

1-1-2006

Investigating the perceptions of academic dishonesty among special educators

Jane M Sileo

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/rtds>

Repository Citation

Sileo, Jane M, "Investigating the perceptions of academic dishonesty among special educators" (2006). *UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations*. 2690.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.25669/9i0i-1yg9>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Retrospective Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

INVESTIGATING THE PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AMONG
SPECIAL EDUCATORS

by

Jane M. Sileo

Bachelor of Science
Roger Williams University
1989

Master of Education
San Diego State University
1998

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctor of Education Degree in Special Education
Department of Special Education
College of Education

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
August 2006

UMI Number: 3244007

Copyright 2006 by
Sileo, Jane M.

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3244007

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Copyright by Jane M. Sileo 2006

All Rights Reserved



Dissertation Approval
The Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

June 5, 20⁰⁶

The Dissertation prepared by

Jane M. Sileo

Entitled

Investigating the Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

Among Special Educators

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Examination Committee Chair

Dean of the Graduate College

Examination Committee Member

Examination Committee Member

Graduate College Faculty Representative

ABSTRACT

Investigating the Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty among Special Educators

by

Jane M. Sileo

Dr. Susan P. Miller, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Special Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The purposes of this study were: (a) to investigate the perceptions of academic dishonesty among special education faculty and students particularly related to the subtleties or gray areas that surround issues of academic dishonesty, (b) to determine how to decrease incidences of academic dishonesty, and (c) to find potential solutions to the problem of academic dishonesty. The participants in this study were special education full-time and adjunct faculty and special education undergraduate and graduate students. Data were collected using the *Faculty Perspectives Survey* and the *Student Perspectives Survey*. These surveys measured opinions regarding what constitutes cheating in traditional and online courses, deterrents to cheating, and sanctions for cheating.

There was a statistically significant difference among faculty and students with regard to what constitutes cheating in online environments. Students believed that collaborating on assignments and submitting the same paper twice was not cheating. Faculty believed these acts were cheating. There was a statistically significant difference among faculty and students with regard to what constitutes cheating in traditional

environments. Students believed that submitting the same paper twice during the same and consecutive semesters was not cheating. Faculty believed it was cheating. There was no statistical significance among full-time and adjunct faculty with regard to what constitutes cheating in online or traditional classes. There was no statistical significance among undergraduate and graduate students with regard to what constitutes cheating in online and traditional classes, deterrents to cheating, and sanctions for cheating. There was a statistical difference among faculty and students with regard to deterrents to cheating. Students believed honor codes are deterrents to cheating in traditional classes. Faculty did not view honor codes as deterrents to cheating. There was no statistical significance between faculty and students with regard to sanctions for cheating.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
APPENDICES	vi
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Historical Perspective Related to Academic Dishonesty	3
Statement of the Problem	9
Research Questions	10
Significance of the Study	11
Limitations of the Study	12
Definitions	13
Summary	13
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	15
Search Procedures	15
Selection Criteria	16
Literature Involving Students' Perceptions Related to Academic Dishonesty	16
Summary of Literature Related To Student Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty	74
Literature Involving Faculty and Administrator Perceptions Related to Academic Dishonesty	75
Summary of Literature Related To Faculty and Administrator Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty	84
Literature Involving Faculty and Student Perceptions Related to Academic Dishonesty	84
Summary of Literature Related to Faculty and Student Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty	92
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	94
Research Questions	94
Participant Demographics	95
Setting	97
Instrumentation	98
Design and Procedures	99
Interscorer Reliability	101
Treatment of Data	101

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	105
Data Analysis	105
Item Analysis Using Descriptive Data	117
CHAPTER 5 Discussion	161
Faculty and Student Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty	163
Conclusions	171
Recommendations for Future Research	172
Summary	173
APPENDICES	175
Appendix A Student Perspectives Survey	176
Appendix B Faculty Perspectives Survey	182
Appendix C Participant Informed Consent Form	189
Appendix D Permission Email from Robert Lupton	191
Appendix E Permission Email from Kenneth Chapman	193
Appendix F Permission Email from D. Carole Shaw	195
REFERENCES	197
VITA	205

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Participant Demographic Information.....	96
Table 2	Between group Means, Standard Deviations, t and p values for Online Items	108
Table 3	Between group Means, Standard Deviations, t and p values for Traditional Items.....	111
Table 4	Between group Means, Standard Deviations, t and p values for Deterrent Items.....	116
Table 5	Item Analysis of Undergraduate Responses to Traditional Course Cheating	118
Table 6	Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Traditional Course Cheating	120
Table 7	Item Analysis of Full-time Faculty Responses to Traditional Course Cheating	122
Table 8	Item Analysis of Adjunct Faculty Responses to Traditional Course Cheating	124
Table 9	Item Analysis of Undergraduate Responses to Online Course Cheating	126
Table 10	Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Online Course Cheating	128
Table 11	Item Analysis of Full-time Faculty Responses to Online Course Cheating.....	130
Table 12	Item Analysis of Adjunct Faculty Responses to Online Course Cheating.....	132
Table 13	Item Analysis of Undergraduate Responses to Deterrent Cheating	134
Table 14	Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Deterrent Cheating	137
Table 15	Item Analysis of Full-time Faculty Responses to Deterrent Cheating	140
Table 16	Item Analysis of Adjunct Faculty Responses to Deterrent Cheating	142
Table 17	Item Analysis of Undergraduate Responses to Scenario Cheating	145
Table 18	Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Scenario Cheating	149
Table 19	Item Analysis of Full-time Faculty Responses to Scenario Cheating	153
Table 20	Item Analysis of Adjunct Faculty Responses to Scenario Cheating	157

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people I wish to acknowledge for the completion of this dissertation. I would like to thank Dr. Susan Miller, my committee chair for her continued support throughout this dissertation. She has been a steady support throughout my doctoral program.

I also want to thank my son Will for his unwavering support throughout this process. He was tolerant when I needed to work on my dissertation, although he didn't always understand why I was completing one. He is the love of my life and I couldn't have made it through this without his support.

I also wish to thank the other members of my committee. I would like to thank Dr. Thomas Pierce for inspiring the topic for my dissertation. Without his introduction, I would have never thought to study academic dishonesty. Dr. Jeff Gelfer provided me with encouragement throughout the process. Dr. Greg Schraw not only taught me that statistics are not always difficult but also gave me encouragement when they were.

I would like to thank the full time and adjunct faculty members who took time from their classes to facilitate the administration of my study.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for understanding that although I wasn't there in body. I was always there in spirit. Without their continued support, I would not have made it through this process.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Academic dishonesty has been a concern on college and university campuses for years. It has been defined as a violation of prescribed rules or standard conditions for completing school assignments (Cizek, 1999 & Dean, 2000) and manifests itself in a variety of ways. For example, students may cheat on an exam, purchase term papers from online paper mills, complete individual assignments as a group, or submit the same paper twice in one semester. Academic dishonesty first emerged in the literature in the early 1920's. So clearly, this is not a new phenomenon. It is, however, still a topic of great concern among higher education faculty.

In 1993, McCabe and Trevino found that 78% of 6,096 undergraduate students reported cheating themselves or seeing others cheat. Furthermore, McCabe (2001) reports that 74% of 2,294 high school students reported serious cheating on tests and 72% reported cheating on written assignments.

In a study of 453 traditional and Internet cheaters, Lester & Diekhoff (2002) found 88% of participants reported using only traditional methods (i.e., looking at another students paper, using crib notes), 10.5% reported using both traditional and Internet methods to cheat, and 1.5% reported using only the Internet to cheat. In a similar study, that involved 698 participants, Scanlon & Neumann (2002) compared traditional

and Internet based plagiarizers. The results indicate there were few differences in how plagiarizing occurred. Specifically, when asked to compare themselves and others in four categories of plagiarism, 9.6% of traditional students reported copying text without citation, 3.2% of traditional students reported copying papers without citation, 2.1% of traditional students reported requesting a paper from another to be handed in as their own, and 2.8% of traditional students reported purchasing a paper to be handed in as their own. In comparison, 8% of Internet plagiarizers reported copying text without citation, 3.1% of Internet students reported copying papers without citation, 4.9% of Internet students reported requesting a paper from another to be handed as their own, and 2.3% of Internet students reported purchasing a paper to be handed in as their own. When asked about others cheating, 52% of traditional students observed others copy text without citation, 24.2% of traditional students observed copying papers without citation, 33%, of traditional students observed others requesting a paper to be handed in as their own, and 21.1% of traditional students observed others purchasing a paper to be turned in as their own. In comparison, 50.4% of Internet students observed others copying text without citation, 28% of Internet students observed others copying papers without citation, 17.1% of Internet students observed others requesting a paper to be handed in as their own, and 21.1% of Internet students observed others purchasing a paper to be turned in as their own. This suggests that there is no real difference between students who use traditional methods to plagiarize and those who use the Internet. The unfortunate result, however, is that both groups reported plagiarizing.

