516	0.249		
Total	130.608	519			
Question 8					
Student type	1.931	3	0.644	0.694	0.556
Error	479.324	517	0.927		
Total	481.255	520			
Question 9					
Student type	1.965	3	0.655	0.797	0.496
Error	424.066	516	0.822		
Total	426.031	519			

Table 11 (cont.) ANOVA for Student Perceptions on the Academic Dishonesty Scale

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Question 10					
Student type	0.512	3	0.171	0.280	0.840
Error	313.851	515	0.609		
Total	314.362	518			
Question 11					
Student type	2.737	3	0.912	0.701	0.550
Error	669.701	517	1.295		
Total	672.438	520			

Note. a. Significant at the $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$, $p < .001^{***}$. b. total student = responses for all students by academic standing

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted at the item scale level to examine if differences within faculty responses on the Academic Dishonesty Scale were significant. As indicated in Table 12, there was a statistically significant main effect within faculty perceptions of student engagement in behaviors identified in question three, $F(1, 102) = 4.451$, $p = .037$. Results of the ANOVA also revealed statistically significant differences within faculty perceptions of: collaboration on assignments when individual work is required, $F(1, 101) = 5.463$, $p = .021$; and the use of information found on the internet without given credit to the source, $F(1, 102) = 6.051$, $p = .016$. Although additional differences were found within faculty responses of student engagement in behaviors deemed academically dishonest, those results were not statistically significant.

Table 12 ANOVA for Faculty Responses on the Academic Dishonesty Scale

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	Significance
Question 1					
Faculty type	0.222	1	0.222	0.134	0.715
Error	167.758	101	1.661		
Total	167.981	102			
Question 2					
Faculty type	4.000	1	4.000	1.902	0.171
Error	208.218	99	2.103		
Total	212.218	100			

Table 12 (cont.) ANOVA for Faculty Responses on the Academic Dishonesty Scale

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	Significance
Question 3					
Faculty type	6.516	1	6.516	4.451	0.037*
Error	149.330	102	1.464		
Total	155.846	103			
Question 4					
Faculty type	0.134	1	0.134	0.073	0.787
Error	182.739	100	1.827		
Total	182.873	101			
Question 5					
Faculty type	7.822	1	7.822	5.463	0.021*
Error	144.605	101	1.435		
Total	152.427	102			
Question 6					
Faculty type	0.001	1	0.001	0.001	0.982
Error	162.158	99	1.638		
Total	162.158	100			
Question 7					
Faculty type	0.526	1	0.526	0.314	0.577
Error	166.028	99	1.677		
Total	166.554	100			
Question 8					
Faculty type	3.949	1	3.949	2.498	0.117
Error	161.272	102	1.581		
Total	165.221	103			
Question 9					
Faculty type	0.841	1	0.841	0.586	0.446
Error	139.159	97	1.435		
Total	140.000	98			
Question 10					
Faculty type	1.062	1	1.062	0.649	0.422
Error	161.888	99	1.635		
Total	162.950	100			
Question 11					
Faculty type	7.787	1	7.787	6.051	0.016*
Error	131.252	102	1.287		
Total	139.038	103			

Note. a. Significant at the $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$, $p < .001^{***}$. b. total faculty= responses for faculty by academic rank

Responses to the Academic Integrity Scale (AIS)

To determine the similarities and/or differences within student perceptions and faculty perceptions of the academic environment of the institution under study, the Academic Environment subscale of the Academic Integrity Scale (AIS) was utilized. The

AIS consists of questions that attempt to measure participants' perceptions of institutional academic dishonesty policies and procedures on a five-point Likert-scale with responses ranging from 1= "Very Low", to 5= "Very High" in the first subsection of questions, 1= "Learned a little" to 3= "Learned A Lot", in the second subsection of questions and 1= "Never" to 5= "Very Often" in the third set of questions (McCabe, 2008d). For the purpose of this study, students indicated their perceptions of the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of academic dishonesty policies at the institution under study. Faculty responses also reflected their perceptions of institutional responses to address academic dishonesty at the institution under study.

Student Responses to AIS. Frequency count and percentages were analyzed for student responses to questions on the AIS. Research reveals that when students feel connected to their educational institution and are informed of the institutional policies and procedures for addressing dishonesty, incidences of engagement of the behavior are decreased (e.g., Buckley et al., 1998). Students, when asked to respond to questions regarding institutional policies to address dishonesty, indicated that the severity for penalties at the institution under study were high or very high (63.3%). This finding, according to research, may serve as a deterrent for student engagement in academic dishonesty. Students in this study also responded that faculty understanding of the academic dishonesty policies at the institution under study were high or very high (73.2%), consistent with research that indicates students perceive faculty to be very knowledgeable of institutional policies to address academic dishonesty (e.g. Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003). Yet, only 38.7% of the student participants indicated that the effectiveness of institutional policies to address dishonesty was high or very high. In

regards to student understanding of institutional policies and support of those policies, student responses were “*Medium*” (35.6%, 47.6%, respectively). However, over seventy percent of students indicated that faculty support of institutional policies to address dishonesty was high or very high (73.3%).

In addition to questions regarding the effectiveness of academic dishonesty policies, when asked if students had been informed about the academic dishonesty policies at the institution under study, the majority of student participants indicated that they had been informed about the policies (89.0%). Students responded that they “*Learned a lot*” of information regarding institutional academic dishonesty policies from sources such as faculty (62.7%) and “*Learned Some*” information from sources such as the student handbook (42.1%). However, students indicated that university resources such as first year experience courses (43.5%), campus website (50.9%), advisors (49.7%), teaching assistants (58.5%) and other students (62.1%) provided little or no information regarding academic dishonesty policies. This finding is disheartening because according to research perceptions of the effectiveness of institutional policies to address dishonesty are influenced not only by the clarity of the policy but also in how that information is disseminated throughout the institution (Prenshaw, Straughan, Albers-Miller, 2002).

Student participants indicated that when asked, on average, if faculty members/instructors discuss behaviors identified as academically dishonest such as plagiarism, students responded that faculty often or very often discussed plagiarism (65.5%), guidelines for group work or collaboration (46.7%), citing information from written sources (70.8%) and information from Internet sources (65.0%). However, in

reviewing student responses regarding discussions of information pertaining to falsifying or fabricating research data (28.7%) and course data (26.1%), over twenty five percent of students responded that those discussions are never discussed.

Table 13 *Frequency Counts and Percentages of Student Responses for Academic Integrity Scale*

Variable	Likert-Scale Responses				
	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
Q1. Severity of penalties.	9(1.8%)	24(4.8%)	149(30.0%)	192(38.7%)	122(24.6%)
Q2. Student understanding of policies.	55(10.8%)	103(20.3%)	181(35.6%)	114(22.4%)	55(10.8%)
Q3. Faculty understanding of policies.	10(2.0%)	17(3.4%)	108(21.5%)	201(40.0%)	167(33.2%)
Q4. Student support of policies.	35(7.0%)	86(17.3%)	237(47.6%)	112(22.5%)	28(5.6%)
Q5. Faculty support of policies.	4(.8%)	18(3.6%)	112(22.3%)	207(41.2%)	161(32.1%)
Q6. Effectiveness of policies.	28(5.6%)	72 (14.4%)	206(41.3%)	141(28.3%)	52(10.4%)
Variable	Number		Percent		
Q 7. Are students informed about the University's policy on academic dishonesty?					
Yes	444		89.0		
No	55		11.0		

Variable	Likert-Scale Responses		
	Learned Little	Learned Some	Learned a lot
Q8. First Year Experience Course	165(43.5%)	142(37.5%)	73(19.3%)
Q9. Website	202(50.9%)	141(35.5%)	57(14.4%)
Q10. Student Handbook	133(33.5%)	167(42.1%)	103(25.9%)
Q11. Advisor	190(49.7%)	123(32.2%)	75(19.6%)
Q12. Student	238(62.1%)	105(27.4%)	45(11.7%)
Q13. Faculty	34(7.5%)	139(30.7)	284(62.7%)
Q14. Teaching Assistants	220(58.5%)	95(25.3%)	67(17.8%)
Q15. Dean/Administrator	256(71.9%)	62(17.4%)	40(11.2%)

Table 13 (cont.) *Frequency Counts and Percentages of Student Responses for AIS*

Variable	Likert-Scale Responses				
	Never	Very Seldom	Seldom	Often	Very Often
Q16.Plagiarism	26(5.1%)	46(9.1%)	102(20.2%)	178(35.2%)	153(30.3%)
Q17.Guidelines on group work or collaboration	43(8.3%)	87(17.2%)	140(27.7%)	153(30.3%)	83(16.4%)
Q18.Proper citation/referencing of written sources	16(3.2%)	40(8.0%)	90(18.0%)	186(37.2%)	168(33.6%)
Q19.Proper citation/referencing of Internet sources	25(5.0%)	48(9.6%)	102(20.4%)	180(35.9%)	146(29.1%)
Q20.Falsifying/fabricating research data	140(28.7%)	88 (18.1%)	93(19.1%)	86(17.7%)	80(16.4%)
Q21.Falsifying/fabricating course data	129(26.1%)	81 (16.4%)	95(19.2%)	97(19.6%)	93(18.8%)

Note. a. Percentages may not equal 100% due to non-response by participants. b. Percentages are represented in parentheses.

Faculty Responses to AIS. The Academic Integrity Scale was utilized to determine faculty perceptions of the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of policies to address academic dishonesty at the institution under study. Research indicates that in order for institutions of higher education to create a culture of integrity, faculty, students and administrators must be involved in the process (McCabe & Trevino, 1993a). Thus, frequency counts analyses and percentages were calculated on faculty responses to the survey instrument.

According to research, a major deterrent for faculty in reporting academic dishonesty cases is the lack of severity in regards to punishments for those found guilty of violations (Liddell & Fong, 2003). In this study, almost half of faculty responded that the severity for penalties at the institution under study were “*Medium*” (49.5%) (See Table 14). Faculty reported that the average student’s understanding of institutional

policies to address dishonesty was “*Low*” (42.5%), with 16% of faculty responding that student understanding is very low. Results revealed that faculty also perceived student support of academic dishonesty policies was medium although a smaller percentage of faculty (9.5%) disagreed and believed that student support was very low. One may argue that some faculty may perceive dishonest students as less accepting of academic policies to deter dishonesty which is consistent with previous research on deviant student behavior and consequences (Micheals & Mieth, 1989). Research revealed that when asked about faculty understanding of academic dishonesty policies (45.8%) and faculty support of those policies (43.9%), responses were “*Medium*.” Surprisingly, 12.4% of faculty responded that the effectiveness of academic dishonesty policies at the institution was very low while only 11.4% of faculty believed that policies to address academic dishonesty at the institution under study were high or very high. This finding demonstrates the need for further research on how perceptions of institutional academic dishonesty policies may impact faculty engagement in procedures to address dishonesty.

When asked if students had been informed about the academic dishonesty policies at the institution under study, more than eighty percent of faculty responded that students are informed about the policies (80.8%). Of questions designed to elicit how the institution informs the campus on the academic dishonesty policy, faculty indicated that less than five percent of students learn little information from resources such as the student handbook and faculty. Instead faculty reported that the majority of information regarding institutional dishonesty policies is provided by faculty (58.3%) and through the campus handbook (61.1%). Further, more than fifty percent of students learn some information from first year experience courses (67.9%), through the campus website

(56.3%), through their academic advisor (52.9%) and through teaching assistants (53.2%) according to faculty participants in this study.

Faculty were also asked how often information regarding behaviors identified as academically dishonest such as plagiarism are discussed in the classroom setting. Overall, faculty responded that they often or very often discuss plagiarism (53.3%), although a surprisingly percentage of faculty responded that they seldom discuss the topic (32.4%). This finding supports research that indicates that plagiarism is oftentimes viewed by faculty as a “black or white” issue in which an assumption is made that students understand what plagiarism entails and thus would not include further discussion of the behavior within the classroom setting (e.g., Howard & Davies, 2009). However, more than fifty percent of faculty reported that discussions on guidelines for group work (54.4%), proper citation of Internet sources (70.9%) and proper citation of information from written sources (74.5%) are often and/or very often discussed. This finding is important to note since research reveals that more students are engaging in academic dishonesty on written assignments more so than on in exams (e.g., Haines et al., 1986; Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2003). Although twenty percent of faculty responded that they often have discussions on fabricating research data, almost fifty percent of faculty responded that those discussions never occur (47.9%). As indicated in Table 14, almost sixty percent of faculty responded that they never discuss fabricating course data (58.3%) while only twelve percent often discuss the behavior (12.5%). Although faculty acknowledge that academic dishonesty is of great concern in higher education, this finding supports research studies that reveal the manner in which faculty disseminate information on

academically dishonest behaviors is oftentimes incongruent with their personal beliefs and classroom conversations (e.g., Nadelson, 2007; McCabe, 1993a).

Table 14 *Frequency Counts and Percentages of Faculty Responses for Academic Integrity Scale*

Variable	Likert-Scale Responses				
	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
Q1. Severity of penalties.	10(9.3%)	27(25.2%)	53(49.5%)	16(15.0%)	1(0.9%)
Q2. Student understanding of policies.	17(16.0%)	45(42.5%)	35(33.0%)	8(7.5%)	1(0.9%)
Q3. Faculty understanding of policies.	2(1.9%)	14(13.1%)	49(45.8%)	37(34.6%)	5(4.7%)
Q4. Student support of policies.	10(9.5%)	35(33.3%)	50(47.6%)	10(9.5%)	---
Q5. Faculty support of policies.	3(2.8%)	10(9.3%)	47(43.9%)	34(31.8%)	13(12.1%)
Q6. The effectiveness of policies.	13(12.4%)	28(26.7%)	52(49.5%)	10(9.5%)	2(1.9%)
Variable	Number		Percent		
Q 7. Are students informed about the University's policy on academic dishonesty?					
Yes	84		80.8		
No	20		19.2		

Variable	Likert-Scale Responses		
	Learned Little	Learned Some	Learned a lot
Q8. First Year Experience Course	12(14.3%)	57(67.9%)	15(17.9%)
Q9. Website	9(10.3%)	49(56.3%)	29(33.3%)
Q10. Student Handbook	3(3.3%)	33(36.7%)	54(61.1%)
Q11. Advisor	31(36.5%)	45(52.9%)	9(10.6%)
Q12. Student	56(67.5%)	24(28.9%)	3(3.6%)
Q13. Faculty	1(1.0%)	39(41.7%)	56(58.3%)
Q14. Teaching Assistants	28(37.7%)	40(53.2%)	9(11.7%)
Q15. Dean/Administrator	42(56.4%)	30(41.0%)	6(5.1%)

Table 14 (cont.) *Frequency Counts and Percentages of Faculty Responses for Academic Integrity Scale*

Variable	Likert-Scale Responses				
	Never	Very Seldom	Seldom	Often	Very Often
Q16. Plagiarism	3(2.9%)	12(11.4%)	34(32.4%)	40(38.1%)	16(15.2%)
Q17. Guidelines on group work or collaboration	13(12.6%)	10(9.7%)	24(23.3%)	41(39.8%)	15(14.6%)
Q18. Proper citation/referencing of written sources	4(3.9%)	6(5.9%)	16(15.7%)	50(49.0%)	26(25.5%)
Q19. Proper citation/referencing of Internet sources	5(4.9%)	9(8.7%)	16(15.5%)	52(50.5%)	21(20.4%)
Q20. Falsifying/fabricating research data	45(47.9%)	8(8.5%)	15(16.0%)	19(20.2%)	7(7.4%)
Q21. Falsifying/fabricating course data	56(58.3%)	10(10.4%)	11(11.5%)	12(12.5%)	7(7.3%)

Note. a. – Absence of reported data. b. Percentages are represented in parentheses.

Research Question Three

Research Question Three (RQ3) asked: “What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions regarding the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures that address academic dishonesty?” Research reveals that communication of an institution’s commitment to promoting integrity and honesty are essential to a successful academic integrity program (Harding, Carpenter, Montgomery & Steneck, 2002). Thus, hypothesis three indicated that faculty and students would exhibit similarities within their perceptions regarding the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures that address academic dishonesty at the institution under study.

Mean scores were analyzed and a one-way analysis of variance was conducted to answer RQ3. Prior to conducting this study, it was anticipated that faculty and undergraduate students would have similar perceptions and scores on the AIS. Higher

scores on the Academic Integrity Scale are thought to be an indication of participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of institutional policies to address academic dishonesty. Therefore it was hypothesized that undergraduate students and faculty would have similarities within their perceptions of the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies to address dishonesty. Although similarities were seen in responses to several questions, there were a number of differences within student responses and faculty responses reflected in the data.