Students today are using both high- and low-tech items to cheat. High tech items include cell phones, MP3 players, flash drives, and scanners (Fussell, 2005). Cell phones

can be used to take and transmit pictures of exams as well as text messages regarding test content. MP3 Players are being used by students to record notes and listen to them while taking the exam. In addition, flash drives and scanners can be used to download copies of the exam prior to the test date. Furthermore, scanners can be used to “turn the ingredients section of a candy wrapper into a customized cheat sheet” (Fussell, 2005, p. A1).

Students are still using low-tech items such as printing notes on water bottle labels (Fussell, 2005). In addition, students are printing notes on the inside of the popular rubber bracelets students are wearing. Thus, it appears that some methods for cheating remain constant, while new methods emerge based on available technology and current fads.

Historical Perspective Related to Academic Dishonesty

1920s - 1940s

The earlier studies regarding cheating focused on the characteristics of the student. There was great interest in trying to figure out the type of individual who was likely to cheat. Brownell (1921 as cited in Whitley 1998) published one of the first studies on academic dishonesty. He found that students who admitted to cheating were more neurotic, extroverted, and less intelligent than their peers. Similarly, Drake (1941) found that students identified with lower intelligence and poorer grades tended to cheat more. He also found that students who participated in fraternities or sororities cheated more than those who did not.

1970s – 1980s

During the 1970s and 1980s, work related to academic dishonesty focused less on the characteristics of individuals who cheat and more on attitudes related to cheating and reasons for cheating. In 1972, Jenson studied student and faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty and found that acts of plagiarism were more common than use of crib notes and that the use of crib notes was seen as the more severe offense among faculty and students. Jenson also noted that faculty, seniors, and students living on campus viewed plagiarism more severely than did students in lower classes (i.e., freshman, sophomores, juniors) or those living off campus. In addition, female students viewed plagiarism more severely than male students.

Stafford (1976) surveyed students and faculty and found that students cheat for a variety of reasons including graduate school admission pressure, parental pressure, employment pressure, overcrowded classes and laziness. Stafford also found the majority of students would do nothing when they observed other students cheating. Faculty responses indicated that the circumstances surrounding the incident of academic dishonesty would determine whether or not the incident would be reported. Many of the faculty members stated that they would rather handle the infraction informally than report it to the judicial board.

Baird (1980) found that students cheated more in high school than in college and admitted cheating on less important tests and quizzes, such as unit exams, more frequently than on major tests, such as midterms and finals. Baird also found that students cite competition for grades, insufficient study time, and a large workload as reasons for cheating. The methods given for cheating were obtaining test information from other

students, allowing someone to copy, copying someone else's assignments, and plagiarism. Baird also found that freshmen or sophomore male fraternity members were more likely to cheat. One final result indicates that students admitted that they would do nothing if they observed another student cheating. These findings support Stafford's (1976) research.

In another study regarding student attitudes toward academic dishonesty, Singhal (1982) found that students with lower GPA's tend to cheat just as often as those with higher GPA's. This result is in direct contrast to the work of Drake (1941). The students involved in Singhal's study indicated that they had cheated at least once during their college career. Singhal also found that 62% of students and 51% of faculty members consider copying homework/lab reports cheating. Finally, Singhal was able to conclude that although over 56% of students admitted cheating, only 3% got caught, indicating that procedures for catching cheaters are inadequate.

Haines, Diekhoff, LaBeff, and Clark (1986) found over 54% of students admitted to cheating in one form or another. These students admitted to cheating on major exams, daily or weekly quizzes, and classroom assignments. In addition, demographic data suggest that the students cheating are younger, either unemployed or employed part time, with little focus on academic study. Students who admitted to cheating tend to play rather than study. Furthermore, Haines, et.al. suggested that students don't feel guilty for cheating. One positive result is that the students who did not cheat stated that the threat of a poor grade or fear of being expelled were reasons enough not to cheat.

Consistent with this research, in two additional historical studies completed in the late 1980's researchers found that the two most common types of academic misconduct

are plagiarism and cheating (Fox, 1988). Brownlee (1987) suggests that plagiarism occurs because although students are able to gather information from the appropriate sources they are unable to formulate their own synthesis when faced with time constraints and documentation standards.

1990s – 2000s

The majority of the research completed during this time frame focused on why and how students cheat. Research regarding academic dishonesty in online environments also emerged during this period.

Students cheat for numerous reasons. Cheating is motivated by (a) the need to maintain good grades; (b) the need to avoid failure; (c) perceptions of school and professors as unfair; (d) lack of time spent on schoolwork; (e) seeing others get away with it; (f) parents who want their children to do well in school; and (g) the increasing difficulty of material being taught (Bushway & Nash, 1977, McCabe, 2001, Schab, 1991, Whitley, 1998, Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). Cheating also occurs most in large lecture-oriented introductory courses. Introductory courses are often just that, an introduction to a topic. As a result, the students do not have an intrinsic interest in the material (Hall & Kuh, 1998). Similarly, Fishbein (1993) found that students attending large universities indicate identifying less with the institutions, feeling less responsible toward them and their codes of conduct, and therefore have less compunction about cheating. Finally, faculty members feel that students are unable to intellectually master the material and therefore cheat (Hall & Kuh).

Finn and Frone (2004) found that students who were low achievers were more likely to cheat than were students who were high achievers; in addition, they found that

cheating was higher for students with lower levels of self-confidence and school identification.

Online courses are being taught at many colleges and universities across the nation. As such, the instructors of these online courses have the availability to reach greater numbers of students than is possible in traditional courses. Online courses (a) reduce the cost for students who can attend class from home; (b) make the lessons of master teachers available to the masses as never before; and (c) enable students in disparate locations to share information and access materials at times convenient to them (Shyles, 2000). Many students take online courses because they seem more flexible. Furthermore, older students or students who have busier schedules often feel more comfortable enrolling in online courses.

One benefit of online courses is the ability to reach a greater number of students in myriad settings. This is also a disadvantage. When students are enrolled in online courses, the person-to-person or face-to-face interaction is nonexistent. As a result, the propensity to cheat seems greater. Students enrolled in online courses do not engage in traditional student/professor relationships. Subsequently, online education only worsens the sense of isolation and anonymity (Carnevale, 1999). The Internet and email are often the only modes of communication.

In addition, it seems as though online courses require far more work for students than do traditional courses (Heberling, 2002). Gibbons, Mize, & Rogers (2002) found that faculty who design courses to be delivered online often think about the time involved in traditional courses, add to it the time that should be spent out of class, and as a result, may add extra requirements. The extra time and energy needed to complete online

requirements and the lack of face-to-face interaction with professors may induce students to cheat.

Online education has come under a great deal of scrutiny over the issue of academic integrity (Heberling, 2002). Students not only utilize the Internet and World Wide Web to take and complete courses, they use it to cheat as well. Renard (2000) classified Internet cheaters into three main groups: (a) the unintentional cheater, (b) the sneaky cheater, and (c) the all or nothing cheater. The unintentional cheater is one who truly does not know they are cheating. They do not know how to use and cite sources properly. The sneaky cheater knows what plagiarism is, knows it is wrong, and knows how to avoid getting caught. Finally, the all or nothing cheater is the student who waits until the last minute to complete assignments, panics, and plagiarizes.

Fain and Bates (2001) found over 225 active Internet term paper sites, including: *a1-termpaper.com*, *thecheatfactory.com*, *schoolsucks.com*, and *geniuspapers.com*. Students use these sites to download or purchase term papers to be turned in as their own. In addition, when taking online exams, students often have private email conversations regarding said exam, and faculty have no way of knowing. Furthermore, in some cases, students download the assessment prior to the exam date, look up the answers and share them with classmates (Olt, 2002). As a result of the World Wide Web and Internet, there may be an attitude among instructors that academic dishonesty is easier because of the availability of material (Renard, 2000).

Gearhart (2001) suggests use of the following guidelines to develop ethical policies for online learners: (a) use a best practices approach, (b) develop online policies that reflect traditional university ethics policies, (c) provide ethical guidelines across

multiple settings, and (d) work with faculty to develop and maintain current ethical policies. In developing each of these guidelines faculty have the opportunity to not only discuss policy with other faculty, but with students as well.

Statement of the Problem

Academic dishonesty continues to be a concern within higher education settings. Prevalence figures range from 54% of students reporting cheating (Haines, Diekhoff, LaBeff, and Clark, 1986) to 78% of students reporting cheating (McCabe & Trevino, 1993). Higbee & Thomas (2002) compared responses from faculty and students on twenty-five statements regarding cheating. Faculty rated changing lab results, writing and submitting the same paper during different quarters, writing and submitting the same paper during the same quarter, and asking test contents the most severe forms of academic dishonesty. Students rated changing lab results the most severe. In comparison, students rated all other statements relatively innocuous. In a similar study, McCabe & Trevino (1996) found that with regard to collaborating on assignments, 83% of students did not think collaborating on assignments was serious cheating and 1 in 4 did not think it was cheating at all.

Perceptions of academic dishonesty are difficult to define. Therefore, it is imperative that perceptions of academic dishonesty be studied to identify the differences between faculty and student views and subsequently determine how to decrease incidences of academic dishonesty. Once student and faculty perceptions are understood, the likelihood of finding potential solutions to the problem of academic dishonesty will increase. Although some research has been conducted related to reasons for cheating and

types of cheating, little research has been done to compare faculty and student perceptions related to cheating, particularly related to the subtleties or gray areas that surround issues of academic dishonesty. Most students and faculty members recognize exam cheating and plagiarism as academic dishonesty, but editing a friend's paper or working on individual projects as a group, are less clear. Furthermore, studies involving students and faculty members in departments of special education and their perspectives on academic dishonesty appear to be nonexistent in the existing educational literature. Moreover, studies explaining differences in perceptions between adjunct and full-time faculty appear to be nonexistent.

Research Questions

The purposes of this study were to investigate the perceptions of academic dishonesty among special education faculty and students at an urban university in the Southwest. The following research questions will be answered.

1. Is there a difference between special education faculty and special education student perceptions related to what constitutes online cheating?
2. Is there a difference between special education faculty and special education student perceptions related to what constitutes in-class cheating?
3. Is there a difference between adjunct and full-time special education faculty members' perceptions related to what constitutes online cheating?
4. Is there a difference between adjunct and full-time special education faculty members' perceptions related to what constitutes in-class cheating?

5. Is there a difference between special education undergraduate and graduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty related to:
 - a. What constitutes cheating?
 - b. Deterrents to cheating?
 - c. Appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating?
6. Is there a difference between special education faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty related to:
 - a. Deterrents to cheating?
 - b. Appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating?

Significance of the Study

Academic dishonesty is on the rise. The number of students who admit cheating has grown significantly in the past 60 years. Unfortunately, there are few studies regarding faculty and student perceptions of cheating. Determining faculty and student perceptions of cheating is important. Knowing and understanding the various perceptions of cheating will allow faculty members the opportunity to have a more meaningful dialogue with students regarding cheating. In addition, due to the prevalence of undergraduate cheating and the fact that many of those students go on to graduate school, it is imperative that we study issues of academic dishonesty at the graduate level (Love & Simmons, 1998).

The burden of proof regarding academic dishonesty is the responsibility of faculty members. If faculty members have a clearer understanding of student perceptions related to cheating and how those perceptions differ from theirs, they will be better prepared to

clarify and explicitly state what constitutes academic dishonesty in their courses and subsequently reduce the prevalence of academic dishonesty.

This study also has the potential to lead to specific recommendations related to addressing academic dishonesty. Furthermore, this study has potential to add to the literature related to possible deterrents to cheating as well as appropriate actions to take when cheating occurs. This study will also provide information related to full-time and adjunct faculty perceptions of cheating. This will help determine whether additional attention is needed related to department academic dishonesty policies.

Limitations

The limitations to this study include the following:

1. The participants were chosen in a purposeful sample that includes faculty and students in a department of special education. Therefore, caution should be used in comparing the results of this study to faculty and students in other departments of special education.
2. The sample is only representative of one university. Therefore, caution should be used prior to generalizing the results to similar students attending other universities.
3. Inquiry that includes self-reported data is limited by the respondent's awareness of socially correct answers. Social learning may inhibit selected responses.

Definitions

1. Academic dishonesty is defined as (a) copying from another student on an exam, (b) using crib notes, (c) assisting others to cheat, and (d) completing assignments as a group that were assigned for individuals (Cizek, 1999; Dean, 2000; Fain and Bates, 2001; & Olt, 2002).
2. Academic integrity is defined as “a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility” (Center for Academic Integrity (CAI), 1999, p. 7).
3. Cheating – “intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise. The term academic exercise includes all forms of work submitted for credit or hours” (Kibler, Nuss, Paterson, & Pavela 1988, p. 1)
4. Plagiarism – “the deliberate adoption or reproduction of ideas or words or statements of another persons as one’s own without acknowledgement (Kibler et. al., 1988, p 2)
5. Online cheating is defined as (a) purchasing term papers from term paper mills; (b) the downloading of class assessments prior to the exam date, looking up the answers and sharing them with classmates; and (c) having another student physically take the exam for you (Fain and Bates, 2001; & Olt, 2002).

Summary

Academic dishonesty initially was noted as a concern in 1921. Since that time various aspects of this phenomenon have been studied. Included among these are

characteristics of cheaters (Drake, 1941; Haines, Diekhoff, LaBeff, & Clark, 1986; Finn & Frone, 2004), attitudes and reasons for cheating (Baird, 1980; Brownlee, 1987; Fishbein, 1993; Jenson, 1972; Singhal, 1982; Stafford, 1976), and types of cheating (Fox, 1988; Fain & Bates, 2001; Olt, 2002). With regard to the prevalence of cheating on University campuses, researchers have noted an increase (Haines, Diekhoff, LaBeff & Clark, 1986; McCabe & Trevino, 1993). Clearly, the problem of academic dishonesty continues to be an area of great concern for those involved in higher education. Specifically, there is a need for further research into the perceptions of faculty and students toward academic dishonesty. Lack of research related to student and faculty members' perceptions of academic dishonesty has hindered a solution to cheating.

In subsequent chapters, details related to this study are discussed. The literature review is presented in Chapter 2. Methodology used for implementation of this study is presented in Chapter 3. The results and discussion of their implementation are discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize and analyze the professional literature related to cheating and academic dishonesty within higher education settings. Knowledge of this literature base is needed to understand faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty in colleges of education. The chapter begins with a discussion of the search procedures and selection criteria used to locate experimental studies related to academic dishonesty and cheating. Next, experimental studies related to academic dishonesty and cheating are summarized and analyzed. Finally, a summary and synthesis of the research on cheating and academic dishonesty is provided.

Search Procedures

A systematic search through four computerized databases (i. e., EBSCO Host, Education Resources Information Center, Cambridge Scientific Abstracts and Psychological Abstracts) was conducted. The following descriptors were used: (a) cheating, (b) academic dishonesty, (c) academic integrity, (d) faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty/cheating, (e) student perceptions of academic dishonesty/cheating, (f) plagiarism and colleges of education, (g) plagiarism and higher education, and (h)

cheating in higher education. An ancestral search through the reference lists of the obtained articles was also performed.

Selection Criteria

Studies were included in this review if they met the selection criteria of: (a) the procedures and data-based results were published between 1990 and 2005, (b) the subjects were undergraduate, graduate students, or faculty, (c) the purpose of the study was to examine perceptions related to cheating and/or to examine ways to decrease cheating/academic dishonesty on college campuses.

Literature Involving Students' Perceptions Related to Academic Dishonesty

General Issues Related to Academic Dishonesty

Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992) completed a study on academic dishonesty. The purpose of their study was to determine how prevalence, determinants, techniques and punishments affect academic dishonesty. The participants for this study were 6,000 students who attended 36 schools ranging from large state schools (n=8), medium state schools (n=8), large private schools (n=8), small private schools (n=8), and 2-year schools (n=8).

The survey instrument included 21 items related to academic dishonesty and took 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Questions 1 through 3 dealt with the right or wrong of cheating, questions 4 and 5 dealt with whether a student had cheated and how they cheated, questions 6 through 9 asked whether a student had been caught cheating, who

detected the cheating, the penalty involved, and if the student knew the penalty prior to committing the act. Questions 10 through 13 concerned students' intent when allowing another student to cheat from them, questions 14 through 18 involved scenarios regarding over or under preparation for an exam. Question 19 asked about the students' perceptions of the professor's concern regarding cheating, and finally questions 20 and 21 discussed appropriate measures for dealing with cheating and its offenders. No information was given regarding how data were analyzed.