Mean scores on responses to the AIS for students by academic standing revealed similarities in scores on questions one, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, eighteen, nineteen and twenty. Students responded that the severity of punishments at the institution (question one) and the effectiveness of institutional policies to address academic dishonesty (question six) were medium. Results also revealed that students responded that they are informed about the institutional academic dishonesty policies but received little information regarding the policies from resources such as the first year experience course, website, student handbook, other students, teaching assistants and deans. Mean scores for students classified as freshman on question four, "*Student support of institutional academic dishonesty policies*" ($M_{q4}=2.93, SD=.941$) and question 17, "*guidelines on group work or collaboration*", ($M_{q17}=2.75, SD=1.29$) were slightly lower than the remaining student groups indicating that the freshman population in this study perceived student support of institutional academic dishonesty policies and faculty discussion on guidelines for group work/collaboration to be "*Low.*" However, in the remaining four questions (question two,

question three, question five and question twenty-one) student responses and mean scores differed.

In question two, “*Average student’s understanding of campus policies concerning student cheating*”, mean scores of freshman ($M_{q2}=2.70$, $SD=1.14$) and juniors ($M_{q2}=2.93$, $SD=1.06$) were slightly lower in comparison to mean scores for sophomores ($M_{q2}=3.14$, $SD=1.21$) and seniors ($M_{q2}=3.09$, $SD=1.15$) that were slightly higher. In question three, “*Average faculty understanding of campus policies concerning student cheating*”, and question twenty-one, “*Falsifying/fabricating of course data*”, mean scores for sophomores ($M_{q3}=4.10$, $SD=.971$; $M_{q21}=3.08$, $SD=1.57$) and seniors ($M_{q3}=4.02$, $SD=.926$; $M_{q21}=3.05$, $SD=1.46$) were slightly higher than the mean scores of freshman ($M_{q3}=3.91$, $SD=1.07$; $M_{q21}=2.27$, $SD=1.31$) and juniors ($M_{q3}=3.90$, $SD=.875$; $M_{q21}=2.72$, $SD=1.41$). An interesting finding was discovered in the mean scores for students by academic standing on question five. Mean scores for students classified as juniors and seniors were lower in student responses to faculty support of institutional academic dishonesty policies in comparison to the scores of freshman ($M_{q5}=4.06$, $SD=.904$) and sophomores ($M_{q5}=4.22$, $SD=.807$) who indicated that faculty highly supported institutional policies to address academic dishonesty. A number of explanations could account for the differences in student responses on the AIS and will be examined in Chapter 5.

Table 15 Mean Scores for Student (by standing) Responses on the Academic Integrity Scale

Variable	Questions										
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11
Acad. Standing	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
Freshman	3.80(.943)	2.70(1.14)	3.91(1.07)	2.93(.941)	4.06(.904)	3.30(.865)	1.30(.465)	1.94(.733)	1.63(.798)	1.91(.742)	1.66(.700)
Sophomore	3.98(.872)	3.14(1.21)	4.10(.971)	3.13(.935)	4.22(.807)	3.44(1.00)	1.14(.354)	1.94(.854)	1.65(.725)	1.94(.825)	1.75(.785)
Junior	3.76(.865)	2.93(1.06)	3.90(.875)	3.03(.978)	3.86(.854)	3.25(.920)	1.11(.315)	1.69(.703)	1.66(.736)	1.89(.775)	1.66(.741)
Senior	3.73(.983)	3.09(1.15)	4.02(.926)	3.02(.943)	3.98(.923)	3.15(1.09)	1.06(.250)	1.69(.744)	1.61(.709)	1.94(.739)	1.73(.805)

Variable	Questions									
	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21
Acad. Standing	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
Freshman	1.50(.647)	2.43(.647)	1.52(.696)	1.47(.614)	3.08(1.18)	2.75(1.29)	3.70(1.21)	3.63(1.20)	2.14(1.32)	2.27(1.31)
Sophomore	1.58(.701)	2.50(.673)	1.84(.840)	1.59(.773)	3.69(1.20)	3.27(1.23)	3.86(1.13)	3.77(1.18)	2.98(1.61)	3.08(1.57)
Junior	1.60(.764)	2.57(.598)	1.50(.717)	1.30(.637)	3.76(1.08)	3.26(1.13)	3.85(1.00)	3.66(1.10)	2.64(1.41)	2.72(1.41)
Senior	1.43(.655)	2.57(.603)	1.58(.773)	1.40(.687)	3.92(1.06)	3.40(1.13)	3.97(1.01)	3.80(1.09)	2.87(1.41)	3.05(1.46)

Note. Mq=Mean of question. b. Questions 1-6; 1=very low; 2=low; 3=medium; 4=high; 5=very high. c. Questions 8-15; 1=learned little; 2=learned some; 3=learned a lot. d. Questions 16-21; 1=never; 2=very seldom; 3=seldom; 4=often; 5=very often.

Mean scores for faculty responses to questions in the AIS revealed similarities within scores for questions three, four, five, six, seven, nine, ten, twelve, thirteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, and nineteen. Mean scores and responses for faculty classified as lecturer were lower on question two ($M_{q2}=1.81$, $SD=.873$), with lecturers indicating that the average students understanding of campus policies regarding academic dishonesty was low. Results also revealed that faculty classified as associate professor/associate teaching professor had lower mean scores or reported that students learned little or no information from first year experience courses ($M_{q8}=1.94$, $SD=.658$) in comparison to faculty groups that reported students learn some information about institutional policies on academic dishonesty in that course.

Mean scores within faculty responses to question one, were slightly higher for faculty classified as adjunct ($M_{q1}=3.03$, $SD=.939$) and other ($M_{q1}=3.15$, $SD=.688$) thus perceiving the severity of penalties at the institution under study was higher than perceptions from the remaining faculty groups. Higher mean scores were exhibited for lecturers on question eleven ($M_{q11}=2.11$, $SD=.333$) with lecturers responding that students learn some information regarding academic dishonesty policies from their academic advisor, although the majority of faculty responded that little to no information is learned through academic advisors. Results also revealed that faculty classified as other ($M_{q14}=2.45$, $SD=.522$) responded that students learn some information regarding institutional policies to address academic dishonesty through teaching assistants (question 14). However, lower mean scores for faculty classified as “other” were found in their responses to the amount of information that is learned through teaching assistants (See Table 16).

Mean score within faculty responses to questions regarding the clarity of information about institutional policies to address specific behaviors identified as academically dishonest within the classroom setting differed for faculty by academic rank. Faculty responses on question eighteen, “*Proper citation/referencing of written sources*” were divided with faculty classified as full professor/full teaching professor ($M_{q18}=3.91, SD=.668$), adjunct ($M_{q18}=3.60, SD=1.11$) and lecturer ($M_{q18}=3.30, SD=.823$) with lower mean scores revealed. Higher mean scores for faculty classified as associate professor/associate teaching professor ($M_{q20}=2.55, SD=1.61$), full professor/full teaching professor ($M_{q20}=2.41, SD=1.56$) and other ($M_{q20}=2.33, SD=1.61$) were revealed in responses to discussions of information regarding falsifying/fabricating research data in the classroom settings. More surprisingly, mean scores for faculty classified as assistant professor/assistant teaching professor and lecturer were much lower than faculty by academic rank with both groups reporting that information regarding falsifying/fabricating research data was never discussed within their classrooms.

Table 16 Mean Scores Student Faculty (by rank) Responses on the Academic Integrity Scale

Variable	Questions										
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11
Acad. Rank	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
AP/ATP	2.50(1.05)	2.31(.779)	3.27(.827)	2.50(.801)	3.27(1.12)	2.28(1.14)	1.27(.455)	2.10(.567)	2.15(.501)	2.52(.512)	1.77(.646)
ASP/ASTP	2.61(.589)	2.25(.638)	3.19(.813)	2.50(.760)	3.47(.679)	2.65(.670)	1.15(.366)	1.94(.658)	2.23(.664)	2.41(.712)	1.50(.632)
Full/Teach	2.50(.797)	2.58(.900)	3.08(.900)	2.54(.934)	3.41(.900)	2.75(.753)	1.08(.288)	2.00(.000)	2.36(.504)	2.63(.504)	1.60(.699)
Adjunct	3.03(.939)	2.37(.926)	3.40(.747)	2.70(.823)	3.51(.975)	2.85(.907)	1.16(.374)	2.00(.632)	2.04(.804)	2.63(.492)	1.80(.679)
Lecturer	2.45(.687)	1.81(.873)	3.00(.894)	2.36(.924)	3.09(.831)	2.54(.934)	1.18(.404)	2.28(.755)	2.37(.517)	2.70(.483)	2.11(.333)
Other	3.15(.688)	2.76(1.09)	3.53(.877)	2.76(.599)	3.61(.960)	2.69(.630)	1.23(.438)	2.00(.471)	2.45(.522)	2.54(.687)	1.72(.646)
	Questions										
	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	
Variable	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	
Acad. Rank											
AP/ATP	1.35(.606)	2.61(.497)	1.76(.664)	1.47(.624)	3.81(.732)	3.31(1.17)	4.18(.588)	3.95(.843)	1.76(1.17)	1.90(1.29)	
ASP/ASTP	1.29(.469)	2.31(.477)	1.68(.704)	1.47(.514)	3.65(.988)	3.36(1.38)	4.00(1.00)	3.89(.936)	2.55(1.61)	2.78(1.58)	
Full/Teach	1.50(.527)	2.81(.404)	1.44(.527)	1.37(.744)	3.66(.778)	3.25(1.42)	3.91(.668)	3.75(.866)	2.41(1.56)	2.25(1.60)	
Adjunct	1.35(.587)	2.65(.572)	1.61(.501)	1.52(.696)	3.26(.827)	3.56(1.00)	3.60(1.11)	3.52(1.08)	1.66(1.11)	2.35(1.26)	
Lecturer	1.62(.517)	2.60(.516)	1.50(.547)	1.50(.547)	3.00(1.34)	3.18(1.16)	3.30(.823)	3.18(.873)	1.45(.934)	1.45(1.03)	
Other	1.18(.603)	2.50(.522)	2.45(.522)	1.90(.700)	3.69(1.25)	3.23(1.42)	4.0(1.47)	3.92(1.55)	2.33(1.61)	3.00(1.41)	

Note. Mq=Mean of question. b. Questions 1-6; 1=very low; 2=low; 3=medium; 4=high; 5=very high. c. Questions 8-15; 1=learned little; 2=learned some; 3=learned a lot. d. Questions 16-21; 1=never; 2=very seldom; 3=seldom; 4=often; 5=very often.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted at the item scale level to examine if differences within student responses to questions on the Academic Integrity Scale were significant. There was a statistically significant main effect within student responses to being informed about institutional policies to address academic dishonesty, $F(3, 494)=7.85, p=.000$. Results of the ANOVA also revealed statistically significant differences within: student perceptions of the amount of information received in first year experience courses, $F(3, 374)=2.65, p=.048$; the amount of information discussed about plagiarism, $F(3, 500)=8.02, p=.000$; the amount of information received on guidelines for group work, $F(3, 502)=4.22, p=.006$; the amount of information discussed about falsifying/fabricating research data, $F(3, 485)=4.27, p=.005$; and the amount of information discussed about falsifying/fabricating course data, $F(3, 494)=4.90, p=.002$.

Table 17 ANOVA for Student Perceptions on the Academic Integrity Scale

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Question 1					
Student type	3.436	3	1.145	1.319	0.267
Error	427.048	492	0.868		
Total	430.484	495			
Question 2					
Student type	8.181	3	2.727	2.105	0.099
Error	654.693	503	1.293		
Total	659.874	506			
Question 3					
Student type	2.503	3	0.834	0.961	0.411
Error	432.447	498	0.868		
Total	434.950	501			
Question 4					
Student type	1.143	3	0.381	0.420	0.739
Error	449.278	495	0.908		
Total	450.421	498			
Question 5					
Student type	6.202	3	2.067	2.628	0.050
Error	391.726	498	0.787		
Total	397.928	501			
Question 6					
Student type	4.996	3	1.665	1.621	0.184
Error	508.571	495	1.027		
Total	513.567	498			

Table 17 (continued) ANOVA for Student Perceptions on the Academic Integrity Scale

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Question 7					
Student type	2.262	3	0.754	7.851	0.000***
Error	47.441	494	0.096		
Total	49.703	497			
Question 8					
Student type	4.491	3	1.497	2.659	0.048*
Error	210.601	374	0.563		
Total	215.093	377			
Question 9					
Student type	0.143	3	0.048	0.090	0.965
Error	207.087	397	0.530		
Total	207.230	394			
Question 10					
Student type	0.233	3	0.078	0.133	0.940
Error	225.767	388	0.582		
Total	226.000	391			
Question 11					
Student type	0.531	3	0.177	0.294	0.830
Error	228.299	379	0.602		
Total	228.830	382			
Question 12					
Student type	2.377	3	0.792	1.650	0.177
Error	184.842	385	0.480		
Total	187.219	388			
Question 13					
Student type	0.897	3	0.299	0.789	0.500
Error	166.385	439	0.379		
Total	167.282	442			
Question 14					
Student type	4.574	3	1.525	2.621	0.051
Error	215.815	371	0.582		
Total	220.389	374			
Question 15					
Student type	2.979	3	.993	2.138	0.095
Error	162.976	351	.464		
Total	165.955	354			
Question 16					
Student type	29.101	3	9.700	8.020	0.000***
Error	604.738	500	1.209		
Total	633.839	503			
Question 17					
Student type	17.206	3	5.735	4.226	0.006**
Error	677.140	499	1.357		
Total	694.346	502			
Question 18					
Student type	3.568	3	1.189	1.075	0.359
Error	547.422	495	1.106		
Total	550.990	498			

Table 17 (continued) ANOVA for Student Perceptions on the Academic Integrity Scale

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Question 19					
Student type	2.424	3	0.808	0.642	0.588
Error	624.318	496	1.259		
Total	626.742	499			
Question 20					
Student type	26.506	3	8.835	4.274	0.005**
Error	996.369	482	2.067		
Total	1022.874	485			
Question 21					
Student type	31.034	3	10.345	4.909	0.002**
Error	1034.631	491	2.107		
Total	1065.665	494			

Note. a.. Significant at the $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$, $p < .001^{***}$. b. total student= responses for all students by academic standing

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted at the item scale level to examine if differences within faculty responses to questions on the Academic Integrity Scale were significant. As indicated in Table 18, there was a statistically significant main effect within faculty perceptions on the amount of information presented to students by teaching assistants, $F(5, 75)=4.42$, $p=.002$. Although additional differences were found in faculty responses to questions in the Academic Integrity scale, those results were not statistically significant.