The results of this study indicated that 90% of respondents said it was wrong to cheat. This finding was in direct contrast to the mean percentage of students who reported cheating in either high school or college, or both (76%). In comparison, only 9% of women attending a small private liberal arts college reported cheating, while 64% of men who attended a small regional university reported cheating. The authors indicated a decrease in the incidence of cheating from high school to college.

In addition, the researchers found that gender and college affiliation affect cheating. Women consistently reported cheating less than men. Furthermore, students enrolled at smaller colleges reported cheating less than those who attended larger state universities.

The researchers found that 88% of respondents said they allowed a friend to cheat "because s/he was a friend." The percentage of students allowing others to cheat for money ranged from a low of .30% to a high of 8%. Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992) also listed some student reasons for allowing others to cheat. These responses ranged from (1) he was bigger than me, to (4) she was damn good looking, to (8) just to do it, I didn't like the teacher, and I knew if I got caught nothing would

happen. The authors found these responses to be consistent with others found in the professional literature.

When asked to respond to hypothetical situations of cheating, Davis, et. al. (1992) found that women reacted more negatively (closer to 7) on a Likert type scale ranging from *that's great (1)* to *very angry (7)* than did men. In addition, when asked the question “you have put many hours into studying for an exam and you are certain you will receive a very high grade, how would you feel about another student cheating and doing better than you”, women were more likely to respond higher on the scale than were men.

When asked about cheating techniques, 80% of the cheaters copied from a nearby student or used crib notes. The responses of the remaining 20% included responses such as (a) we worked out a system of hand and feet positions, (b) each corner of the desk marked an answer, (c) I memorized the responses to a copy of the test a head of time, (d) we traded tests and compared answers, (e) opened my book and looked up the answers, (f) I hid a calculator down my pants, (g) I tape recorded the answers prior to the exam and listened to them on my walkman during the test, (h) I've done everything from writing the answers all the way up my arm to having notes in a plastic bag inside my mouth, and (i) I would make a paper flower, write notes on it, and then pin it on my blouse.

When asked questions regarding faculty and institutional responsibility, students overwhelmingly responded (90%) that instructors should care whether students are cheating on exams. When asked, “what measures will deter cheating in the classroom” the most desirable deterrent was to use separate forms of a test. In addition, some of the other deterrents were (a) inform the students why they should not cheat, (b) arrange

seating so students are separated by empty desks, (c) walk up and down aisles during an exam, and (d) constantly watch the students. The least preferred deterrents were (a) announcing “do not cheat,” (b) having assigned seats, (c) having all essay exams, and (d) requiring students to leave their belongings outside the classroom.

Finally, with regard to punishment, respondents indicated that the punishment should wait until after the exam is completed. In addition, 20% of respondents indicated that telling the students to keep their eyes on their own paper during the exam, taking the test away, and having the student start over was enough punishment. Another 20% of respondents indicated that assigning a failing grade to the student who was cheating was appropriate.

The researchers concluded there are many factors involved in why students cheat. In addition, they provided suggestions regarding how to deter students from cheating. They suggested that deterrents of cheating are systemic, and until the system is changed, short-term deterrents will not address the problem in the long run.

A strength of this study was the questionnaire itself. The questions focused on why students cheat and the appropriate deterrents. Another strength of the study was the large number of participants.

Davis (1993) completed a follow-up study on academic dishonesty. The purpose of this study was to investigate the frequency of academic dishonesty in college. The 21-item follow-up survey was administered to 2,153 upper level college students. The results of the follow-up survey confirmed the results of the original survey. No information was given with regard to how the data were analyzed.

Due to the decreased number of respondents to the follow-up survey, Davis (1993) elected not to report any rates below 40%. Davis reported data on repeat offenders in the follow-up survey. The results indicated that 48% of those who reported cheating did so on multiple occasions. Davis reports that the average number of offenses is 4.25. Upon further analysis, Davis found that 98% of cheaters in college had also cheated in high school. As with the original study (Davis, et. al, 1992), men were more likely than women to cheat in college. In addition, men and women who attend small liberal arts colleges tended to report lower incidents of cheating than men and women at larger public universities. Davis suggested further research be conducted to determine why this occurred.

Love and Simmons (1998, 1997) studied graduate student perceptions of cheating and plagiarism within a university setting. The purpose of their study was to determine four things: (a) what perceptions graduate students had regarding cheating and plagiarism, and the proposed penalty for those caught, (b) the degree to which cheating and plagiarism were addressed upon admittance to graduate school, (c) perceptions of prevalence of cheating and plagiarism, and (d) the factors that influence cheating and plagiarism. Participants for the study were 6 first year masters students enrolled in the College of Education. Half of the participants were male and the other half female. These students were interviewed prior to the start of Spring semester. Of the six students, 2 were enrolled in health education, 2 in rehabilitation counseling, and 2 in community counseling.

The basis for the interview questions was a modified version of Ferrell and Ferguson's (1993) Academic Misconduct Survey. Following the first interview, the 41

items were reduced to 16 behaviors seen to be more relevant to graduate students. The interviews were transcribed and subsequently analyzed by both researchers. Love and Simmons (1998, 1997) used the constructivist inquiry method. During the data analysis, each researcher conducted each step of the analysis separately. Upon completion of the data analysis, three main categories emerged: orientation and socialization experiences, definitions, sanctions, and prevalence of cheating and plagiarism, and factors that influence the likelihood of a student cheating or plagiarizing.

Of the six student respondents, none received a formal orientation. Two students from the department of community counseling attended a reception on a Friday evening in which they were introduced to current students, faculty, and alumni of the department. The students in the health education program were also invited to attend a reception, this time at a professor's home. This professor taught one of the main courses the students would have to take. Again, the reception was more social than informational.

Many of the six students complained of no orientation. The frustration they shared was based on learning to navigate a new environment on their own. One student mentioned that he learned proper paper format from other students. As a result of no real orientation, students were asked to read the catalog for current policies and procedures, including those on cheating and plagiarism.

It was assumed that master's level students know what cheating and plagiarism are (Love & Simmons, 1998, 1997). As a result, specific conversations did not occur. Of the four students, only two were able to state exactly where they had learned about cheating and plagiarism. One was enrolled in an honors program as an undergraduate and the other was enrolled in a department of psychology where the department chair "harped

on plagiarism and appropriate citations” (p. 6). Although master’s level students know about cheating and plagiarism, Love and Simmons found they had a difficult time defining plagiarism. For example, submitting the same paper for two classes and collaborating on individual assignments were not seen as plagiarism. In addition, when asked to define plagiarism, five of the six subjects used plagiarism as their definition for cheating.

Two of the six students indicated that behaviors not seen as cheating or plagiarism as undergraduates would be viewed more strictly as graduate students. In addition, respondents stated that sanctions for cheating and plagiarism should be based on the student’s intentions. For example, if a student did not plan to cheat the penalty should be less than for one who planned to cheat.

Love and Simmons (1998, 1997) indicated there should be concern regarding cheating and plagiarism with master’s students. Each student said they were aware of students collaborating on solo assignments, as well as distributing exam answers prior to the exam. One respondent stated that cheating occurs among graduate students because of the level of stress involved in completing papers, theses, and dissertations.

There are several factors that influence a graduate student’s behavior toward cheating and plagiarism. Love and Simmons (1998, 1997) found thirteen categories of factors that encouraged students to complete honest work or avoid cheating. These thirteen factors were subsequently divided into inhibiting and contributing factors. The positive internal inhibiting factors were such things as personal confidence, positive professional ethics, fairness to authors, desire to work or learn, and fairness to others. The negative internal inhibiting factors were such things as fear and guilt. The external

inhibiting factors were seen as professors' knowledge, probability of being caught, time pressure, cheating seen as dangerous, type of work required, and need for knowledge in the future. The external contributing factors were pressure (grade, time, task) and professors. The internal contributing factors were negative personal attitudes, lack of awareness, and lack of competence.

Love and Simmons (1998, 1997) concluded that the decision to cheat is based on numerous factors. One factor is the lack of formal orientation. Without this, students do not receive the opportunity to learn the social structure of the department, which in turn would influence student perceptions of cheating and plagiarism.

The strength of this study was the population. Few studies have been completed on students enrolled in Colleges of Education. Although this study was completed using an interview format and the population was small, the results are important. Students enrolled in Colleges of Education do cheat and it is their perceptions of what constitutes cheating that researchers need to examine.

Partello (1993) studied first year college students and cheating. The purpose of this study was to use a survey and a one-credit class to begin the discussion on academic dishonesty with first year college students. The participants were engaged in a component of the Freshmen Year Experience (FYE) program. This program helps freshmen make the transition from high school to college. During the fall semester 1992, Partello was the instructor for a one-credit class of 34 first year students. During this class, the plagiarism survey was distributed and completed. The survey became the impetus for discussion on plagiarism. In addition, two weeks after the class discussion, a short survey was administered to the students.

The results of Partello's (1993) survey indicated that 82% of students admitted to cheating in high school, while only 6% admitted to cheating in college. In addition, when asked whether the participants had copied another's homework, 91% said they had in high school, and 79% said they had not in college. When asked whether they had plagiarized, 27% said they had in high school, in contrast, only 3% said they had in college. Finally, when asked why they cheated in high school, 62% said they were worried about getting a good grade. The same question was asked about college, and an overwhelming majority (91%), said they had never cheated. Partello concluded the percentages of students cheating decreased from high school to college.

The strengths of the study included the survey instrument. The instrument included data from high school and college, as well as questions pertaining to plagiarism. The survey instrument also included myriad scenarios surrounding plagiarism. These scenarios gave the students the opportunity to truly think about what constitutes plagiarism. The weakness of the study was the small number of participants. It would be interesting to compare data from the first year experimental group to subsequent groups of first year students.

Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce (1996) completed a study on the effectiveness of cheating countermeasures. The purpose of this study was to examine both the self-reported prevalence and incidence of academic dishonesty among students enrolled at a major Southeastern university. In addition, Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce studied the effectiveness of a variety of commonly employed cheating countermeasures. Participants for this study were students enrolled in 27 different classes late in the fall semester 1989. Survey instruments took 20 minutes to complete and consisted of ten different items

measuring various types of academic dishonesty. A total of 1,672 usable questionnaires were obtained.

Prior to administering the survey to the large population, a pilot study was completed using the authors' own classes. During the pilot study, standard reliability and validity checks were conducted. Respondents for both the pilot study and large group study were asked to rate the ten items using a Likert-type scale. The author completed a factor analysis and four constructs emerged: (a) taking of information, (b) tendering of information, (c) plagiarism, and (d) misrepresentation. Of the ten questionnaire items, five discussed the taking of information, one question discussed tendering of information, three items discussed plagiarism, and one item discussed misrepresentation. Also included were 20 items regarding effective countermeasures.

The results of the study indicated that 68.1% of respondents admitted to completing an academically dishonest act at least once during the fall semester. Conversely, 31.9% of respondents reported that they had not participated in an academically dishonest act. With regard to the four constructs discussed earlier, 46.7% of respondents admitted to some form of Taking Information, while 37.7% admitted to Plagiarism. Smaller percentages of students admitted to Tendering of Information (21.1%) and Misrepresentation (22.7%). The item most commonly reported was "neglecting to footnote or cite reference material" with 33.3%. Other items listed were copying from another student's exam (26.3%), giving false excuses to delay an exam or assignment (22.7%) and allowing an exam to be copied from (22.1%). Items such as using crib sheets were also listed, however the percentage of students engaging in that behavior was smaller (10.4%). The item least likely reported was studying a "hot" copy

of an exam with 5.2%. When asked whether or not they had engaged in academic dishonesty during the semester, 16.1% stated they had one time, while 11.2% stated they had twice. The largest percentage (27.1) admitted to being academically dishonest on six or more separate occasions during a fifteen-week semester.

The results of the countermeasure questions revealed that 82% of students indicated the most effective technique was question scrambling. Furthermore, 70% indicated smaller class size is an effective countermeasure, approximately 68% thought using several proctors is effective, 68% indicated giving unique makeup exams is effective, 67% indicated having 2 or more forms of the exam is effective, and 55% indicated that providing study sheets and giving more essays are effective measures of reducing cheating. Finally, 52% of respondents indicated that making old exams available for test preparation, checking student identification (47%), and giving different assignments (43%) are all effective countermeasures for cheating in college and university classrooms.

The researchers concluded that academic dishonesty is more prevalent on college and university classrooms than administrators are willing to admit. In addition, in order to effectively countermeasure academic dishonesty, the researchers concluded that university personnel must provide additional logistical support and supplemental resources to effectively reduce the occurrence of cheating.

The strength of this study was the research questions. It is important to know how students are cheating. In addition, it is important to know what students think are effective countermeasures for cheating. Knowing this information allows college and

university faculty the opportunity to use these tools to reduce the number of cheating occurrences on their campuses.

Jendrek (1992) studied student reactions to academic dishonesty. The purpose of her study was to determine three things (1) do students report instances of academic dishonesty, (2) why students choose either to report or not report instances of academic dishonesty, and (3) how do students feel about those who cheat? Jendrek used a stratified random sampling procedure to draw 2000 students from a student body of approximately 13,000. Criteria were based on class standing. Five hundred students were selected from each class. The students were selected randomly from a list of full-time students registered at a public university located in the Midwest. In March 1987, the questionnaires were mailed to the 2000 students. Seven hundred seventy-six usable questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 38.8%. The questionnaire was mailed late in the semester, which precluded the mailing of a follow-up questionnaire.

The questionnaire included six sections. Section 1 focused on whether the student had seen another student cheating during an examination. Section 2 examined the students' general attitudes toward academic dishonesty using Likert-type questions. Section 3 consisted of a list of 26 behaviors. Section 4 asked students about the structure of their examinations. Section 5 questioned students about the type of assignments they had been given throughout their academic career. Finally, Section 6 contained demographic questions. No information was given regarding experimental design or how data were analyzed.

The results of Section 1 indicated that 74% of the students said they had witnessed cheating during an examination. Gender, grade point average (GPA), and class

standing influenced this result. Reports of cheating increased as class standing increased. For example, 82.8% of seniors reported witnessing cheating in comparison to 61.9% of first-year students. In addition, men were more likely to witness instances of cheating than women. However, women (17.0%) were more likely to report cheating than men (7.7%). Students with a GPA of 3.5 or higher were less likely to have observed cheating (6.5%) than were students with GPA's less than 2.5 (17.7%).

The results also indicated that 53.1% of students who said that they had witnessed cheating ignored the incident and thus ignored university policy. Approximately 37.5% of students did not report the incident to their instructor, but did say something to their friends. Some respondents (5.1%) expressed disapproval to the student but did not report the incident, and finally 3.5% took some type of action, but again did not report the incident to the instructor. The results of this section indicated that 99% of respondents did not tattle on their classmates. Again, gender and GPA, as well as membership in a Greek sorority or fraternity influenced these results. As with previously discussed results, men (65.9%) were more likely than women (49.3%) to ignore the incident. In contrast, women (43.5%) were more likely than men (29.7%) to tell other students about the incident without reporting it to the instructor. Students with higher GPA's were more likely to tell the offending student of their disapproval than were students with lower GPA's, 11.9% (GPA 3.5 or higher) in comparison to 5.6% (GPA less than 2.5). Students who participated in Greek sorority's and fraternity's were more likely (46.7%) to tell another student about the incident than were students who were not involved in the Greek system (34%).

The results further indicated that the reasons stated by students as to why they responded a particular way fell into three categories (a) "it's the students problem" (35.2%), (b) "it's the professor's problem, not mine" (6%), and (c) "I don't tattle and I don't get involved" (14.8%). An alarming 43.9% of students who witnessed cheating did not respond to this item. As with the previously discussed content, GPA influenced the responses to this item. Students with lower averages were more likely to state "it's the professor's problem, not mine (12.5%) as compared to 4.3% of students with a GPA of 3.5 or higher. In addition, students with higher GPA's were more likely to say that they "don't tattle and don't want to get involved" than were students with lower GPA's, 34.8% in contrast to 25%.

The results also indicated that 36.5% of students said that they were indifferent, while 31% and 25% respectively said they were disgusted and angry with the student they had observed cheating. Women (28.5%) were more likely than men (17.5%) to express anger, conversely, men (44.4%) were more likely to express indifference than were women (32.3%). Consistent with previous results, students with lower grade point averages (43.8%) were more likely to express indifference toward a student who had cheated than were students with higher grade point averages (23%).