Table 18 ANOVA for Faculty Perceptions on the Academic Integrity Scale

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Question 1					
Faculty type	1.046	1	1.046	1.484	0.226
Error	71.868	102	0.705		
Total	72.913	103			
Question 2					
Faculty type	1.129	1	1.129	1.541	0.217
Error	73.978	101	0.732		
Total	75.107	102			
Question 3					
Faculty type	0.046	1	0.046	0.072	0.789
Error	64.868	102	0.636		
Total	64.913	103			
Question 4					
Faculty type	0.025	1	0.025	0.039	0.843
Error	62.848	100	0.628		
Total	62.873	101			

Table 18 (continued) ANOVA for Faculty Perceptions on the Academic Integrity Scale

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Question 5					
Faculty type	0.009	1	0.009	0.012	0.914
Error	79.029	102	0.775		
Total	79.038	103			
Question 6					
Faculty type	0.176	1	0.176	0.227	0.635
Error	77.912	100	0.779		
Total	78.088	101			
Question 7					
Faculty type	0.033	1	0.033	0.203	0.654
Error	16.007	99	0.162		
Total	16.040	100			
Question 8					
Faculty type	0.500	1	0.500	1.515	0.222
Error	26.390	80	0.330		
Total	26.890	81			
Question 9					
Faculty type	0.148	1	0.148	0.370	0.545
Error	33.146	83	0.399		
Total	33.294	84			
Question 10					
Faculty type	0.622	1	0.622	1.983	0.163
Error	26.969	86	0.314		
Total	27.591	87			
Question 11					
Faculty type	1.677	1	1.677	4.181	0.044*
Error	32.492	81	0.401		
Total	34.169	82			
Question 12					
Faculty type	0.084	1	0.084	0.269	0.605
Error	24.940	80	0.312		
Total	25.024	81			
Question 13					
Faculty type	0.681	1	0.681	2.568	0.113
Error	24.115	91	0.265		
Total	24.796	92			
Question 14					
Faculty type	0.244	1	0.244	0.592	0.444
Error	30.493	74	0.412		
Total	24.796	75			
Question 15					
Faculty type	0.115	1	0.115	0.278	0.600
Error	31.054	75	0.414		
Total	31.169	76			
Question 16					
Faculty type	0.770	1	0.770	0.833	0.364
Error	92.485	100	0.925		
Total	93.255	101			

Table 18 (continued) ANOVA for Faculty Perceptions on the Academic Integrity Scale

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Question 17					
Faculty type	1.734	1	1.734	1.183	0.279
Error	143.576	98	1.465		
Total	145.310	99			
Question 18					
Faculty type	1.768	1	1.768	1.931	0.168
Error	88.778	97	0.915		
Total	90.545	98			
Question 19					
Faculty type	0.242	1	0.242	0.235	0.629
Error	100.998	98	1.031		
Total	101.240	99			
Question 20					
Faculty type	2.163	1	2.163	1.139	0.289
Error	172.740	91	1.898		
Total	174.903	92			
Question 21					
Faculty type	0.642	1	0.642	0.307	0.581
Error	185.798	89	2.088		
Total	186.440	90			

Note. a. Significant at the $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$, $p < .001^{***}$. b. total faculty = responses for faculty by academic rank

Summary

In this study, the researcher examined faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty at a large, public Midwestern institution. Utilizing a series of frequency counts, mean scores and one-way analysis of variance, similarities and differences were found within faculty perceptions and student perceptions for the dependent variables under study. Overall the findings revealed that faculty and students strongly agreed that engaging in academically dishonest behaviors was wrong. However, differences existed within student responses to engagement in behaviors deemed academically dishonest and within faculty perceptions of student engagement. Specifically, the majority of students responded that they had not engaged in dishonest behaviors although almost half of faculty responded that students engaged in behaviors characterized as constituting plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration at a higher

frequency at the institution under study. In regards to the effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures that address academic dishonesty, mean scores showed similarities within faculty responses and student responses to the amount of information received regarding the academic dishonesty policies of the institution under study but differed within their perceptions of where the information is received as well as how much information is received when provided. Results also revealed that faculty exhibited statistically significant differences in responses to behaviors identified as academically dishonest. Further, students and faculty both exhibited statistically significant differences within their responses to perceptions of institutional policies and procedures that address dishonesty. Based on the results of this study, although not all of the hypotheses were fully supported by the data, each one provided valuable knowledge regarding factors that may influence perceptions of academic dishonesty which was the basis for this investigation. In the final chapter, an overview of the study, interpretation of the results as well as recommendations for future research will be provided.

CHAPTER 5

Research examining student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors is not a new phenomenon. With reports documenting almost 100 years of research (e.g., Anderman & Murdock, 2007; Buckley et al., 1998; Drake, 1941; McCabe & Trevino, 1993a; Pajares, 1996; Williams & Hosek, 2003), it is important to understand factors that may influence engagement in academic dishonesty in efforts to better understand the students who engage in the behavior and to find institutional solutions to deter future incidences from occurring. Although previous research on academic dishonesty is vast, it is important to note that perceptions and beliefs about academic dishonesty and behaviors identified as academically dishonest are as important as examining the behavior itself (Prenshaw, Straughan, & Albers-Miller, 2000). Thus, in this study, the researcher examined perceptions of academic dishonesty among undergraduate students and faculty at a large public Midwestern institution. In this chapter, an overview of the problem statement, purpose of the study, results obtained from the study, limitations, study implications, and institutional recommendations will be provided. Additionally, the chapter concludes with a discussion of the need for and an identification of areas for future research to address academic dishonesty.

Problem Statement and Purpose of the Study

Research studies indicate that faculty and students share similar viewpoints regarding academic dishonesty, as reports indicate that students have more stringent views than faculty (e.g., Ballew & Roig, 1992; Livosky & Tauber, 1994; Nuss, 1984). However, research also reveals significant differences in perceptions of specific behaviors identified as academically dishonest, the severity of those behaviors and institutional responses to address academic dishonesty (e.g., Davis et al., 1992; Graham

et al., 1994; Liddell & Fong, 2003). As such, this study attempted to understand what similarities and/or differences existed within faculty perceptions and student perceptions regarding three dependent variables: general views of academic dishonesty, frequency of engagement in behaviors identified as academically dishonest and the effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures designed to address academic dishonesty. This research study was based on the premise that by understanding underlying factors that may impact not only student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors but also institutional responses to the problem may ultimately reduce the prevalence of academic dishonesty.

To examine faculty perceptions and student perceptions, the study utilized an online survey that was administered to a random sampling of undergraduate college students ($N=561$) and faculty who primarily teach undergraduate courses ($N=112$) at a large public Midwestern institution during the Fall Semester 2011. Participants were contacted through their university-issued email accounts and for those who agreed to participate, they were provided with a link to *SurveyMonkey.com* in order to anonymously submit their responses. Students responded to demographic questions regarding academic standing, academic department, gender, age, race/ethnicity and residential status (See Table 1). Faculty participants provided information regarding academic department, academic ranking and academic status (See Table 2). Additionally, all participants responded to questions regarding overall perceptions of academic dishonesty (Attitudes toward Dishonesty Scale), student engagement in behaviors identified as academically dishonest (Academic Dishonesty Scale) and the effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures to address dishonesty (Academic Integrity Scale).

Discussion of Results

Demographics

Participants in this study were derived from the undergraduate student population and faculty population at a large public Midwestern institution. As indicated in Table 1, the majority of student participants were “*White (non-Hispanic)*” (67.4%), “*Senior*” (46.5%), enrolled in the “*College of Arts and Sciences*” (50.1%), between the ages of “*18-24*” (55.5%), “*Female*” (64.5%), and resided “*Off-campus*” (89.1%). Despite the low response rate, student participant demographics were reflective of the larger undergraduate student population of the institution under study (See Appendix H).

Faculty participants were asked demographic questions regarding academic department, academic rank/tenure status and academic appointment. As documented in Table 2, the majority of faculty respondents were employed within the “*College of Arts and Sciences*” (49.5%) were “*Non- Tenure Track*” (64.2%) and were ranked as “*Adjunct*” (25.2%), reflective of the larger faculty population at the institution under study (See Appendix H).

Engagement in Academic Dishonesty

Research studies reveal that students are engaging in behaviors identified as academically dishonest at alarming rates (e.g., McCabe, 1993a; Schmelkin et al., 2008). Theories, such as Kohlberg’s moral development theory, have been utilized in the research literature as a means or basis of understanding why students engage in academic dishonesty. According to the theory of moral reasoning, when faced with the temptation to engage in academic dishonesty, students are engaged in an ethical dilemma, one that involves complying with institutional standards of honesty and integrity vs. one that

involves engagement in the dishonest behavior (Kohlberg, 1976a). The manner in which students make that decision is based on a number of factors that may include not only their level of moral reasoning but also personal perceptions of specific actions and consequences.

Consistent with previous research (Nowell & Laufer, 1997), when asked about engagement in academic dishonesty, a slightly higher percentage of seniors admitted to engaging in behaviors classified as academically dishonest (12.1%) than juniors (7.2%), sophomores (7.9%), and freshmen (7.4%). This finding is not surprising to the researcher as research reveals that student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors is not only a factor of personal perceptions but also individual factors (i.e. grade attainment) which may influence students' inclination to engage in academic dishonesty (e.g., Bowers, 1964; Davis & Ludvigson, 1995; McCabe & Trevino, 1993a, 1997c). Based on student responses, one may conclude that although students strongly agreed that engaging in academic dishonesty was wrong (Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty scale), knowing that an action is dishonest may not be sufficient enough to predict an individual's actual engagement in moral behavior (e.g., Eisenburg, 2004; Leming, 1978a; Rest, 1979b). Thus, although individuals may have moved towards a higher moral development stage (seniors, for example) as outlined by Kohlberg (1976b), they still may not perceive certain behaviors as morally wrong and consequently, their behavior may not be impacted by the moral characteristics of the action (Eisenberg, 2004).

In regards to gender, in this study, male students (12.4%) admitted to engagement in academic dishonesty more often than their female counterparts (7.8%). This finding is consistent with a body of research that indicates male students admit to engaging in the

behavior more often than their female counterparts (e.g., Buckley et al., 1998; McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999b; Tibbetts, 1999). However, further analysis of the responses to questions regarding the frequency of engagement in behaviors identified as academically dishonest (Academic Dishonesty Scale) revealed that female students admitted to “*copying material and turning in as own work*”, “*helping someone cheat on an exam*”, “*copying from another student during a test*”, and “*turning in work done by another student*” slightly higher than male students. Thus, one may conclude that this finding supports Gilligan’s (1982b) model of moral development by demonstrating that female students may be more oriented towards an ethic of care for others and thus would admit to engaging in behaviors that are for altruistic purposes and/or collaborative in nature (e.g., Calabrese & Cochran, 1990; McCabe & Trevino, 1997c).

Overall, the response rate for student engagement in academic dishonesty in this study was relatively low (less than 10%). This number was surprising considering reports that indicate a substantial number of students are engaging in academic dishonesty (e.g. Schmelkin et al., 2008). However, research reveals that incidences of academic dishonesty are lower when the perception of being caught is high and when the culture of an institution promotes academic integrity (e.g., McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 2001c). In this study, students responded that the severity of penalties at the institution under study were high. From this finding, one may conclude that the severity of punishment associated with violations of the academic dishonesty policy may serve as a deterrent for student engagement at the institution. Secondly, students were asked if they have engaged in “academic dishonesty”, a term that research reveals encompasses a number of meanings (e.g., Nuss, 1984; Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003). However, a limitation of this

study was that clear definitions of specific behaviors deemed dishonest at the institution were not included within the actual questionnaire. Research reveals that the ambiguity in definitions of cheating and/or academic dishonesty have been identified in the literature as a reason why students may not believe that their actions are dishonest and thus would respond accordingly (e.g., Gehring & Pavela, 1994; Nuss, 1984; Park, 2003).

However, in reviewing responses to questions on the Academic Dishonesty Scale (ADS), differences were exhibited in the number of students who admitted to “cheating” in a previous question compared to students who admitted to engaging in specific behaviors identified as academically dishonest. Although less than 10% ($N=53$) of students in this study admitted to engaging in academic dishonesty, 36.7% ($N=206$) admitted to collaborating on an individual assignment, 27.8% ($N=156$) admitted to utilizing information from the Internet without citation and 21.5% ($N=121$) admitted to copying information from a published source without giving the author credit at least one time (ADS). Research reveals that when students are asked about engagement in academic dishonesty in general terminology (i.e. “Have you cheated?”), the percentage of students who respond is much lower than responses from students who are asked about engagement in specific dishonest behaviors (i.e. “Have you collaborated on an individual assignment?”) (Chapman et al., 2004). Thus, one may conclude that students at the institution under study are engaging in behaviors deemed academically dishonest and will admit to that engagement when specific behaviors are identified.

Further interpretation of student engagement in behaviors on the ADS is also warranted. Research reveals that although a small percentage of students admit to engagement in academic dishonesty only once, for a substantial minority that behavior is

repetitive (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). More than ten percent of students in this study admitted to behaviors characterized as plagiarism (i.e. copying material and submitting the work as their own, copying a few sentences without attribution, using information from the Internet without citation) and unauthorized collaboration (i.e. collaboration on individual assignments, receiving assistance on individual assignments) more than once which is consistent with the body of research. Thus, one may conclude that not only are students admitting to engagement in academically dishonest behaviors at the institution but that they admit to repeat violations.

On the other hand, the low number of student engagement lends support for research that reveals that students may not perceive certain behaviors identified as academically dishonest by the institution to constitute dishonesty and thus would not admit to engaging in “cheating” (e.g., Brown, 2002; Carpenter, Harding & Finelli, 2006; Godfrey & Waugh, 1998; Rabi, Patton, Fjortoff & Zgarrick, 2005; Rakovsky & Levy, 2007). As an example, Howard (1995) utilizes the term “patch-work writing” to characterize the behavior in which students “borrow” information from several sources in an attempt to synthesize information into their own understanding. This behavior, which would be perceived as a violation of the student code of conduct under plagiarism at the institution under study, according to Howard may be viewed differently by students as a legitimate way to write research papers. One may conclude that this finding supports further research on student engagement in specific behaviors deemed dishonest as well as strengthens the need for institutions to provide clear definitions of academically dishonest behaviors and educate students on those behaviors.

Faculty Perceptions of Student Engagement in Academic Dishonesty

In this study, the percentage of faculty who perceived students engaged in behaviors deemed as academically dishonest was high. One may conclude that this finding is consistent with research that reveals faculty perceptions of behaviors identified as academically dishonest are oftentimes more negative than self-reports by students (e.g., Nolan, Smith & Dai, 1998; Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2002). Faculty in this study consistently perceived students engaged in behaviors identified by questions in the Academic Dishonesty Scale (ADS) at a higher frequency at the institution under study than students' responses to engagement, which is consistent with previous research on faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty (e.g. Kennedy et al., 2000; Nolan, Smith & Dai, 1998; Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2003). As an example, approximately ninety percent of faculty believed that students would admit to copying material and submitting the information as their own work (See Table 12). This finding is troubling considering results from student responses revealed that over eighty percent (80.4%) of students indicated that they have not engaged in the behavior.

Research reveals that studies on faculty perceptions of student engagement in behaviors deemed dishonest have focused on commonly known behaviors such as cheating on an exam, but relatively few studies have examined perceptions of ambiguous behaviors such as plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration (e.g., Higbee & Thomas, 2002; Pincus & Schemelkin, 2003). In this study, faculty classified as assistant professors/assistant teaching professors and lecturers perceived a higher frequency of student engagement in behaviors such as unauthorized collaboration. Although, the remaining faculty groups responded that engagement in those behaviors was occurring, it

was not to the same frequency level as reported by lecturers and assistant/assistant teaching professors in this study. Further, in regards to behaviors commonly referred to as “cheating”, the findings from this study also revealed inconsistencies within faculty groups in regards to their perceptions of the frequency in which students engaged in those behaviors. Lecturers perceived a higher frequency of student engagement in behaviors such as utilizing unfair methods to learn information on an exam in comparison to faculty classified as full/full teaching professors who perceived that engagement in that behavior occurred less frequently.

From the findings, the question arises as to what may account for differences within faculty perceptions of student engagement in behaviors deemed as academically dishonest. Research reveals that faculty understanding and perceptions of academic dishonesty is not a constant process but cyclical and may be influenced by a number of factors (e.g., Saddlemire, 2005). For example, research reveals that faculty may differ in their individual perceptions of academic dishonesty based on their own personal belief systems (e.g. Smith et al., 1998). One could argue that faculty in this study may have made determinations regarding student engagement in academic dishonesty based on personal classroom experiences which is consistent with research (e.g., Bisping et al., 2008; Burke, 1997; Marcoux, 2002). Further, research studies also reveal that faculty may make determinations in regards to perceptions of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors based on a scale of seriousness, which could have accounted for differences within perceptions of student engagement in specific behaviors such as plagiarism (e.g., Pincus & Schemelkin, 2003). However, that explanation is beyond the scope of this research study since seriousness of specific behaviors was not

investigated. Further research should be conducted on understanding and identifying underlying causes for differences within faculty perceptions of student engagement in behaviors deemed academically dishonest.

Research Question One

The purpose of the research study was to examine faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty and of behaviors identified as being academically dishonest. Research Question One states: “What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty?” More specifically, the study hypothesized that faculty and students would exhibit similarities within their overall perceptions of academic dishonesty. Analyses of the results revealed that there were no differences found within student perceptions of general views of academic dishonesty by academic rank. Students agreed that it is wrong to engage in academic dishonesty. One may conclude that although moral development was not directly studied, this finding supports research that reveals academic integrity and honesty are morally valued virtues (Lumpkin, 2008).