When asked how often another student asked the respondent to assist them in answering questions on an exam, 48% said they had been approached. Gender, GPA, and membership in a Greek sorority and fraternity again influenced students' responses. When comparing class standing, first year students were less likely than upper-class students to be asked to assist. Specifically, 36.4% of first year students, 49.8% of sophomores, 59.8% of juniors, and 48.7% seniors indicated that they were asked to assist

another student with answering questions on an exam. Women (1.5%) were less likely to be asked to assist than were men (5.7%). Students participating in the Greek system were more likely to be asked to assist (58.3%) than were students not participating in the Greek system (43.1%).

When asked what the respondents did when asked to assist in answering questions on an exam, most students, approximately 54% honored the request. One third (32.7) indicated that they showed the student their paper, although they said nothing to the requester. In addition, 12.2% said they agreed to give the answer, while 9% expressed disapproval, yet gave the requesting student the answer. A small percentage (15%) of the students rejected the request. Again, men (31.3%) were more likely to help than were women (18.1%), and membership in the Greek system also affected the response to this question (29.3% of Greeks as compared to 17.5% of non-Greeks were likely to assist the requester).

The results of Section 2 (student's general attitudes toward academic dishonesty) were as follows. When asked whether "academic dishonesty is a problem at this university", 40.6% disagreed with this statement, while 29.4% said they did not know. Again, gender, class standing, and grade point average influenced responses to this question. Men (45.5%) were more likely than women (38.2%) to disagree with this statement. With regard to class standing, 40.9% of seniors agreed with the statement in comparison to 18.1% of first-year students. Grade point average also affected response to this statement, 43.8% of students with GPA's less than 2.5 and 37% of students with GPA's greater than 3.5 disagreed with this statement. It seems that the higher the GPA the more likely the response was "I don't know."

When asked “under some circumstances academic dishonesty is justified” most students (84.2%) disagreed with this statement. Gender influenced response to this statement. Men were more likely to agree (20.9%) as compared to 13.2% of women.

When asked whether “academic dishonesty is justified when a person needs to pass a course” the majority (91.9%) of students disagreed with this statement as compared to 8% who agreed. There were no external factors that influenced response to this statement.

When asked whether “reporting a student who is cheating is worse than cheating” 81.6% disagreed with this statement. Gender and grade point average influenced response to this question. Men (28.22%) were more likely to agree with this statement than were women (13.8%). Students with higher grade point averages of 3.5 and above were more likely (88.3%) to disagree with this statement than were students with grade point averages of 2.5 to 2.99 (75.2%).

When asked whether “reporting a friend who is cheating is as bad or worse than cheating” 61.6% of respondents disagreed with this statement. Men were more likely (51.9%) than women (31.8%) to agree with this statement. Students with GPA’s of less than 2.5 (40.5%) were more likely to agree than were students with GPA’s of 3.5 and above (34.3%).

The overall results of this study indicated that gender and grade point average influenced student reactions to academic dishonesty. Gender influenced 9 of 11 outcomes. As grade point average increased, so did the likelihood that students were less likely to observe cheating and more likely to tell the offender than were their peers with lower grade point averages. The author concluded that students are unlikely to report

another for academic dishonesty for two reasons (a) faculty do not understand university policy and are therefore unable to explain it in detail to their students, and (b) students just do not care about the cheating and feel indifferent toward the offending student.

The strength of this study was the detailed results that emerged. The researchers investigated a broad spectrum of variables (i.e., gender, grade point average, class standing, and membership in the Greek system) that may influence academic dishonesty. A weakness of the study was that respondents were students from one university. Thus generalization was limited.

Ashworth and Bannister (1997) studied student perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in higher education. The purpose of their study was to determine what constitutes cheating in the eyes of students in higher education. Participants for this study were interviewed by a group of students who were completing a Masters-level course in qualitative research. Prior to interviewing, the Masters-level students had received approximately 9 hours of instruction in qualitative research. The interviews were designed to resemble a conversation. Interviewees were asked to define cheating, and describe situations relevant to cheating. In addition to the interview style, short vignettes were designed to illicit responses from the participants regarding cheating. A total of 19 interviews were completed.

The results of their study indicated that overall student perceptions of cheating are consistent among interviewees. Ashworth and Bannister were able to determine three main categories (1) cheating and plagiarism, (2) personal reactions to cheating, and (3) the institution. Cheating and plagiarism were determined to be a moral issue. Cheating was viewed as more overt than plagiarism. Personal reactions to cheating and plagiarism

were very individualized. What one student viewed as cheating was not necessarily viewed as cheating by another. As such, gauging the seriousness of cheating was also discussed. Cheating on an exam seemed to merit more response than plagiarizing a paper. Student interviewees also indicated various reasons and justifications for why cheating occurs. With regard to the institution, students indicated that cheating was a low-key issue at this particular institution. Responsibility for understanding cheating was placed on the students rather than faculty. This seemed to confuse students. In addition, punishments for particular acts of cheating were unclear. Peer loyalty was evident in the reluctance to punish those who cheat.

The researchers concluded that understanding the student perspective would allow faculty the opportunity to fully discuss appropriate norms with their students. In addition, when speaking with the students, the gist of the conversation should be stated positively rather than negatively.

The strength of this study was the results. Students do not always know what constitutes cheating. This study could be used as a conversation starter among students and faculty regarding perceptions of cheating and plagiarism.

Roberts and Rabinowitz (1992) completed a study on cheating. The purpose of the study was to determine whether different factors in created scenarios helped to explain variations on the four criterion variables (i.e., whether the student cheated, whether the student did something wrong, whether the student should be punished and whether the respondent would do the same thing the fictional student did) related to student perceptions of cheating. Roberts and Rabinowitz collected data from 550 college students who attended three different state universities in Pennsylvania. The respondents

ranged from first-year to seniors and were enrolled primarily in education and psychology courses. There were an equal number of males and females.

They distributed the survey during class. Each survey packet contained a short introduction to the study, one of sixteen scenarios, a short survey requesting demographic data and a question asking whether the student depicted in the scenario had cheated. The surveys were randomized prior to distribution. This ensured that the randomization occurred across all subjects rather than just within each class or school. The independent variables were analyzed based on four criteria (a) whether the student cheated, (b) whether the student did something wrong, (c) whether the student should be punished and (d) whether the respondent would do the same thing the fictional student did. For purposes of analysis the independent variables were labeled CHEAT, WRONG, PUNISH, and DONE. The participants responded to a five point Likert-type scale. The scale was set up so that the lower the response, the stronger the perception that the student had met the four criteria listed previously. In addition to separate scores for the criteria a total score was also obtained. This total score was labeled TOTALBAD. The dependent variables (factors) were need, provocation, opportunity, and intentionality.

The General Linear Model ANOVA was used to analyze the data. The results of the analysis indicated only main effects. There were no statistically significant interactions present at any level. However, Roberts and Rabinowitz (1992) found two items of interest: the general level of perception of cheating and the differences between the high and low ends of the continuum for each factor. For example, although the students determined that the fictional student had cheated, they were less willing to make the moral judgment that the fictional student should be punished. Of the four dependent

variables analyzed, opportunity did not show significant results. Significant effects were found on cheating and marginally significant effects were found on whether the student was wrong and the total score for the need factor. The second factor, provocation showed significant results for the measure of whether the student should be punished. The final factor that showed significant results was intentionality, specifically whether the student intended to cheat. The significance of this result indicated that when a student deliberately sets out to cheat, other students are more willing to deem this behavior dishonest. An interesting note, however, was that although the students completing the survey found this behavior dishonest, the results indicated that they were still unsure about wanting the fictional student to be punished.

A secondary correlational analysis of the dependent variables was performed. The results of those analyses indicated that the students who completed the survey were consistent with their answers. If they said the fictional student cheated, they tended to say that it was wrong and that the fictional student should be punished. The results of the correlational analysis also indicated that the respondents who said that the fictional student had cheated were less likely to do the same. Finally, when analyzed against self-reported GPA, the students with higher GPA's were more likely to say that the fictional student had cheated and should be punished.

The authors concluded that results of the study indicated that cheating occurred. They found that it was difficult to determine the effects of a students cheating on his actual test and assignment scores. The authors were happily surprised to find that students who work harder for their grades are more likely to disapprove of cheaters and are more

willing to see them punished. Finally, the authors concluded that course instructors must determine ways to reduce cheating in the college classroom.