Research reveals that students are more likely to engage in behaviors deemed academically dishonest if they believe that they will get away with the behavior (e.g., Mustine & Tewksbury, 2005; Whitley, 1998). On the other hand, research also reveals that students are less likely to engage in academic dishonesty if they believe or perceive that their behavior will be detected and they will be punished for their actions (e.g., Buckley et al., 1998; Landon, 1999). In regards to this study, higher mean scores were exhibited within student responses on question two (“*Students should go ahead and cheat if they know they can get away with it*”), question three (“*Students should try to cheat*

even if their chances of getting away with it are slim”), and question four (“*I would let another student cheat off my test if he/she asked*”) of the Attitude towards Academic Dishonesty Scale (ATAD). As indicated in Chapter 4, higher mean scores on the ATAD represent less accepting and less permissive viewpoints in comparison to lower mean scores which reflect more accepting and more permissive perceptions of general statements of academic dishonesty (Davis et al., 1992; Bolin, 2004). Thus, one may conclude that students in this study were less accepting and less permissive of general academic dishonesty statements, which is consistent with research (e.g., Ballew & Roig, 1992; Nuss, 1984).

Analyses of faculty responses revealed a number of differences within faculty perceptions of how students would respond to the ATAD. Faculty classified as lecturers differed the most in their perceptions of student responses to general academic dishonesty statements on the ATAD. This number is surprising to the researcher as lecturers in this study represented less than ten percent of the total faculty participant population. As noted previously, higher scores on the ATAD indicate less accepting and less permissive perceptions towards academic dishonesty whereas lower mean scores represent more accepting and permissive perceptions. Faculty classified as lecturers perceived that student responses to questions such as “*students should try to cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are slim*” would be more permissive and more accepting than other faculty groups by academic rank in this study. Likewise, lecturers perceived that students would be less accepting of statements such as “*it is wrong to cheat.*” A plausible explanation for differences in faculty perceptions may be attributed to the notion that some faculty believe that students are more tolerant of academic dishonesty than they

will admit in self-reports (Ballew & Roig, 1992). This may help to explain why lecturers perceived students would hold more permissive attitudes towards the “*it is wrong to cheat*” statement. However, while there may be additional explanations behind why faculty classified as lecturers differed the most in their perceptions of how students would respond those explanations are beyond the scope of this study. Thus, further research on understanding differences within faculty perceptions (i.e. non-tenured faculty vs. tenured faculty) and what may influence those differences should be explored.

Research Question Two

Research Question Two (RQ2) states: “What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions of the frequency in which students engage in behaviors classified/categorized as academically dishonest?” Researchers have found that when presented with the question of engagement in academically dishonest behaviors, a negative relationship existed between behaviors seen as dishonest and the frequency in which students engaged in those behaviors (Bisping et al., 2008). As such, the researcher hypothesized that students would admit to engagement in academically dishonest behaviors at a higher frequency than faculty perceptions of that engagement. Analyses of the data revealed a lower frequency of student engagement in behaviors identified as academically dishonest which is inconsistent with the growing body of research on student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors (e.g. Carpenter, Harding & Finelli, 2006; Harris, 1989; McCabe, 1997b). As indicated in Table 8, less than twenty percent of students admitted to engaging in behaviors commonly referred to as “cheating” such as copying material and submitting that work as their own, helping someone cheat on an exam or cheating on an exam in any way. However, students

admitted to engaging in behaviors classified as plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration in higher numbers, consistent with research (e.g., Mahmood, 2009). Despite the lower than anticipated findings, the results obtained in this study allude to the notion that engagement in academically dishonest behaviors is occurring at the institution under study and may be occurring at a higher frequency in behaviors identified as ambiguous.

Students admitted in higher frequency to engaging in behaviors characterized as plagiarism and of behaviors classified as unauthorized collaboration at the institution under study. Almost 25% of students admitted to copying sentences from published sources without proper citation. Additionally, close to thirty percent of students surveyed admitted to utilizing information found on the Internet without documentation. These findings are consistent with research that reveals engagement in academic dishonesty is more common and occurs in higher frequency on written assignments than on exams (e.g., Haines et al., 1986; Pe Symaco & Marcelo, 2003). Further, a small difference in mean scores was found for sophomores on question five, (“*collaborated on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work*”) with a slightly higher percentage of sophomores admitting to engagement in the behavior at least once (See Table 7). This finding may show support for research that reveals immaturity and lower levels of moral development as identified by Kohlberg may be major causes for student engagement in academic dishonesty (Hughes-Christenson & McCabe, 2006). However, there is a caveat in this interpretation. At the institution under study, the average age of the student population is “27.” One would need to make the assumption that students who identified themselves as sophomores in this study, are representative of “traditional-aged students”, where maturity levels are in the early stages of Kohlberg’s moral development

model because of age. However, with research studies suggesting that adult students are the new “traditional student”, students in this study may have maturity levels that are reflective of the later stages of moral development and thus would contradict research regarding age and maturity levels (e.g., McCabe & Trevino, 1997c; Park, 2003). In this regard, future research should focus on within group studies of student engagement where age is also included in the analysis of data and interpretation of results.

When mean scores were examined for faculty classified as assistant/assistant teaching professors, associate/associate teaching professors, full/full teaching professors, adjuncts, lecturers, and others, mean scores differed in nine out of the eleven questions (See Table 9). Adjuncts, assistant professors/ assistant teaching professors and faculty classified as “other” reported that student engagement in certain behaviors such as turning in work completed by someone else occurred at a lower frequency in comparison to the other faculty groups at the institution under study. This finding is consistent with a body of research that indicates non-tenured faculty members exhibit slightly higher perceptions that engagement in academically dishonest behaviors occurs less frequently than tenured faculty (Volpe et al, 2008). On the other hand, one can make the argument that this finding supports research that reveals faculty may actually underestimate the amount of engagement in academically dishonest behaviors that occurs in higher education (Volpe et al., 2008). However, in reviewing student responses in this study to questions on the Academic Dishonesty Scale, the finding is consistent with the low number of students who admitted to actually engaging in the behavior (7.3%). Further, statistically significant differences were found within faculty perceptions of student engagement on behaviors constituting plagiarism (copying a few sentences from a

published source without citation, using information found on the internet without giving the author credit) and unauthorized collaboration (collaborating on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work). Thus, one may conclude that although the majority of faculty perceived a higher frequency of student engagement in certain behaviors such as turning in work completed by someone else, this finding demonstrates that not all faculty perceive that is true at the institution under study. However, despite these findings, the results obtained as a result of research question two, provide valuable insight into students who are engaging in academic dishonesty and faculty who differ within their perceptions of student engagement.

Research Question Three

Research Question Three (RQ3) states: “What are the similarities and differences within faculty and undergraduate student perceptions regarding the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures that address academic dishonesty?” In order to understand faculty perceptions and student perceptions of the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies and procedures that address academic dishonesty for the institution under study, the researcher hypothesized that faculty and students will exhibit similarities within their perceptions. Overall similarities within student perceptions of institutional responses to address academic dishonesty were found. Responses to the Academic Integrity Scale (AIS) revealed that more than half of the students surveyed believed that the severity of penalties at the institution and faculty understanding and support of institutional policies to address dishonesty was high. This result is consistent with research that reveals students are less likely to engage in academic dishonesty if there is a positive perception that the institutional culture supports

integrity (e.g., Corradini Goodwin, 2007; Haines et al., 1986; Singhal, 1985; Whitley, 1998). From this finding, one can conclude that student perceptions of institutional responses to address academic dishonesty may help to explain why the number of students who reported engagement in academically dishonest behaviors in this study was low, as research indicates that severity of being caught is a deterrent for student engagement in academic dishonesty (e.g., Brown, 1995; Michaels & Miethe, 1989).

However, as determined by the ANOVA, significant differences within student perceptions of institutional responses to address academic dishonesty on a number of questions in the Academic Integrity Survey (AIS) were found. Students differed within their perceptions of institutional policies to address academic dishonesty, such that freshman scored slightly higher in regards to if students are informed about the University's policies to address academic dishonesty ($p=.000$). One may conclude that incoming students may be receiving messages about academic dishonesty from the onset of entering the institution. However, in regards to the amount of information received in first year experiences courses, freshman and sophomores scored slightly higher. It is important to note that at the institution under study, the first year experience courses have gone through major curricular revisions which may account for the differences observed by juniors and seniors on this question. Statistically significant differences were also found within student responses to the amount of information received by faculty on discussions of plagiarism, guidelines for group work, the amount of information regarding falsifying/fabricating research data and course data. Freshman scored slightly lower than sophomores, juniors and seniors on all three questions. This finding is important to note because research reveals that student perceptions of faculty responses to

academic dishonesty may impact students' inclination to engage in academic dishonesty (Fass, 1986). Thus, one can conclude from this finding that freshman perceive less information regarding academic dishonesty is discussed within the classroom setting than sophomores, juniors and seniors. A possible reason for the difference in perception could be that as students advance within their academic majors, the expectations for integrity in their work is consistently communicated. Further research should be conducted on how messages of academic dishonesty and integrity are communicated to incoming students where that is freshman, returning students and/or transfer students.

Research indicates that in order for policies governing academic dishonesty to be effective, the entire campus community must be engaged in the dissemination of information regarding responsible student conduct (McCabe & Trevino, 1993a). Analyses of faculty responses to the AIS revealed similarities in the clarity, consistency and effectiveness of institutional policies to address academic dishonesty. Faculty that responded to the questions regarding the dissemination of information on academic dishonesty revealed that students learned little or no information from first year experience courses, from deans/administrators and from teaching assistants. Instead faculty responded that the greatest amount of information regarding academic dishonesty and behaviors deemed academically dishonest comes from faculty, which is consistent with research (e.g., Fass, 1986; Gallant & Drinan, 2006; Ritter, 1993). Thus, from the findings of this study, it becomes apparent that information regarding institutional academic dishonesty policies is communicated greatly by faculty. However in reviewing faculty responses to the effectiveness of institutional policies to address academic dishonesty, responses were moderate. This finding may be attributed to research that

indicates that faculty express concerns that institutional policies to address academic dishonesty require substantial work by faculty, are made without faculty input and the consequences associated with violations are not severe to pursue further adjudication of cases (Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003).

Faculty responses to the amount of information regarding academically dishonest behaviors are discussed within the classroom yielded mixed results. Although more than fifty percent of faculty responded that they often or very often discuss plagiarism, a surprisingly percentage of faculty responded that they seldom discuss the topic (32.4%). This finding supports research that indicates that plagiarism is often described according to institutional policies in the course syllabi and an assumption is made that students understand what plagiarism entails (e.g., Howard & Davies, 2009). Further, this finding is consistent with research that reveals when faculty are asked about classroom discussions of academic dishonesty, the number of faculty that report doing nothing is relatively small, but the number that admit to doing little or seldom discuss information is significantly larger (Schneider, 1999).

Although twenty percent of faculty responded that they often have discussions on fabricating research data, almost fifty percent of faculty responded that those discussions never occur (47.9%). This finding is concerning because at the institution under study, a recent academic dishonesty case was investigated in which a student was found in violation of the student code of conduct after it was discovered that the student falsified information in a research project. However, the decision was overturned by the Student Conduct Committee due to the faculty member's lack of a clear definition/expectation of unacceptable behavioral practices in the course. One can conclude that this finding is

consistent with research that reveals faculty members may not fully understand the academic integrity policies of their respective institution and oftentimes since students' first knowledge of the policies is drawn from faculty, they themselves fully do not understand the extent of academic dishonesty (Jendrik, 1992).

As determined by the ANOVA, differences within faculty responses on questions designed to address the effectiveness, clarity and consistency of institutional policies to address academic dishonesty revealed statistically significant difference were found on the amount of information faculty perceived was provided by teaching assistants ($p=.002$). From these findings, one can conclude that at the institution under study, information on institutional academic dishonesty policies is provided to students but the dissemination of the policy and of behaviors deemed academically dishonest may be inconsistent, which is consistent with research (e.g., Volpe et al., 2008). Thus, efforts to address academic dishonesty should also focus on institutional responses to the problem.

Limitations

The limitations in this study involved the nature of the research topic, the low response rate, the terminology utilized in the study, and the research institution. Scheers and Dayton (1987) state that due to the nature of academic dishonesty, participants may not respond in a manner that is truly reflective of their own beliefs, thoughts and perceptions. According to research on the social desirability bias, participants may respond to self-reports of engagement in a manner in which they believe is socially acceptable to the researcher rather than in a manner that reflects their true self (Paulhus, 1991). Given this information, participants may not have been as truthful in answering questions regarding their own engagement in academically dishonest behaviors. In

addition, faculty may have been unwilling to freely express their opinions on university policies to address dishonesty and their own conversations about dishonesty in the classroom. Although the researcher took precautions to ensure confidentiality in this study (i.e. secured database), the potential lack of honesty in responses could be attributed to a fear of those responses being traced back to the true identity of the participants.

As a result, it may be possible that the sensitive nature of the study contributed to the low response rate/lack of participation. Efforts were made to reduce the non-response bias that is evident in research studies. A relatively large sample size was generated from the Institutional Research Office per the request of the researcher. Additionally, follow-up emails were sent to the participants at one week, two week with a final reminder during the last week of the survey. However, despite the 6370 survey instruments that were sent out, only 10% of the total recipient population agreed to participate in the study. When response rates were examined for student responses, there was a 9.3% response rate by student participants (N=561). However in a study of undergraduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty at a comparable Midwestern institution (e.g. Walton, 2010), the response rate for the entire student body (approximately 7,800 students), only yielded a 15.89% response. In relation to faculty, the response rate for faculty participants in this study was 31% (N=112) less than the almost 60% response rate in a comparable study of faculty perceptions at a large public institution (e.g. Marcoux, 2000). A number of reasons may account for the low response rate. For example, during the specific time period of the survey, several additional institutional surveys were being distributed to students and this may account for the fact that a larger

number of students did not participate in the study. Another possible explanation for the low response rate may have been a result of the time in the semester. The survey was administered towards the end of the semester right after mid-terms but a few weeks prior to the holiday season. This time frame is undoubtedly a busy time due to impending finals. Despite this, a review of comparative studies of faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty revealed that the response rate for those studies were relatively low as well (e.g., Hard, Conway & Moran, 2006). Although there is no way of predicting the outcome, an increased number of responses may have produced different results than those presented.

A third limitation of the study was the terminology utilized throughout the questionnaire. In reviewing the research literature on academic dishonesty, what remains consistent is the lack of a clear definition of “*academic dishonesty*” (e.g., Gehring & Pavela, 1994; Ikupa, 1997; Kibler et al., 1988; Pavela, 1978) and the use of “*cheating*” (e.g., Garavalia et al., 2001; Hoff, 2000) to encompass all behaviors identified as academically dishonest. In this study, the term “*academic dishonesty*” was derived from the Student Code of Conduct of the institution under study and there is an assumption that students and faculty understood what the specific definitions of academic dishonesty entailed. However, since the definitions were not readily available during the study, participants may have made assumptions about what academic dishonesty entails and the behaviors they perceived to be dishonest. In a study conducted by Burrus et al. (2007), it was found that students' understanding of behaviors regarded as academically dishonest were incomplete, that students reported significantly more cheating behavior when a formal definition was provided and that surveys that do not provide a clear definition of

behaviors identified as academically dishonest may lead to an underreporting of such behavior. Thus, the lack of readily available definitions may have influenced students to indicate that they have not engaged in academically dishonest behaviors. Further, the study did not examine a specific behavior but instead grouped all behaviors identified as academically dishonest under the topic/heading of academic dishonesty. The researcher believes that the results of the study may have yielded different results if the study was limited to studying a specific behavior such as plagiarism and if clearer definitions of academic dishonesty were included within the actual questionnaire.

A final limitation to this study was the utilization of a specific institution to study faculty and student perceptions. The decision to utilize a specific institution was due to the convenience of the location, significance of the institution to the researcher, and due to financial and time constraints which limited utilization of additional institutions of higher education. However, the use of a single institution greatly limits the generalizability of the results to other institutions of higher education such as private colleges and universities. Further, specific questions in the survey instruments may not have been applicable to the academic dishonesty concerns of the specific institution under study (i.e. questions regarding research data and course data).

Implications of Findings

This study examined the influence of perceptions on overall views of academic dishonesty, student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors and on the effectiveness of institutional policies to address dishonesty from a theoretical framework that was based on Kohlberg's theory of moral development and reasoning. Kohlberg's theory (Kohlberg, 1976) focuses not on one's individual behavior but instead the manner

in which an individual uses the reasoning process to explain or make a moral judgment about engagement in a behavior. The argument thus can be made that no greater example of an important ethical dilemma faced by students, faculty and an institution than the issue of academic dishonesty and the potential consequences associated with the behavior. Research on moral development has revealed empirical research that there is a positive relationship that exists between moral behavior, moral reasoning and academic dishonesty (e.g. Leming, 1978; Nuss, 1981). In examination of studies on morality, research differentiates the idea of moral reasoning or the processes that are utilized when one makes a decision from the idea of moral behavior or the overt actions that call for a level of moral commitment (Heilbrun & Georges, 1990 as cited in Bruggeman & Hart, 1996). From this research, although both moral reasoning and moral behavior involve doing what is deemed acceptable, the difference is in knowing that an action is right and doing what is considered right are two different processes.