The strength of the study was the scenarios used for the survey instrument. It seems that there are as many ways for a student to cheat as there are students cheating. Often there are clear-cut ideas of how students cheat, unfortunately, there are also gray areas within cheating which make it difficult for students to know whether or not they have cheated. The scenarios depicted many different situations using some of those gray areas. The weakness included the response scale used for the survey. The wording of the response scale made it difficult for the reader to understand the results of the study. The higher the indicator the less likely the fictional student was perceived to have cheated. The authors also indicated difficulty with the response scale. Roberts and Rabinowitz (1992) found that regardless of the specific combination of factors, the fictional student was always found to have cheated. The respondents, however, were again less likely to state whether the fictional student should be punished.

Brown and Howell (2001) studied the efficacy of policy statements on plagiarism. The purpose of their study was to compare the effect of two institutional policy statements as a response to questions about plagiarism. The participants for the study were 207 undergraduate students enrolled in the School of Psychology. There were 70 first year students, (49 female and 21 male), 61 second-year students, (46 female and 15 male), 45 third-year (34 female and 11 male), and 31 fourth-year students (23 male and 8 female). The mean age for the students was 19.9 years.

Participants for the study received one of two booklets. The booklets consisted of identical cover sheets requesting demographic data, one of three statements on plagiarism

(Educational, Warning, or No Information), two samples of plagiarism (close paraphrase or verbatim copy, randomly presented), and five corresponding questions. Participants received the booklet from a randomized stack of booklets. The Educational condition consisted of a 270-word passage that was used to educate the participant about plagiarism. The Warning condition consisted of a passage (137 words) that inaccurately defined plagiarism and did not state how to cite references accurately. Finally, the last condition, No Information, contained no prior instruction regarding plagiarism and the respondent proceeded to complete the questionnaire.

The questionnaire itself contained two 80-word passages placed side by side on the page. Participants were told the passage on the left-hand side was taken from an introductory psychology textbook. The passage on the right-hand side was from a student's essay. After reading each passage, respondents were asked to answer five questions. Question 1 asked the respondents to rate the seriousness of the behavior. Question 2 asked the respondents to rate the seriousness of staff response to the behavior. Question 3 asked the respondents to rate the perceived frequency of plagiarism among students in the same year. Question 4 asked the respondents to focus on how well plagiarism was understood by the students. Finally, question 5 asked the respondents to find out how well they thought other students avoided plagiarism. Participants responded on a continuous line with a range from 0 to 100.

Data were analyzed using repeated-measures ANOVA. Type III sums of squares were also used because the sample sizes were uneven. Furthermore, Material was analyzed using the within subjects factor, while Condition was analyzed using the between subjects factor and year of study.

The results of the study indicated that across all conditions, verbatim copying was viewed as a more serious breach of academic dishonesty than was paraphrasing. Additional results found that a majority of respondents thought it “absolutely necessary” to cite a source from which information had been copied verbatim. In addition, approximately half thought it was “absolutely necessary” to cite a source from which information had been paraphrased.

Respondents in the Educational condition had higher ratings for severity and lower ratings for frequency than did those in the Warning or No Information conditions. Furthermore, results of the study indicated that although statements on plagiarism are often used, the wording of the statement is the most critical component. These statements need to include information on verbatim copying and paraphrasing, as unacknowledged paraphrasing is considered plagiarism. The researchers concluded that providing clear statements on plagiarism was more effective in changing student perceptions of the seriousness of plagiarism than simple definitions and friendly warnings.

The strengths of the study included the three conditions and the survey instrument. By including the three conditions, the researchers were able to determine that the more information a student had regarding plagiarism, the less likely they were to plagiarize. Another strength was the way in which the survey was distributed. Each survey had the exact same cover letter and first page. Thus, the respondents did not know that there were three different conditions for the survey.

Types of Cheating

In 1993, Ferrell and Ferguson completed a survey study on academic dishonesty and graduate education students. The purpose of the study was to determine different

perceptions of graduate education students relative to academic misconduct. The survey entitled the Academic Misconduct Survey (AMS) (Ferrell as cited in Ferrell and Ferguson, 1993) was used as the instrument in this study. For the purposes of this study, two independent samples were used. Twenty students enrolled in a master's degree program were used as one sample group, while 21 students enrolled in a doctoral degree program were used as the second sample. All students attended a comprehensive state university in the southern United States.

The AMS consists of 41 Likert-type items measuring academic misconduct across five areas. Ferrell and Ferguson identified the five areas as (a) cheating on tests and assignments, (b) use of illegal resources, (c) quasi-misconduct, (d) subtle manipulation, and (e) bold manipulation. Rather than being presented on paper, the AMS was presented using 41 cards and a data sheet. Respondents were asked to use the following sentence starter "As a graduate student, I would be likely to..." in reference to each of the 41 behaviors presented on the cards. Data were collected during regular class sessions. Participants were told of the study and were given the option to participate. Anonymity was insured.

Results of the study indicated that master's level respondents had a tendency to read a shorter version of a novel or play rather than reading the fully assigned version. In addition, respondents indicated a tendency to have term papers corrected for errors in style, language and grammar only when those items were being graded. Furthermore, respondents indicated a tendency to base an article report on an abstract rather than reading the entire article. Respondents at the doctoral level also reacted positively to

items dealing with quasi-misconduct. These respondents also tended to give higher rankings to subtle manipulation.

Ferrell and Ferguson (1993) concluded that both masters and doctoral level students engaged in this study tended to gravitate toward behaviors that are not necessarily deviant but instead are considered minor breeches of student integrity. In sum, the authors of this study found academic dishonesty not to be a significant problem.

The strength of this study was the population. There are minimal data on academic dishonesty and students enrolled in education programs. The weakness of the study was the method of data analysis. Utilization of the Q-technique factor and the use of an inverse relationship made it difficult to clarify the results of the study.

Ferrell and Daniel (1995) studied behaviors related to academic misconduct. The purposes of their study were to develop a self-report anonymous questionnaire that could be shown to measure valid constructs relative to academic misconduct (Phase I) and to utilize the questionnaire to identify groups of respondents with similar academic misconduct behaviors (Phase II).

The participants in Sample I of the study were 330 undergraduate teacher education students enrolled in introductory foundations of education courses. These courses were taught at three institutions of higher education located in the southern United States. Of the 330 participants, 176 students were enrolled at a small comprehensive state university in a rural setting, 128 were enrolled at a large comprehensive state university in an urban setting, and 26 were enrolled in a small private religious college. These students completed the Academic Misconduct Survey (AMS). Sample I data were used to establish the validity and reliability of the AMS.

Participants of Sample II were similar to those in Sample I in that they were undergraduate teacher education students enrolled in similar introductory foundations of education courses and attended similar IHE's. There were fewer respondents for Sample II than there were in Sample I, with 27 students enrolled in a small comprehensive state university (School I), 31 enrolled in a large comprehensive state university (School II), and 32 enrolled in a small private religious college (School III). Respondents in Sample II completed a modified version of the AMS. The data from Sample II were used to identify clusters of students within each school who may have the propensity to cheat.

Ferrell and Daniel (1995) found the results of the factor analysis to indicate that five factors accounted for 39.7% of the variance across the solution and thus the results of the five-factor solution were most interpretable. The items in Factor I dealt with cheating behaviors related to test taking and assignment completion. Factor II behaviors consisted of using materials inappropriately. Factor III behaviors consisted of minor breaches of student integrity. Factor IV behaviors were subtle manipulations of professors to obtain higher grades. Finally, Factor V behaviors were considered more bold manipulations of professors to obtain better grades.

Factor analyses were also used to analyze and compare the data collected in Sample II to those collected in Sample I. As a result of the factor analysis for Sample I, 45 of the original 63 items could be used to discriminate across the above five factors. Thus, a modified AMS was created and subsequently distributed to Sample II. Approximately half of the respondents in Sample II tended to indicate that they had "never engaged in any of the behaviors." As a result, only 15 respondents from each

school (total n=45) were used in the analysis of Phase II. A separate factor analysis was completed for all three schools.

The results of the factor analysis for School I indicated that persons in Factor I were students who had a propensity toward behaviors relating to inappropriate use of resources and quasi-misconduct. Respondents in this group were more likely to read condensed versions of plays/novels, and base an article report on only the abstract. Persons in Factor II rated items related to cheating on tests and exams and quasi-misconduct highest. Respondents in this group had a tendency to consciously memorize a block of questions on an exam so that they could review them later, and have a term paper corrected for errors in style, grammar, and language when these items were not being graded.