The results of this study reveal important challenges that must be addressed in order to promote a culture of integrity. Students at this institution believe that engagement in academic dishonesty is wrong. If we acknowledge that students who place value on ethics and morals would be less likely to engage in academically dishonest behaviors as stated by Kohlberg, than students who responded positively to moral statements such as it is wrong to cheat would also not admit to engagement in specific behaviors deemed dishonest, as research reveals (e.g., Leming, 1979b; Malinowski & Smith, 1985). Following this reasoning, one may conclude that the number of students who admitted to engaging in academically dishonest behaviors in this study was relatively low because students who exhibit higher levels of moral reasoning would not

engage in dishonesty. However, as evident in the findings of this study, even when students responded that engaging in academic dishonesty is wrong, students admitted to engagement in specific behaviors classified as cheating, plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration and oftentimes admitted to engagement in the behaviors more than once. Research argues that even ethical students may engage in actions that may be seen as academically dishonest by an institution when the students themselves may not be aware that an action is indeed dishonest (Malinowski & Smith, 1985). Even in studies when moral reasoning was examined on students inclination to engage in academic dishonesty, research revealed that even under certain circumstances (i.e. low risk of being caught), students demonstrated a “get away with it if you can” approach to moral decision making (Bruggeman & Hart, 1996). Thus, implications from this finding support research that reveals (despite the moral and ethical values held by students) students are engaging in behaviors such as plagiarism more than once and oftentimes do not believe that their actions are dishonest. Thus, institutional efforts must be made to provide students with acceptable behavioral practices and emphasize the importance of maintaining integrity in their educational and future career goals.

Research reveals that faculty have a unique opportunity in that they not only can educate students on acceptable behavioral practices but also can serve as models of academic integrity (e.g. Gerhing & Pavela, 1994). However, when faculty encounter academic dishonesty in their own classrooms, research reveals that they oftentimes discover that they are not equipped to handle the situation (Belanger, Leonard, LeBrasseur, 2012). Unless faculty operate at the preconventional levels as outlined by Kohlberg (self-interests), they quickly realize that they must take action whether that

action is in the classroom environment or through the institutional adjudication procedures and follow the procedures. Chang (1994) indicates that an instructor's level of moral reasoning impacts students' perceptions of the moral climate of the classroom environment. Instructors with higher moral reasoning are in turn more likely to motivate student learning and responsible moral development than those with lower levels of moral reasoning.

Research on faculty-student communication and interpersonal relationships indicate that students who perceive their instructors as competent and moral individuals, will improve student motivation and learning outcomes and potentially decrease incidents of academic dishonesty from occurring (e.g., Chory, 2007; Frymier & Houser, 2000; Tata, 1999). The problem arises when faculty are not aware of the policies or perceive the policies are ineffective or inadequate. Although less than 13% of faculty in this study indicated that faculty support of institutional policies to address dishonesty were low or very low, a higher percentage of faculty responded that the effectiveness of institutional policies was medium. Implications from this finding suggest that the policies at the institution are indeed effective, but there is a need for those policies to be improved upon and communicated more effectively.

The data on faculty responses of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors provides support for research on faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty. Faculty in this study reported significantly higher perceptions of student engagement than what was reported by students in self-reports at the institution under study. Further, results of this study revealed that faculty perceptions of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors was not only high, but differences within faculty

respondents in regards to high frequently students engaged in specific behaviors deemed academically dishonest was found. However, this mindset of believing that students are engaging in high frequency rates of engagement by faculty identified by the results of this study require an examination of faculty and institutional ethos. Research reveals that faculty who have worked hard in acquiring their positions, have a vested interests in ensuring academic standards are not undermined (Belanger, Leonard & LeBrasseur, 2012). However, existing research does not examine the implications surrounding differences within faculty populations to what behaviors are deemed dishonest and the frequency of engagement in those behaviors by students. This is needed within the field in order to address institutional responses to the problem.

Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty, behaviors identified as academically dishonest and institutional responses to the problem. The findings of this study are important to educators and administrators in institutions of higher education and can be utilized to provide recommendations for preventative methods to deter increases in incidents of academic dishonesty.

Institutional Efforts to Address Academic Dishonesty: Campus Community

Research indicates that if institutions of higher education want students to exhibit honest and ethical behavior and faculty to report behaviors when discovered, the institution must “model” appropriate and acceptable behaviors (Engler, Landau & Epstein, 2008). With this knowledge, McCabe and Trevino (1993a) indicate that institutions should create an academic culture where academic dishonesty is deemed

unacceptable and academic integrity is highly desired and regarded amongst all members of the campus community. Pursuant to Kohlberg, the researchers indicate that institutions create “just communities”, communities in which students and faculty are involved in the development of an institutional contract that outlines the norms, values, rights and responsibilities of all its members. The underlying assumption is that by creating “just communities”, the institutional culture will create conditions essential for moral development and in turn lead to less incidences of academic dishonesty as well as close the gap between policy and actual practice (e.g., Gallant & Drinan, 2006; McCabe & Trevino, 1993a).

As research has revealed, the academic environment of an institution is essential in the development of ethical and honest students and as such, clear communication of institutional policies to address dishonesty and promote integrity is an important way to foster student development and faculty involvement (Kibler, 1993). To do this, multiple methods of communication must be established (i.e. campus-wide emails, providing the student code of conduct with admission packets for both undergraduate and graduate students, student handbooks) that convey messages about academic dishonesty from the onset of attending the university and throughout the students’ career (i.e. advising sessions, syllabi, workshops, seminars, academic dishonesty forums) (Perkins, 2000). In order to accomplish this, according to McCabe, Trevino and Butterfield (2001c) better educational methods must be utilized to educate students and faculty about institutional academic dishonesty policies. Research studies reveal that institutions with well-designed and well-communicated policies have decreased incidences of student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors (Roth & McCabe, 1995). Individuals must be provided

with accurate information about behaviors that are deemed academically dishonest in order to counteract negative and/or inaccurate perceptions that are utilized to justify engagement in the behavior (Perkins, 2003). For example, policies to address academic dishonesty must include a definition of academic dishonesty and provide examples of specific behaviors that constitute dishonesty which are in turn communicated to students through course syllabi, campus websites, student handbooks, orientations, etc.

Additionally, policies to address academic dishonesty must include procedures for reporting dishonesty and the consequences associated with being found guilty of violations, which in turn are communicated to the entire campus community (i.e. students, deans, advisors and faculty). Further, procedures to address dishonesty should be reviewed on a continuous basis to accommodate the changing nature of academic dishonesty and of behaviors deemed dishonest at the institution.

Institutional Efforts to Address Academic Dishonesty: Role of Faculty

Research reveals that students not only enter institutions of higher education with preconceived perceptions and misconceptions about academic dishonesty but also enter at different stages of moral development (Kibler, 1993). Accordingly, as the findings of this study reveal, students place a high value on the importance of knowing institutional academic integrity policies and on faculty discussions of specific behaviors deemed dishonest within the classroom setting. As such, discussions about academic dishonesty not only provide the opportunity to highlight the importance of integrity but also can educate students on potential violations of institutional student codes of conduct. Thus, faculty can address academic dishonesty in their respective classrooms through the course syllabus by providing a clause on academic integrity and including potential

consequences associated with students being found guilty of a violation (i.e. suspension). Classroom discussions of academic dishonesty should include specific examples of behaviors deemed dishonest (i.e. copying and pasting information from the Internet, collaborating on written assignments when individual work is required, sharing of Excel files, paraphrasing information without citation) by the institution.

However, research reveals that faculty may be reluctant to report incidents of academic dishonesty due to the time involved (e.g., Graham et al., 1994), lack of administrative support in adjudicating academic dishonesty cases (e.g., Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998) and the consequences associated with reporting to both students and faculty (e.g., Davis, 1993; Holcomb, 1992; Mathur & Offenbach, 2002; McCabe, 1993).

Additionally, research reveals that faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty and behaviors deemed as dishonest are seldom taken into consideration (e.g., McCabe & Pavela, 2005; Nadelson, 2007; Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003). Thus, the adjudication process must not only offer due process protection for students, but also take into account the faculty perspective. Institutional policies and procedures should allow for faculty to make an academic determination (i.e. grade for an assignment) in regards to academic dishonesty cases that are independent from disciplinary procedures. Additionally, faculty should be notified throughout the investigation process as well as receive notification when a final decision is rendered.

Given the differences in faculty perceptions observed in this study, dialogue is critical within and among academic departments (Marcoux, 2002). Further, to address personal perceptions of academic dishonesty, Hard et al. (2006) states that institutions must educate faculty regarding the occurrence of academic dishonesty and on the

importance of reporting all suspected incidences of dishonesty to the respective administrative unit. Likewise, those responsible for the adjudication of academic dishonesty cases should regularly keep faculty informed and involved in future preventative methods to address dishonesty. As an example, at the institution under study, reported incidences of academic dishonesty are reported twice a year with the information readily available via the Office of Academic Affairs website. However, as evident by the study, that information may not be adequately disseminated to the campus community and better communication efforts should be addressed.

Institutional Efforts to Address Academic Dishonesty: Role of Students

Research studies reveal that as undergraduate students emerge as adults, they are engaged in an exploration of not only themselves but also of the environment (s) that surround and promotes growth toward the working world (Arnett, 2000). From an ethical perspective, the college atmosphere provides rich opportunities to practice moral reasoning where they have to assign priorities to their behaviors (Rest et al., 1986). By examining student perceptions and misconceptions about behaviors that constitute academic dishonesty, institutions of higher education can effectively implement methods to address academic dishonesty. Institutions must go beyond mere compliance to a pre-established student code of conduct and instead, continuously educate students regarding their expectations while enrolled in the educational institution. This educational component can be implemented through orientations, first year experience courses and through workshops that are provided throughout the academic year. However, it is also important that students take personal responsibility for knowing what expectations are

required by institutions and comply with those established policies and procedures throughout their academic career.

Future Research

Although research on academic dishonesty is vast, studies examining the similarities and differences in how faculty and students perceive academic dishonesty and behaviors institutions define as dishonest are limited. However, if the purpose of the research on academic dishonesty is to identify and prevent the problem, the variable(s) that could help us understand and make sense of why cheating occurs is being neglected (Kohn, 2007a). Thus, it is imperative that research on the topic continue in efforts to not only provide preventative solutions to address the problem but also efforts to understand the problem in itself. The following are suggestions for future research based on the findings of this study.

1. This study examined student perceptions and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty and how those perceptions may influence student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors as well as institutional responses to the problem. While the insights of this study were valuable, the study did not examine the severity of behaviors identified as dishonest. It is possible that student responses and faculty responses on the severity of behaviors (i.e. cheating on an individual assignment in comparison to cheating on an exam) would have produced differing perceptions within student populations and faculty populations. If students perceive that sharing exam answers with classmates is not dishonest, a discussion of why that can be seen as unfair advantage for students warrants future discussions.

Further, it would be beneficial to research in examining how faculty perceive the severity of behaviors deemed dishonest when considering reporting the misconduct as well as how an institution determines would behaviors are considered severe and the rationale behind that determination as it relates to sanctions.

2. This study employed a quantitative method of understanding faculty perceptions and student perceptions at the institution under study. In reviewing the findings of this study, it is also important to question how can an institution effectively decrease the likelihood that students will engage in academic dishonesty. Although research has provided valuable insights in efforts to decrease incidences of academic dishonesty, this is a question that lacks one specific answer. Instead, research on academic dishonesty is in need of studies that allow for an examination of the “voices” of students and faculty. It could be a benefit to future research on academic dishonesty if researchers are able to conduct qualitative or mixed-method studies on student perceptions and faculty perceptions to grasp a better understanding of how those perceptions may influence student engagement in academic dishonesty.
3. Although beyond the scope of this research, as studies highlight the rise in plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration, an area of future research is in regards to International students and the misconceptions and perceptions that are brought with them in US institutions of higher education. Studies have reported that students in Asian cultures view “plagiarism” as a sign of

respect and reverence because one cannot improve upon what is already written (Belanger, Leonard & LeBrasseur, 2012). Thus, a growing body of research reveals that International students are perceived to be more likely to commit an act of academic dishonesty involving plagiarism citing difficulties in languages and differences in cultures as the rationale (Park, 2003). Further, implications of being found guilty of violations of academic dishonesty for International students are tremendously greater than native students.

4. A final recommendation for future research on academic dishonesty as a result of the findings of this study, is in addressing institutional policies to address academic dishonesty. Although students and faculty expressed some similarities within their responses of the clarity and effectiveness of institutional policies to address dishonesty, the differences observed were greater. Thus it is important that studies examine how information regarding academic dishonesty is communicated across different institutions of higher education and how students, faculty and administrators perceive the effectiveness of those policies.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty and how perceptions may influence students' inclination to engage in behaviors identified as academically dishonest and institutional responses to the problem. Research on the topic of academic dishonesty has either examined the student perspective or the faculty perspective but relatively few studies have examined within group perceptions in one study. However, reducing academic

misconduct requires an understanding of factors that influence the two key stakeholders in the epidemic: students who engage in academically dishonest behaviors and faculty who are charged with the responsibility of reporting and deterring the behavior.

The findings of this study are important to students, faculty, and administrators in institutions of higher education in a number of ways. In this study, although only a small percentage of students who responded to the survey admitted to engaging in “cheating”, what was more important to note was the inconsistencies in students who admitted to cheating and the actual responses to questions regarding engagement in specific behaviors recognized by the institution as dishonest. As a result of conducting this study, one may conclude that students may not believe that they are engaging in behaviors that are deemed dishonest by their respective institution, which is consistent with research (e.g., Kidwell et al., 2003; Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003). Due to the increasing importance of creating academic cultures of integrity, it is imperative that research on this topic continue in efforts to understand not only why students engage in academic dishonesty but also what behaviors or seen by students as dishonest. As such, institutional efforts to challenge students’ comprehension of academically dishonest behaviors should provide specific examples that are consistently communicated throughout a student’s academic career. Secondly, in regards to faculty participants, the results of this study indicate that faculty perceive student engagement in academically dishonest behaviors at a higher rate than students admit engagement in the behaviors. Faculty perceptions of student engagement in academic dishonesty may be confounded by a number of personal attributes that were not examined in this study but may provide more insights into the results found.

Finally, as a result of conducting this study, one may conclude that differences in faculty perceptions and student perceptions of institutional responses to address academic dishonesty requires further understanding of how institutions communicate messages about academic dishonesty and respond to violations of misconduct by students. In reviewing research on academic dishonesty, studies document the need to examine factors such as perceptions of academic dishonesty in addition to researching occurrence of dishonesty and individual and contextual characteristics of students who engage in dishonesty. Although it is not possible to generalize this study to all institutions of higher education, the urgency of the epidemic especially in the rise of technology and takemyexam.com websites leads one to understand that the problem cannot be ignored. This study thus should be examined in the context of the research on academic dishonesty and serve as a building block for additional research examining faculty perceptions and student perceptions of academic dishonesty and how those perceptions influence student engagement, and institutional responses to the problem.

REFERENCES

- Academic Achievement Center (nd). *Preventing academic dishonesty in writing-A guide for faculty*. Retrieved July 14, 2011 from <http://www.ltu.edu/aac/avoiding.asp>
- Ahrin, A., & Jones, K. (2009). A multidiscipline exploration of college students' perceptions of academic dishonesty: Are nursing students different from other college students? *Nurse Education Today*, *29*(7), 710-714.
doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2009.03.001
- Anderman, E., & Murdock, T. (2007). *Psychology of Academic Cheating*. Boston, MA: Elsevier.
- Andrews, K, Smith, L., Henzi, D., & Demps, E. (2007). Faculty and student perceptions of academic integrity at U.S. and Canadian Dental Schools. *Journal of Dental Education*, *71*(8), 1027-1039.
- Arneklev, B., Grasmick, H., Tittle, C., & Bursik, R. (1993). Low self-control and imprudent behavior. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *15*, 307-331.
doi:10.1007/BF01064461
- Ashworth, P., & Bannister, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education*, *22*(2), 187-203. doi:10.1080/03075079712331381034
- Baird, J. (1980). Current trends in college cheating. *Psychology in the Schools*, *17*, 515-522. doi:10.1002/1520-6807(198010)17:4<515::AID-PITS2310170417>3.0.CO;2-3
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman.
- Barnett, D., & Dalton, J. (1981). Why college students cheat. *Journal of College*

Personnel, 22(6), 545-551.

Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. (1999). "Intermediate" concepts and the connection to moral education. *Educational Psychology Review*, 11(4), 343-360.

Belanger, C., Leonard, V., & LeBrasseur, R. (2012). Moral reasoning, academic dishonesty and business students. *International Journal of higher Education*, 1(1), 72-89. doi:10.5430/ijhe.v1n1p72

Bisping, T., Hilde, P., & Roskelley, K. (2008). Modeling academic dishonesty: the role of student perceptions and misconduct type. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 39(1), 4-18. doi:10.3200/JECE.39.1.4-21

Bolin, A. (2004). Self-control, perceived opportunity and attitudes as predictors of academic dishonesty. *The Journal of Psychology*, 138(2), 101-114. doi:10.3200/JRLP.138.2.101-114

Boston Globe online (2007, May). *Duke: 34 MBA students punished for cheating*. Retrieved June 26, 2009 from <http://www.boston.com>

Bowers, W. (1964). *Student Dishonesty and its Control in College*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Broeckelman-Post, M. (2008). Faculty and student influences on academic dishonesty. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 51(2), 206-211. doi:10.1109/TE.2007.910428

Brown, B. (1995). The academic ethics of graduate business students: A survey. *Journal of Education for Business*, 70(3), 151-156. doi:10.1080/08832323.1995.10117742

Brown, D. (2002). Cheating must be okay-everybody does it! *Nurse Educator*, 27(1), 6-8. doi:10.1097/00006223-200201000-00010

Brown, B., & Emmett, D. (2001). Explaining variations in the level of academic

dishonesty in studies of college students: Some new evidence. *College Student Journal*, 35, 529-538.

Bruggeman, E., & Hart, K. (1996). Cheating, lying and moral reasoning by religious and secular high school students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 89, 340-344.
doi:10.1080/00220671.1996.9941337

Buckley, M., Wiese, D., & Harvey, M. (1998). An investigation into the dimensions of unethical behavior. *Journal of Education for Business*, 73, 284-290.
doi:10.1080/08832329809601646

Burke, J. (1997). *Faculty perceptions of and attitudes toward academic dishonesty at a two-year college* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Georgia, Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED431486)

Burrus, R., McGoldrick, K., & Schuhmann, P. (2007). Self-reports of student cheating: Does a definition of cheating matter? *The Journal of Economic Education*, 38(1), 3-16. doi:10.3200/JECE.38.1.3-17

Calabrese, R., & Cochran, J. (1990). The relationship of alienation to cheating among a sample of American adolescents. *Journal of Research & Development in Education*, 23, 65-72.

Callahan, D. (2004). *The cheating culture: Why more Americans are doing wrong to get ahead*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Carnegie Classification (2008). Retrieved from <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org>

Carpenter, D., Harding, T., & Finelli, C. (2006). Engineering students perceptions of and attitudes toward cheating. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 95(3), 181-194.

Carter, S. L., & Punyanunt-Carter, N. M. (2006). Acceptability of treatments for cheating

in the college classroom. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 33, 212-216.

Retrieved from <http://www.thefreelibrary.com>

Caruana, A., Ramaseshan, B., & Ewing, M. T. (2000). The effect of anomie on academic dishonesty among university students. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14(1), 23-29. doi:10.1108/09513540010310378

Center for Academic Integrity (1999). *The fundamental values of academic integrity*.

Retrieved July 1, 2009 from <http://www.academicintegrity.org>

Chang, F. Y. (1994). School teachers' moral reasoning. In J. R. Rest & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development in the professions: Psychology and Applied Ethics* (pp. 71-83). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Chapman, K. J., Davis, R., Toy, D., & Wright, L. (2004). Academic integrity in the business school environment: I'll get by with a little help from my friends.

Journal of Marketing Education, 26(3), 236-250. doi:10.1177/0273475304268779

Cheat. (2009). In *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. Retrieved from

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cheat>

Chickering, A., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chory, R. M. (2007). Enhancing student perceptions of fairness: The relationship between instructor creditability and classroom justice. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 89-105.

Cizek, G. J. (1999a). *Cheating on tests: How to do it, detect it, and prevent it*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cizek, G. J. (2003b). *Detecting and preventing classroom cheating: Promoting integrity*

in assessment. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Cohen, P. (2011). Thinking Cap: The seemingly persistent rise of plagiarism. Retrieved from artsbeat.blogs.nytimes.com

Cole, S., & McCabe, D. L. (1996). Issues in academic integrity. *New Directions for Student Services*, 73, 67-77. doi:10.1002/ss.37119967307

Collected Rules and Regulations (2007). Retrieved from <http://www.system.missouri.edu>

Cooper, H. M., & Lowe, C. A. (1977). Task information and attributions for academic performance by professional teachers and roleplayers. *Journal of Personality*, 45, 469-483. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1977.tb00165.x

Corradini Goodwin, A. (2007). *Exploring the relationship between moral reasoning and students' understanding of the honor code at the University of Maryland* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://drum.lib.umd.edu/>

Crain, W.C. (1985). *Theories of Development: Concepts and Application*. Englewood, N.J.: Prentice-Hill.

Crittenden, V. L., Hanna, R. C., & Peterson, R. A. (2009). Business students' attitudes toward unethical behavior: A multi-country comparison. *Marketing Letters*, 20(1), 1-14. doi:10.1007/s11002-008-9051-4

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.

Cummings, R., Dyas, L., Maddux, C., & Kochman, A. (2001). Principled moral reasoning and behavior of preservice teacher education students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(1), 143-158. doi:10.3102/00028312038001143

Davis, S. (1993). *Cheating in college is for a career: Academic dishonesty in the 1990's*.

Atlanta, GA: Southeastern Psychological Association.

- 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. doi:10.1207/s15328023top1901_3
- Davis, S. F., & Ludvigson, H. W. (1995). Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation. *Teaching of Psychology, 22*, 119-121. doi:10.1207/s15328023top2202_6
- Davis, S. F., Noble, L. M., Zak, E. N., & Dreyer, K. K. (1992). A comparison of cheating and learning/grade orientation in American and Australian college students. *College Student Journal, 28*, 353-356.
- Decoo, W. (2002). *Crisis on campus: Confronting academic misconduct*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Derryberry, W., Snyder, H., Wilson, T., & Barger, B. (2006). Moral judgment differences in education and liberal arts majors: Cause for concern? *Journal of College and Character, 2*(4), 1-10. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1190
- Desruisseaux, P. (1999, April 30). Cheating is reaching epidemic proportions worldwide, researchers say. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1-2*.
- Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., Clark, R. E., Williams, L. E., Francis, B., & Haines, V. J. (1996). College cheating: Ten years later. *Research in Higher Education, 37*, 487-502. doi:10.1007/BF01730111
- Donleavy, G. (2007). No man's land: Exploring the space between Gilligan and Kohlberg. *Journal of Business Ethics, 80*(4), 807-822. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9470-9

- Drake, C. A. (1941). Why students cheat. *Journal of Higher Education*, 12, 418-420.
doi:10.2307/1976003
- Dumas, J. (1999). Usability testing methods: Subjective measures, part II - measuring attitudes and opinions. *American Institutes for Research*. Retrieved from <http://www.upassoc.org>
- Eastman, J., Iyer, R., & Reisenwitz, T. (2008). The impact of unethical reasoning on different types of academic dishonesty: An exploratory study. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 5(12), 7-16.
- Eisenberg, J. (2004). To cheat or not to cheat: Effects of moral perspective and situational variables on students' attitudes. *Journal of Moral Education*, 33(2), 163-178.
doi:10.1080/0305724042000215276
- Engler, J., Landau, J. & Epstein, M. (2008). Keeping up with the Joneses: Students' perceptions of academically dishonest behavior. *Teaching of Psychology*, 35, 99-102. doi:10.1080/00986280801978418
- Ercegovac, Z., & Richardson, J. (2004). Academic dishonesty, plagiarism included in the digital age: A literature review. *College and Research Libraries*, 65(4), 301-318.
Retrieved from <http://www.baruch.cuny.edu>
- Fass, R. A. (1986). By honor bound: Encouraging academic honesty. *Educational Record*, 67(4), 32-35.
- Finelli, C. J., Sutkus, J. A. Carpenter, D. D., & Harding, T. S. (2007). A longitudinal study of the ethical development of engineering and non-engineering students at a national research university. *Proceedings of the Research in Engineering Education Symposium, Davos, Switzerland*. Retrieved from http://www.engconfintl.org/8axabstracts/Session%206B/rees08_submission_48.pdf

- Fischer, C. T. (1970). Levels of cheating under conditions of informative appeal to honesty, public affirmation of values and threats of punishment. In T. L. Benjamin & A. R. Griggs (Eds.), *Handbook for Teaching Introductory Psychology* (pp.12-16). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlaum Associates.
- Flint, A., Clegg, S., & MacDonald, R. (2006). Exploring staff perceptions of student plagiarism. *The Journal of Further and Higher Education, 30*(2), 145-156.
doi:10.1080/03098770600617562
- Fontana, J. S. (2009). Nursing faculty experiences of students' academic dishonesty. *Journal of Nursing Education, 48*(4), 181-185. doi:10.3928/01484834-20090401-05
- Forsyth, D. R., Pope, W. R., and McMillan, J. H. (1985). Students' reactions after cheating: an attributional analysis. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 10*, 72-82. doi:10.1016/0361-476X(85)90007-4
- Fowler, F. J. (1996). Design and Evaluation of Survey Questions. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods* (pp. 343–374). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Franklyn-Stokes, A., & Newstead, S. E. (1995). Undergraduate cheating: Who does what and why? *Studies in Higher Education, 20*(2), 159-172.
- Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an Interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education, 49*, 207-219.
doi:10.1080/03634520009379209
- Gaberson, K. B. (2007). Academic dishonesty among nursing students. *Nursing Forum, 32*(3), 14-20. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6198.1997.tb00205.x

- Gallant, T. B., & Drinan, P. (2006). Organizational theory and student cheating: Explanation, responses and strategies. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(5), 839-860.
- Garavalia, L., Olson, E., Russell, E. & Christensen, L. (2001). How do students cheat. In E. M. Anderman & T. B. Murdock (Eds.), *Psychology of Academic Cheating* (pp. 33-48). Boston, MA: Elsevier.
- Gehring, D., Nuss, E., & Pavela, G. (1986). *Issues and perspectives on academic integrity*. Columbus, OH: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Gehring, D., & Pavela, G. (1994). *Issues and perspectives on academic integrity*. Washington DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Gerdeman, R. (2000). Academic dishonesty and the community college. ERIC Database. (ED447840)
- Gilligan, C. (1977a). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and of morality. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47, 481-517.
- Gilligan, C. (1982b). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., & Wiggins, G. (1987). In origins of morality in early childhood relationships of morality in young children. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), *The emergence of morality in young children* (pp. 277-305). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Godfrey, J. R., & Waugh, R. F. (1998). The perceptions of students from religious schools about academic dishonesty. *Issues in Educational Research*, 8(2), 95-116.

Goldsen, R. K., Rosenberg, M., Williams, R. M., Jr., & Suchman, E. A. (1960). *What college students think*. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand Company.

Graham, M. A., Monday, J., O'Brien, K., & Steffen, S. (1994). Cheating at a small college: An examination of student and faculty attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*(2), 255-260.

Haines, V. J., Dierkhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., & Clark, R. E. (1986). College cheating: Immaturity, lack of commitment, and the neutralizing attitude. In T. L. Benjamin & A. R. Griggs (Eds.), *Handbook for Teaching Introductory Psychology* (pp. 342-354). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hard, S., Conway, J., & Moran, A. (2006). Faculty and college student beliefs about the frequency of student academic misconduct. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(6), 1058-1080. doi:10.1353/jhe.2006.0048

Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Finelli, C. J., & Passow, H. J. (2004). Does academic dishonesty relate to unethical behavior in professional practice? An exploratory study. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 10*(2), 311-326.

Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Montgomery, S. M., & Steneck, N. H. (2002). A comparison of the role of academic dishonesty policies of several colleges on the cheating behavior of engineering and pre-engineering students. *Proceedings of the 32nd ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference, Boston, MA*. IEEE Catalog number 02CH37351C.

Hardigan, P. (2004). First and third year pharmacy students' attitudes toward cheating behaviors. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 68*(5), 1-5.
doi:10.5688/aj6805110

- Harris, J. R. (1989). Ethical values and decision processes of male and female business students. *Journal of Education for Business*, 64(5), 234-238.
doi:10.1080/08832323.1989.10117365
- Hendershott, A., Drinan, P., & Cross, M. (2000). Towards enhancing a culture of academic integrity. *NASPA Journal*, 37(4), 587-597. doi:10.2202/1949-6605.1119
- Herman, A., L. (1996). College Cheating: A plea for leniency. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64, 260-266. doi:10.2307/1979896
- Hetherington, E. M., & Feldman, S. E. (1964). College cheating as a function of subject and situational variables. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 55(4), 212-218.
doi:10.1037/h0045337
- Higbee, J. L., & Thomas, P. V. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of behaviors that constitute cheating. *NASPA Journal*, 40(1), 39-52. doi:10.2202/1949-6605.1187
- Hilbert, G. A. (1985a). Involvement of nursing students in unethical classroom and clinical behaviors. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 1, 230-234.
doi:10.1016/S8755-7223(85)80160-5
- Hilbert, G. A. (1988b). Moral development and unethical behavior among nursing students. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 4, 163-167. doi:10.1016/S8755-7223(88)80133-9
- Hoff, D.J. (2000). As stakes rise, definition of cheating blurs. *Education Week*, 19(41), 14-16.
- Holcomb, T. (1992). A case study analysis of honor codes at six institutions of higher education (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Athens, GA. *Doctoral Dissertations International*.

- Houston, J.P. (1977). Four components of Rotter's internal-external scale and cheating behavior. In T. L. Benjamin & A. R. Griggs (Eds), *Handbook for Teaching Introductory Psychology* (pp. 275-283). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlaum Associates.
- Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarism, authorship, and the academic death penalty. *College English*, 57(7), 788-806. doi:10.2307/378403
- Howard, R. M., & Davies, L. J. (2009). Plagiarism in the Internet Age. *Educational Leadership*, 66(6), 64-67.
- Hudd, S. S., Apgar, C., Franklyn-Bronson, E., & Lee, R. G. (2009). Creating a campus culture of integrity: Comparing the perspectives of full-and part-time faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(2), 146-177.
- Hughes-Christensen, J. M., & McCabe, D. L. (2006). Academic misconduct within higher education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 36(2), 1-21.
- Ikupa, J. (1997). Causes and cure of examination malpractices. *The Business Administrator*, 1(1), 38-39.
- Iyer, R., & Eastman, J. (2006). Academic dishonesty: Are business students different from other college students. *Journal of Education for Business*, 82(2), 101-110. doi:10.3200/JOEB.82.2.101-110
- Jacobson, L. I., Berger, S. E., & Milham, J. (1970). Individual differences in cheating during a temptation period when confronting failure. In T. L. Benjamin & A. R. Griggs (Eds.), *Handbook for Teaching Introductory Psychology* (pp.48-56). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlaum Associates.
- Jeffreys, M. R., & Stier, L. (1998). Student academic dishonesty. *Imprint*, 45(3), 48-49.

- Jendrek, M. P. (1992). Students' reaction to academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 260-273.
- Johnson, S., & Martin, M. (2005). Academic dishonesty: A new twist to an old problem. *Athletic Therapy Today, 10*(4), 48-50.
- Jones, A. (2007). Cheat sheet. *Teacher Magazine, 18*(6).
- Keith-Spiegel, P., Tabachnick, B. G., Whitley, B. E., & Washburn, J. (1998). Why professors ignore cheating: Opinions of a national sample of psychology instructors. *Ethics & Behavior, 8*(5), 215-227. doi:10.1207/s15327019eb0803_3
- Keith-Spiegel, P., & Whitley, B. E. (2001). Special Issue: Academic Dishonesty. *Ethics & Behavior, 11* (3). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Keller, M. (1976). Academic dishonesty at Miami. Student Life Research, Miami University. In T. L. Benjamin & A. R. Griggs (Eds.), *Handbook for Teaching Introductory Psychology (pp.1-16)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kennedy, K., Nowak, S., Raghuraman, R., Thomas, J., & Davis, S. F. (2000). Academic dishonesty and distance learning: Student and faculty views. *The College Student Journal, 34*(2), 309-314.
- Kibler, W. (1993). Academic dishonesty: A student development dilemma. *NASPA Journal, 30*(1), 252-67.
- Kibler, W. C., Nuss, E. M., Paterson, B. G., & Pavela, G. (1988). *Academic integrity and student development: Legal issues, policy perspectives*. Asheville, NC: College Administrators Publications.
- Kidwell, L. (2001). Student honor codes as a tool for teaching professional ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics, 29*(1/2), 45-49.

- Kidwell, L., Wozniak, K., & Laurel, J. P. (2003). Student reports and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 7(3), 205-214.
- Kohn, A. (2007a). Who's cheating whom? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89, 88-97.
- Kohn, A. (2008b). Who's cheating whom? *The Education Digest*, 73(5), 4-11.
- Kolanko, K. M., Clark, C., Heinrich, K. T., Olive, D., Serembus, J. F., & Sifford, K. S. (2006). Academic dishonesty, bullying, incivility, and violence: Difficult challenges. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 27(1), 34-43.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969a). Stage and sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research* (pp. 347-480). Chicago, IL: Rand- McNally.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976b). Moral stages and moralization: the cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.). *Moral development and behavior* (pp. 31-53). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lambert, K. D., Ellen, N., & Taylor, L. (2003). Cheating-What is it and why do it: A study in New Zealand tertiary institutions of the perceptions and justifications for academic dishonesty. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 3(1/2), 98.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2003). Collegiate academic dishonesty revisited: What have they done, how often have they done it, who does it, and why did they do it? *Electronic Journal of Sociology*. ISSN: 1198 3655.
- Landon, B. (1999). Technical issues in systems for WWW-based course support. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications* 5(4), 437-453.
- Leming, J. (1978a). Cheating behavior, situational influence and moral development. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 71(4), 214-217.

- Leming, J. (1979b). *The relationship between principled moral reasoning and cheating behavior under threat and nonthreat situations*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED174512)
- Liddell, J., & Fong, V. (2003). Faculty perceptions of plagiarism. *Journal of College and Character, 6*(2), 1-10. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1416
- Livosky, M., & Tauder, R. T. (1994). View of cheating among college students and faculty. *Psychology in the Schools, 31*(1), 72-82. doi:10.1002/1520-6807(199401)31:1<72::AID-PITS2310310110>3.0.CO;2-J
- 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 for Business, 75*(4), 231-235. doi:10.1080/08832320009599020
- Malinowski, C. I., & Smith, C. P. (1985). Moral reasoning and moral conduct: An investigation prompted by Kohlberg's theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*(4), 1016-1027. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.49.4.1016
- Maramark, S., & Maline, M. B. (1993). *Academic dishonesty among college students*. Washington, DC: Office of Research, U.S. Department Of Education.
- Marcoux, H. E. (2002). *Kansas State University faculty perspective, opinions, and practices concerning undergraduate student academic dishonesty and moral development* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.k-state.edu>
- Markie, P. J. (1994). *A professor's duties: Ethical issues in college teaching*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

- Marsh, R. L., Landau, J. D., & Hicks, J. L. (1997). Contributions of inadequate source monitoring to unconscious plagiarism during idea generation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 23, 889-897. doi:10.1037//0278-7393.23.4.886
- Mathur, R., & Offenbach, S. I. (2002). Preliminary observations on faculty and graduate student perceptions of questionable research conduct. In N. H. Steneck & M. D. Scheetz (Eds.), *Investigating research integrity* (pp.15–20): *Proceedings of the First ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity*. Retrieved from <http://ori.dhhs.gov/multimedia/acrobat/papers/IRI-all.pdf>
- McCabe, D. (1993a). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of honor codes. *Research in Higher Education*, 34(5), 647-658. doi:10.1007/BF00991924
- McCabe, D. (1997b). Classroom cheating among natural science and engineering majors. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 3, 433–445. doi:10.1007/s11948-997-0046-y
- McCabe, D. (2001c). Cheating: why students do it and how we can help them stop. *American Educator*, 1–7.
- McCabe, D. (2008d). *Academic Integrity Survey*. Retrieved from <http://acad-integrity.rutgers.edu/rutgers.asp>
- McCabe, D., & Bowers, W. J. (1996). The relation between student cheating and college fraternity and sorority membership. *NASPA Journal*, 33, 280-291.
- McCabe, D. L., Feghali, T., & Abdallah, H. (2008). Academic dishonesty in the Middle East: individual and contextual factors. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 451-467. doi:10.1007/s11162-008-9092-9
- McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2005). New honor codes for a new generation. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com>

- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L.K. (1993a). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education*, *64*, 522-538.
doi:10.2307/2959991
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L.K. (1995b). Cheating among business students: A challenge for business leaders and educators. *Journal of Management Education*, *19*(2), 205-218. doi:10.1177/105256299501900205
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L.K. (1997c). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multi-campus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, *38*(3), 379-396.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., & Butterfield, K. (1996a). The influence of collegiate and corporate codes of conduct on ethics-related behavior in the workplace. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *6*(4), 461-476. doi:10.2307/3857499
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., & Butterfield, K. (1999b). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments. *The Journal of Higher Education*, (March/April), 211-234. doi:10.2307/2649128
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., & Butterfield, K. (2001c). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics & Behavior*, *11*(3), 219-232.
doi:10.1207/S15327019EB1103_2
- Micheals, J. W., & Mieth, T. D. (1989). Applying theories of deviance to academic cheating. *Social Science Quarterly*, *70*, 870-885.
- Miller, A., Murdock, T., Anderman, E. M., & Poindexter, A. L. (2007). Who are all these

- cheaters? Characteristics of academically dishonest students. In E. M. Anderman & T. B. Murdock (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on academic cheating* (pp.9-32). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- MLA Handbook for Writers (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.mla.org/resources>
- Murdock, T. B., & Anderman, E. M. (2006). Motivational perspectives on student cheating: Toward an integrated model of academic dishonesty. *Educational Psychologist, 41*(3), 129-145. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep4103_1
- Murdock, T., & Stephens, J. (2007). Is cheating wrong? Students' reasoning about academic dishonesty. In E. M. Anderman & T. B. Murdock (Eds.), *Psychology of Academic Cheating* (pp. 229-254). Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (2005). Southern college students' cheating behaviors: An Examination of problem behavior correlates. *Deviant Behavior, 26*, 439-461. doi:10.1080/016396290950659
- Nadelson, S. (2007). Academic misconduct by university students: Faculty perceptions and responses. *Plagiarism: Cross-Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication and Falsification, 2*(2), 1-10.
- Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Newstead, S. E., Franklyn-Stokes, A., & Armstead, P. (1996). Individual differences in student cheating. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(2), 229-241. doi:10.1037//0022-0663.88.2.229
- Nolan, R., Smith, J., & Dai, Y. (1998). Faculty perception on student academic honesty. *College Student Journal, 32*(2), 305-310.

- Nowell, C., & Laufer, D. (1997). Undergraduate students cheating in the fields of business and economics. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 28, 2-12.
doi:10.2307/1183170
- Nuss, E. M. (1984). Academic integrity: Comparing faculty and student attitudes. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 32, 140-144.
- NY Newsday (2007, May). *Students Lie, Cheat and Steal, Courtesy of the Internet*. Retrieved June 25, 2009 from <http://www.net.cetera>
- Ogilby, S. M. (1995). The ethics of academic behavior: Will it affect professional behavior? *Journal of Education for Business*, 71(2), 92-97.
doi:10.1080/08832323.1995.10116766
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 543-578. doi:10.2307/1170653
- Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students-literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(5), 471-488.
doi:10.1080/02602930301677
- Partello, P. (1993). First-year students and cheating: A study at Keene State College. *Research Strategies*, 11, 174-179.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Enhancement and denial in socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 307-317. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.60.2.307
- Pavela, G. (1978). Judicial review of academic decision-making after Horowitz. *School Law Journal*, 55, 55-75.
- Perry, W. G. (1999). Forms of Ethical and Intellectual Development in the College

Years: A scheme. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pe Symaco, L., & Marcelo (2003). Faculty perception on student academic honesty.

College Student Journal, 37, 327-333.

Perkins, H. W. (2003). The emergence and evolution of the social norms approach to substance abuse prevention. In H. W. Perkins (Ed.), *The social norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse: A handbook for educators, counselors, and clinicians* (pp. 3–17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Piaget, J. (1963). *Judgment and reasoning in the child*. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield.

Pincus, H. S., & Schmelkin, L.P. (2003). Faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(2), 196-209. doi:10.1353/jhe.2003.0017

Plagiarism (2009). In *Oxford English Dictionary Online Dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://dictionary.oed.com/>

Prenshaw, P., Straughan, R., & Albers-Miller, N. (2000). University academic dishonesty policy and student perceptions of cheating: An exploratory content analysis across fourteen universities. In J. L. Thomas (Ed.), *Advances in Marketing* (pp. 203-208). Jacksonville, AL: Association of Collegiate Marketing Educators.

Pullen, R., Ortloff, V., Casey, S., & Payne, J.B. (2000). Analysis of academic misconduct using unobtrusive research: A study of discarded cheat sheets. *College Student Journal*, 34(4), 616-617.

Pulvers, K., & Diekhoff, G. M. (1999). The relationship between academic dishonesty and college classroom environment. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(4), 487-499.

- Rabi, S. M., Patton, L. R., Fjortoff, N., & Zgarrick, D. (2006). Characteristics, prevalence, attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty among pharmacy students. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 70*(4), 73.
doi:10.5688/aj700473
- Rakovski, C., & Levy, E. (2007). Academic dishonesty: perceptions of business students. *College Student Journal, 41*(2), 466-481.
- Rest, J. (1979a). *Development in judging moral issues*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rest, J. (1983b). Morality. In P. H. Mussen (Senior Ed.), J. Flavell & E. Markman (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Cognitive Development, 3*, (pp. 556-629). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Rest, J., Edwards, L., & Thoma, S. (1997). Designing and validating a measure of moral judgment: Stage preference and stage consistency approaches. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*(1), 5-28. doi:10.1037//0022-0663.89.1.5
- Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. (1999). A Neo-Kohlbergian approach: The DIT and schema theory. *Educational Psychology Review, 11*(4), 291-324.
- Rimer, S. (2003). A Campus fad that's being copied: Internet plagiarism seems on the rise. *New York Times Late Edition (online), Column 1, 7*. Retrieved from <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html>
- Ritter, D. A. (1993). Faculty approaches to plagiarism: Multiple influences, multiple strategies. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. *Doctoral Dissertations International*.
- Roberts, D., & Rabinowitz, W. (1992). An investigation of student perceptions of

- cheating in academic situations. *Review of Higher Education*, 15, 179-190.
- Robinson-Zanartu, C., Pena, E.D., Cook-Morales, V., Pena, A.M., Afshani, R., & Nguyen, L. (2005). Academic crime and punishment: Faculty members' perceptions of and responses to plagiarism. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 20(3), 317-337. doi:10.1521/scpq.2005.20.3.318
- Roig, M. (1997a). Can undergraduate students determine whether the text has been plagiarized? *The Psychological Record*, 47, 113-123.
- Roig, M. (1999b). When college students' attempts at paraphrasing become instances of potential plagiarism. *Psychological Reports*, 84, 973-982.
doi:10.2466/PR0.84.3.973-982
- Roig, M., & Ballew, C. (1994). Attitudes toward cheating of self and others by college students and professors. *Psychological Record*, 44(1), 3-12.
- Roig, M., & DeTommaso, L. (1995). Are college cheating and plagiarism related to academic dishonesty? *Psychological Reports*, 77, 691-698.
- Rollet, J. (2004). Poll finds nursing most honest profession. *Advance for Nurse Practitioners*, 12(1), 17.
- Roth, N. L., & McCabe, D. L. (1995). Communication strategies for addressing academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36(6), 531-541.
- Saad, L. (2006). Nursing tops the list of most honest and ethical professions. *The Gallup Poll*. Retrieved from <http://www.galluppoll.com/content>
- Saddlemire, M. (2005). *Faculty perceptions of undergraduate academic dishonesty*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://rave.ohiolink.edu>
- Scheers, N. J., & Dayton, C. M. (1987). Improved estimation of academic cheating

- behavior using the randomized response technique. *Research in Higher Education*, 26, 61-69. doi:10.1007/BF00991933
- Schmelkin, L. P., Gilbert, K., Spencer, K. J., Pincus, H. S., & Silva, R. (2008). A multidimensional scaling of college students' perceptions of academic dishonesty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(5), 587-607.
- Schmidt, S. D. (2006). Cheating: An ethical concern for nursing educators. *The Alabama Nurse*, (March/April/May), 1-4.
- Schneider, A. (1999). Why professors don't do more to stop students who cheat. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com>
- Sileo, J. M. (2006a). Investigating the perceptions of academic dishonesty among special educators (Doctoral dissertation). University of Nevada, Las Vegas. *Dissertations Abstract International*.
- Sileo, J. M. (2008b). Academic dishonesty and online classes: A Rural education perspective. *Rural Special Edition Quarterly*, 27(1/2), 55-60.
- Sims, R.L. (1993). The relationship between academic dishonesty and unethical business practices. *Journal of Education for Business*, 68(4), 207-211.
doi:10.1080/08832323.1993.10117614
- Singhal, A.C. (1982). Factors in students' dishonesty. In L. T. Benjamin & R. A. Griggs (Eds.), *Handbook for Teaching Introductory Psychology* (pp. 775-780). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Smith, J. N., Nolan, R. F., & Dai, Y. (1998). Faculty perception of student academic dishonesty. *College Student Journal*, 32(2), 305-310.
- Spaulding, M. (2009). Perceptions of academic honesty in online vs. face-to-face

- classrooms. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 8(3) 183-198.
- Spiller, S., & Crown, D. F. (1995). Changes over time in academic dishonesty at the collegiate level. *Psychological Reports*, 76, 763-768.
doi:10.2466/pr0.1995.76.3.763
- Stannard, C. I., & Bowers, W. J. (1970). The college fraternity as an opportunity structure for meeting academic demands. *Social Problems*, 17(3), 371-390.
doi:10.1525/sp.1970.17.3.03a00070
- Stephens, J. M. (2005). Justice or just us? What to do about cheating. In A. Lathrop & K. Foss (Eds.), *Guiding students from cheating and plagiarism to honesty and integrity: Strategies for change* (pp. 32-34). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Storch, E. A., & Storch, J. B. (2002). Fraternities, sororities, and academic dishonesty. *College Student Journal*, 36(2), 247-252.
- Stossel, J. (2004). Big cheats on campus. *ABC News*, 20/20. Retrieved June 27, 2009 from <http://abcnews.go.com>
- SurveyMonkey.com (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.surveymonkey.com>
- Sutton, E. M., & Huba, M. E. (1995). Undergraduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty as a function of ethnicity and religious participation. *NASPA Journal*, 33(1), 19-34.
- Tang, S., & Zuo, Z. (1997). Profile of college examination cheaters. *College Student Journal*, 31(3), 340.
- Tata, J. (1999). Grade distributions, grading procedures, and students' evaluations of instructors: A justice perspective. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133, 263-271.
doi:10.1080/00223989909599739

- Thoma, S., Narvaez, D., Rest, J., & Derryberry, P. (1999). Does moral judgment development reduce to political attitudes or verbal ability? Evidence using the Defining Issues Test. *Educational Psychology Review, 11*(4), 325-341.
- Tibbetts, S.G. (1999). Differences between women and men regarding decisions to commit test cheating. *Research in Higher Education, 40*(3), 323-42.
- Timiraos, N. (2002). Professor discusses research, trends in cheating on college campuses. *The Hoya, November, 1*.
- University of Missouri-System (2009). *Facts and Figures-UM Saint Louis*. Retrieved October 19, 2009 from <http://www.umsystem.edu>
- Volpe, R., Davidson, L., & Bell, M. C. (2008). Faculty attitudes and behaviors concerning student cheating. *College Student Journal, 42*(1), 164-175.
- Walker, A. L. (2008). Preventing unintentional plagiarism: A method for strengthening paraphrasing skills. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 35*(4), 387-395.
- Whitley, B. E. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(3), 235 -274.
- Williams, M. S., & Hosek, W. R. (2003). Strategies for reducing academic dishonesty. *Journal of Legal Studies Education, 21*(1), 87-108. doi:10.1111/j.1744-1722.2003.tb00326.x
- Wood, J. A., Longenecker, J. A., McKinney, J. G., & Moore, C. W. (1988). Ethical attitudes of students and business professionals: A study of moral reasoning. *Journal of Business Ethics, 7*(4), 249-257. doi:10.1007/BF00381828
- Wright, J. C., & Kelly, R. (1974). Cheating: Student/faculty views and responsibilities. *Improving College and University Teaching, 22*(1), 31-34.

APPENDIX A**LETTER OF INTRODUCTION**

My name is Tanisha Stevens and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri-Saint Louis, in the Division of Education Leadership and Policy Studies. As part of my dissertation project, I am conducting research on perceptions of academic dishonesty among students and faculty in a large public institution.

Information for the study will be obtained from participants, such as yourself, who are enrolled or currently teach in a public-four year institution. Your participation in the online survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Demographic questions such as academic year, gender and age will be asked. However, no information will be gathered from you during the course of the questionnaire that can directly link you to your responses.

I want to remind you that your participation in the survey is entirely voluntary and that you may elect to not participate at any time or to not answer any question. If you decide to participate, I ask that you be completely honest and answer each question to the best of your ability. Additionally, if you elect to participate, you will be able to view and print a copy of an informed consent letter that provides additional information regarding the study, your role in the study and provides contact information for the principal investigator in the event there are additional questions and/or concerns. Once completed, your responses will be kept in a password-protected database through SurveyMonkey.com.

Thank you once again for your participation.

APPENDIX B**INFORMED LETTER FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES/
ONLINE CONSENT**

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Tanisha N. Stevens, in education at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, under the supervision of Dr. Shawn Woodhouse. The purpose of this research is to examine faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty and of behaviors identified as academically dishonest.

Your participation will involve:

- A brief anonymous online questionnaire that consists of thirty-two questions and will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.
- The completed questionnaire responses will be kept in a secure password protected database that can only be accessed by the principal investigator and her advisor.
- This database will be password-protected through a secure on-line location through SurveyMonkey.com with no access granted to anyone except the principal investigator.

There are no anticipated risks associated with this research. Minimum risks may include:

- A loss of time in order to complete the questionnaire.
- Potential for possible discomfort from answering sensitive questions.

There are no direct benefits for you participating in this study. However, your participation will contribute to the knowledge about general understanding of academic dishonesty, perceptions of dishonesty and perceptions of behaviors identified as academically dishonest which is of great importance to institutions of higher education.

Your participation is voluntary and you may choose not to participate in this research study or to withdraw your consent at any time. You may choose not to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You will NOT be penalized in any way should you choose not to participate or to withdraw.

By agreeing to participate, you understand and agree that your data may be shared with other researchers and educators in the form of presentations and/or publications. In all cases, your identity will not be revealed. In rare instances, a researcher's study must undergo an audit or program evaluation by an oversight agency (such as the Office for Human Research Protection). That agency would be required to maintain the confidentiality of your data. In addition, all data will be stored on a password-protected computer and/or in a locked office.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or if any problems arise, you may call the Investigator, (Tanisha Stevens, 314-363-6376) or the Faculty Advisor, (Dr. Shawn Woodhouse, 314-516-7397). You may also ask questions or state concerns regarding your rights as a research participant to the Office of Research Administration, at 314-516-5897.

Please note: Although your participation in the current study is greatly appreciated, participation is completely voluntary and you are under no obligation to continue. Also, it is recommended that you print a copy of this letter to keep for your records.

APPENDIX C**INSTRUCTIONAL SCRIPT**

Prior to beginning the questionnaire, I would like to provide you with some basic information. The survey is divided into 4 sections. In the first section, you will be asked some demographic information such as age, gender, and academic level. This information will not be utilized to identify you in any way or to link your responses to the subsequent sections. In the remaining sections, you will be asked a series of questions related to perceptions of academic dishonesty and institutional responses to academic dishonesty. You will be provided with a statement and then are asked to please click on the most appropriate response in the answer section.

There is no right or wrong answer to the questions, so the hope is that you will answer each question openly and honestly to the best of your abilities. Your responses will not be linked to any identifying information at any time in the process and if there are any questions, my contact information is provided in the informed consent letter. Thank you for your willingness to participate in the study to help us learn more about student and faculty perceptions on college academic dishonesty issues.

APPENDIX D
STUDENT SURVEY

Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

Part I: Demographics

1. What is your academic college?

- Arts and Sciences
- Business Administration
- Education
- Fine Arts and Communication
- Joint Engineering
- Nursing

2. What is your academic standing?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

3. What is your gender/sex?

- Female
- Male
- Other

4. What is your age?

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55+

5. Which group best represents your ethnic background/race?

- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian American/Pacific

- Black/African American (non-Hispanic)
- Hispanic/Spanish/Latin American
- White (non-Hispanic)
- International Student
- Multiracial Student
- Other (please indicate)
- No response

Other (please specify)

6. What is your residential status?

- On-campus housing (dorms, university-owned apartments)
- Off-campus housing

7. Have you engaged in any form of academic dishonesty at the university (i.e. cheating on an exam, copying and pasting information without citation)?

- Yes
- No

8. If you answered yes to question 7, were you caught?

- Yes
- No

9. If you answered yes to question 8, were you disciplined by the faculty, university or both?

- Not disciplined
- Faculty member only
- University adjudication process only
- Faculty and adjudication process

Part II: Attitude towards Dishonesty Scale

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

10. It is wrong to cheat.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral

- Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
11. Students should go ahead and cheat if they know they can get away with it.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
12. Students should try to cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are slim.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
13. I would let another student cheat off my test if he/she asked.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree

Part III: Academic Dishonesty Scale

Please indicate the extent to which you engaged or did not engage in the behavior outlined in the following statements.

14. Copied material and turned it in as your own work.
- Not Even One Time
 - One time
 - Two Times
 - A Few Times
 - Many times

15. Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

16. Copied a few sentences of material from a published source without giving the author credit.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

17. Helped someone else cheat on a test.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

18. Collaborated on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

19. Copied from another student during a test.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

20. Turned in work done by someone else.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

21. Received substantial help on an individual assignment without the instructor's permission.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

22. Cheated on a test in any way.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

23. Used a textbook or notes on a test without the instructor's permission.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

24. Used information found on the Internet without giving credit to the source.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

Part IV: Academic Environment

How would you rate the following:

25. The severity of penalties for cheating at the institution.

- Very Low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very High

26. The average student's understanding of campus policies concerning student cheating.

- Very Low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very High

27. The average faculty member's understanding of these policies.

- Very Low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very High

28. Student support of these policies.

- Very Low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very High

29. Faculty support of these policies.

- Very Low
- Low
- Medium
- High

Very High

30. The effectiveness of these policies.

Very Low

Low

Medium

High

Very High

31. Have you been informed about the University's policy on academic dishonesty?

Yes

No

32. If yes, where and how much have you learned about the University's policy on academic dishonesty? (Click all that apply.)

	Learned Little or Nothing	Learned Some	Learned A Lot
First year orientation programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campus Website Student Handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic Advisor, Residential Advisor or Faculty Advisor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faculty (discussed in class, course syllabi or course outlines)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching Assistant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Learned Little or Nothing	Learned Some	Learned A Lot
Dean or other Administrator	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify)

In the past, how often, did your instructors discuss policies concerning:

33. Plagiarism

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

34. Guidelines on group work or collaboration

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

35. Proper citation/referencing of written sources

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

36. Proper citation/referencing of Internet sources

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

37. Falsifying/fabricating course lab data

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

38. Falsifying/fabricating research data

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY

APPENDIX E
FACULTY SURVEY

Faculty Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

Part I: Demographics

1. What is your academic college?

- Arts and Sciences
- Business Administration
- Education
- Fine Arts and Communication
- Honors College
- Joint Engineering
- Nursing

2. What is your academic appointment?

- Tenure Track Faculty
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty

3. What is your academic rank?

- Assistant Professor/Assistant Teaching Professor
- Associate Professor/Associate Teaching Professor
- Full Professor/Full Teaching Professor
- Adjunct Faculty
- Lecturer
- Other

Other (please specify)

Part II: Attitude towards Dishonesty Scale

Please indicate the extent to which you believe UNIVERSITY STUDENTS would agree or disagree with the following statements.

4. It is wrong to cheat.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree

- Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
5. Students should go ahead and cheat if they know they can get away with it.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
6. Students should try to cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are slim.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
7. I would let another student cheat off my test if he/she asked.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree

Part III: Academic Dishonesty Scale

Please indicate the extent to which you believe students in general engage or do not engage in the behaviors outlined in the following statements.

8. Copy material and turn it in as their own work.
- Not Even One Time
 - One time
 - Two Times
 - A Few Times
 - Many times

9. Use unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it is given.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

10. Copy a few sentences of material from a published source without giving the author credit.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

11. Help someone else cheat on a test.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

12. Collaborate on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

13. Copy from another student during a test.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

14. Turn in work done by someone else.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

15. Receive substantial help on an individual assignment without the instructor's permission.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

16. Cheat on a test in any way.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

17. Use a textbook or notes on a test without the instructor's permission.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

18. Use information found on the Internet without giving credit to the source.

- Not Even One Time
- One time
- Two Times
- A Few Times
- Many times

Part IV: Academic Environment

How would you rate the following:

19. The severity of penalties for cheating at your institution.

- Very Low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very High

20. The average student's understanding of campus policies concerning student cheating.

- Very Low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very High

21. The faculty's understanding of these policies.

- Very Low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very High

22. Student support of these policies.

- Very Low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very High

23. Faculty support of these policies.

- Very Low
- Low
- Medium
- High

Very High

24. The effectiveness of these policies.

Very Low

Low

Medium

High

Very High

25. Do you believe students are informed about the University's policy on academic dishonesty?

Yes

No

26. If yes, where do students receive the information and how much information do you believe is provided about the University's policy on academic dishonesty? (Click all that apply.)

	Little or No Information Provided	Some Information Provided	A Lot of Information Provided
First year orientation programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campus Website	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic Advisor, Residential Advisor or Faculty Advisor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faculty (discussed in class, course syllabi or course outlines)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching Assistant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Little or No Information Provided	Some Information Provided	A Lot of Information Provided
Dean or other Administrator			

Other (please specify)

In the past year, how often, on average, did you discuss policies concerning the following issues:

27. Plagiarism

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

28. Guidelines on group work or collaboration

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

29. Proper citation/referencing of written sources

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

30. Proper citation/referencing of Internet sources

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

31. Falsifying/fabricating course lab data

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

32. Falsifying/fabricating research data

- Never
- Very Seldom
- Seldom/Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY

APPENDIX F**PERMISSION TO UTILIZE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS**

From: Don McCabe [mailto:dmccabe@andromeda.rutgers.edu]
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2009 5:30 PM
To: Stevens, Tanisha N.
Subject: RE: Request

No problem and good luck!

-----Original Message-----

From: Stevens, Tanisha N. [mailto:smithtn@umsl.edu]
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2009 5:35 PM
To: Donald McCabe
Subject: RE: Request

Dr. McCabe,

I have attached a copy of the questions from the survey instruments (tables below) that I would like to utilize in my dissertation. The rationale behind the use of these particular questions was based on a review of current studies that focused on perceptions, academic dishonesty, and student and faculty populations. Besides a review of your past and current works in the field of academic dishonesty, additional studies utilized survey instruments adapted by the work conducted by McCabe and Trevino (1997).

Additionally, the institution under study is a large public research institution located in a geographically Midwestern state. At the conclusion of my dissertation, I would be interested in having my work published in research journals such as the Journal of Higher Education, as well as in student-focused journals such as the College Student Journal. Dependent upon the results of my research study, I would also be interested in comparing perceptions across disciplines (i.e. business vs. nursing) and would be interested in submitting those findings to discipline-specific journals such as the American Journal of Nursing.

Thank you once again. My hope is that the email message will help clarify my intentions for the instruments.

Sincerely,

Tanisha Stevens, MA
smithtn@umsl.edu

-----Original Message-----

From: davis122@suddenlink.net [mailto:davis122@suddenlink.net]

Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2009 1:29 PM

To: Stevens, Tanisha N.

Subject: Re: Request for permission to utilize survey instrument

Tanisha,

Thanks for the email. You certainly have my permission to use the academic dishonesty scale. If I can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes for a successful dissertation project.

Cheers from Hideaway Lake, TX,

SD

---- "Stevens wrote:

Dr. Davis,

Good afternoon. My name is Tanisha Stevens and I am a Doctoral student in Higher Education Administration at the University of Missouri-Saint Louis. My research interests focus on faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty and perceptions of specific behaviors identified as cheating. To study perceptions of dishonesty, I am requesting permission to utilize the following survey instrument: The Attitudes Toward Academic Dishonesty Scale. At any time, I can provide copies of my dissertation (or parts thereof) as well as the data file if so requested.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for reviewing my request and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Tanisha Stevens, MA

APPENDIX G

DEFINITIONS

- *Academic Dishonesty*: “any form of cheating, plagiarism or sabotage which results in students giving or receiving unauthorized assistance or receiving credit for work which is not their own” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.010 Standard of Conduct, 2011, p. 1).
- *Cheating*: “(a) use of any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes, tests, or examinations; (b) dependence upon the aid of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments; (c) acquisition or possession without permission of tests or other academic material belonging to a member of the University faculty or staff; (d) knowingly providing any assistance to another student on quizzes, tests, or examinations” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.010 Standard of Conduct, 2011, p. 1).
- *Non-Tenure Track Faculty*: “1) full-time, ranked, non-regular faculty (non-tenure track (NTT) faculty); (2) full-time, unranked, non-regular faculty; and (3) part-time, non-regular faculty (adjunct faculty)” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 310.035 Non-Tenure Track Faculty, 2011, p. 2).
- *Plagiarism*: “(a) use by paraphrase or direct quotation of the published or unpublished work of another person without fully and properly crediting the author with footnotes, citations, or bibliographical reference; (b) unacknowledged use of material prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic materials; (c) unacknowledged use of original work/material that has been produced through collaboration with others without the release in writing from collaborators” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.010 Standard of Conduct, 2011, p. 1).
- *Regular Faculty*: “tenured and tenure track faculty, or the traditional faculty of the institution” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 2011).
- *Sanctions*: “imposed upon any student found to have violated the Student Conduct Code” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.020 Rules of Procedures in Student Conduct Matters, 2011, p. 2).
- *Student*: “a person having once been admitted to the University who has not completed a course of study and who intends to or does continue a course of study in or through one of the campuses of the University” (Collected Rules and Regulations, 200.020 Rules of Procedures in Student Conduct Matters, 2011, p.1).

APPENDIX H**STUDENT/FACULTY DEMOGRAPHICS***Student Demographics Fall 2011 (University's Fact Book)*

Variable	Number
Student Level	
Freshman	1,307
Sophomore	1,260
Junior	2,165
Senior	4,591
Ethnicity	
White (non-Hispanic)	7,727
Hispanic	270
Asian/Pacific Islander	413
Native American	39
African-American	2,357
Non-Resident	583
Multiple Ethnicities/Unknown	966
Gender	
Male	5,078
Female	7,400

Faculty Demographics Fall 2011(University's Fact Book)

Variable	Number
Tenure Status	
Tenured	236
Non-Tenured	297
Academic Appointment	
Professor	131
Associate Professor	188
Assistant Professor	137
Instructor	1
Lecturer	21
Other	55

Note. Demographics for full-time faculty

APPENDIX I**IRB APPROVAL LETTER****Office of Research Administration**

DATE: October 13, 2011
TO: Tanisha Stevens, PhD
FROM: University of Missouri-St. Louis IRB

PROJECT TITLE: [270162-1] PROMOTING A CULTURE OF INTEGRITY: A
STUDY OF FACULTY AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF
ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AT A LARGE PUBLIC MIDWESTERN
UNIVERSITY

REFERENCE #:
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: October 13, 2011

REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category # 2

The chairperson of the University of [REDACTED] IRB has APPROVED has reviewed the above mentioned protocol for research involving human subjects and determined that the project qualifies for exemption from full committee review under Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46.101b. The time period for this approval expires one year from the date listed above. You must notify the University [REDACTED] IRB in advance of any proposed major changes in your approved protocol, e.g., addition of research sites or research instruments.

You must file an annual report with the committee. This report must indicate the starting date of the project and the number of subjects to date from start of project, or since last annual report, whichever is more recent.

Any consent or assent forms must be signed in duplicate and a copy provided to the subject. The principal investigator must retain the other copy of the signed consent form for at least three years following the completion of the research activity and they must be available for inspection if there is an official review of the [REDACTED] human subjects research proceedings by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office for Protection from Research Risks.

This action is officially recorded in the minutes of the committee.

If you have any questions, please contact [REDACTED]. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.