The results obtained for School II indicated that persons in Factor I expressed a positive orientation toward cheating on tests and assignments and inappropriate use of resources. In contrast persons in Factor II gave lower ratings to these same items. Individuals in Factor II rated items related to quasi-misconduct and cheating on tests and assignments high.

The results for School III indicated that the Factor I cluster consisted of those individuals who reacted positively to quasi-misconduct behaviors. On the other hand, persons in Factor II related highest to the cheating on tests and assignments construct.

As a result of the study, the authors were able to conclude that students enrolled in teacher education programs on the whole do not admit engaging in behaviors that are considered academic misconduct. In addition, Ferrell and Daniel found that although academic misconduct among education students is low, approximately half were

classified into groups that indicated the propensity toward academic misconduct behaviors.

The strength of this study was the validation of the AMS and the use of education students for subjects. The results indicated that the AMS has internal validity based on prior research using the same survey. A weakness of the study was the missed opportunity to compare student responses across varying institutions.

Contextual Variables Related to Cheating

McCabe and Trevino (1997) studied individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty. Specifically, McCabe and Trevino studied whether academic dishonesty is (a) related to age, (b) higher among males than females, (c) greater among students involved in intercollegiate athletics, (c) higher among fraternity/sorority members, (d) inversely related to the perceived certainty that other students will report cheating they observe, (e) inversely related to the perceived severity of penalties for academic dishonesty, and (f) inversely related to student perceptions of the degree of faculty understanding and support for campus academic integrity policies. The participants attended nine public institutions of higher education. Enrollment ranged from just under 5,000 students to over 35,000 students, with a mean undergraduate student enrollment of 12,329.

Surveys were mailed to 500 sophomores, juniors, and seniors at seven of the nine schools. Of the 500 students, 200 were seniors, 150 were juniors, and 150 were sophomores. The eighth school mistakenly expanded the participants to 220 seniors and 200 each for juniors and sophomores. The ninth school distributed a total of 600 surveys, including 100 to first year students. The remaining 500 were distributed to 200 seniors,

200 juniors and 100 sophomores. Survey information from the 100 first-year students was not used in data analysis. A total of 1,793 surveys were returned for a response rate of 38.7%. Of the 1,793 surveys returned, 44% were from seniors, 33% from juniors, 20% from sophomores, and 3% from freshmen. Sixty-five percent of respondents were female.

The dependent variable was adapted from McCabe and Trevino (1993) and consisted of a composite measure asking students about 12 types of self-reported academic dishonesty. The survey asked respondents to indicate the frequency in which they had engaged in the 12 types of academic dishonesty on a five-point Likert scale.

McCabe and Trevino found that academic dishonesty was positively correlated to ($p < .01$) age, gender, GPA, intercollegiate athletics, extracurricular activities, fraternity/sorority membership, peer behavior, and peer disapproval. Academic dishonesty was correlated with parents' education, peer reporting, and severity of penalties at $p < .05$, while the relationship of faculty/ understanding of campus academic integrity policies was correlated at the $p < .05$ level.

These results indicated that academic dishonesty is influenced by myriad factors on a college campus. The contextual factors with the most influence were peer-related. Fraternity/sorority membership, peer behavior, and peer disapproval were also among the highest rated contextual variables.

McCabe and Trevino (1997) concluded that an institution can have a powerful influence on academic dishonesty. They suggested the establishment of honor codes. McCabe and Trevino characterize honor codes as having "an honor pledge, unproctored examinations, peer reportage, and a peer-run judiciary or honor council" (p. 393).

The strength of this study was the number of participants. McCabe and Trevino (1997) were able to show significant correlations among independent and dependent variables with a high level of confidence.

Burns, Davis, Hoshino, and Miller (1998) studied academic dishonesty across cultural patterns. Japan and South Africa were the settings for the study. Participants from Japan included 132 physics and applied physics majors (17 women, 115 men), 53 French literature majors (all women), and 43 physical engineering majors (36 men, 7 women). These students were enrolled at two Japanese Universities and all volunteered to participate in the study. Participants from South Africa included 210 students who volunteered to participate. These students were enrolled in one of two South African Universities. Fifty-seven women and 33 men attended a historically White university, while 88 women and 32 men attend a historically Black university. The majority of participants (87.1%) were enrolled in psychology programs.

The survey instrument included seven items. Specifically, these items related to cheating history in both high school and college, the fear of being caught, whether cheating improved a person's exam score, the influence of strict penalties on cheating behavior, procedures participants deemed as effective penalties, and reasons for cheating. In addition, the survey included demographic information. The survey was administrated during a regular class session and took approximately 10 minutes to complete.

The results of the study indicated that a small number of Japanese students admitted cheating in high school (20%). Twenty-two percent of men admitted cheating in comparison to 18.8% of women. These rates differ significantly from the distribution based on the American percentages (Davis et.al. 1992). In addition, Japanese cheating

rates increased greatly from high school to college 20.36% to 41.7%. Of those who admitted cheating in college, women admitted cheating more with 44.87% than men did with 36.95%. This result is in direct contrast to American cheating rates, where men typically cheat more than women.

When compared using college major, Japanese students enrolled in physical engineering majors reported cheating the most (45.9%). French literature majors came in second with 43.4%, and physics majors reported cheating the least (29.4%).

Forty-six percent of Japanese students who reported cheating in high school were repeat offenders. Some students reported cheating more than 13 times. A large majority of college level students (53.68%) reported cheating more than once. When asked why they cheated, Japanese students gave such reasons as: "I don't study," "I cheat to enhance my score," and "it's easier to cheat than to study." When asked about penalties for cheating, suspension or expulsion was mentioned most.

The results of the South African Sample indicated that students enrolled at the historically Black university reported lower levels of cheating, 26.7% for high school and 7.5% for college, than did students who were enrolled at the historically White university. Forty-six percent of students enrolled in the historically White university reported cheating in high school and 12.2% of those students reported cheating in college. In addition, 43.75% of male students enrolled at the historically Black university reported cheating at the high school level and 21.87% did so in college. Nineteen percent of women reported cheating in high school, while only 4.54% reported cheating in college. Consistent with men enrolled at the historically Black university, men enrolled at the historically White university reported higher cheating rates in high school than in college

(54.54% and 15.15% respectively) than did the women (40.35% and 12.28% respectively).

Comparisons were made between Japanese and South African students. The results indicated that South African men and women self-reported cheating at higher rates than their Japanese counterparts. In addition, 37.5% of South African students reported cheating more than once in high school as compared to 13.53% of repeat offenders at the collegiate level. Students enrolled in South African universities stated the reason they cheat is due to poor study habits and pressure to get good grades. As with their Japanese counterparts, suspension was mentioned as an effective tool to stop students from cheating again.

Burns, et.al. (1998) concluded that although cheating exists in countries other than the United States, those rates are lower than those reported in the United States. Data from South African students is similar to data reported from American students: men cheat more than women in high school and higher education, and cheating decreases from high school to college. Students enrolled in South African universities did not cite specific reasons for cheating, as compared to American students who report getting good grades and pressure in academia as reasons for cheating.

It was interesting to note that Japanese students reported women cheating more than men and cheating in college was higher than cheating in high school. These results were in direct contrast to American trends in which men report cheating more than women and cheating decreases in college. However, Japanese and American students did report similar reasons for cheating, indicating the need for good grades as the main reason.

The strengths in this study included the number of participants and the setting. It was interesting to compare the data from countries other than the United States to those of the United States. It was a surprise to see that Japanese women cheat more than Japanese men. It would be interesting to study whether this is a direct result of societal influence on women. Follow-up studies are needed to determine the reasons for the differences that Burns et.al. reported. Cultural difference also needs to be explored more thoroughly.

Diekhoff, LaBeff, Shinohara, and Yasukawa (1999) studied college cheating in Japan and the United States. The purpose of their study was to determine whether Japanese students report cheating for similar reasons and as much as American students do. The participants of the study fell into two groups. The American participants were 474 undergraduate students enrolled in a small university located in the southwest. The participants were enrolled in several sections of introductory psychology and sociology courses during fall semester 1994. Of the original 474 participants, 72 students were excluded because they were considered non-traditional students. A total of 392 usable American surveys were returned for analysis. Participants from Japan were 286 undergraduate students enrolled in three Japanese universities. Japanese participants were enrolled in social psychology, communication, comparative sociology, and international relations classes. Survey data were collected during July, October, and December 1995. A total of 276 usable surveys were returned for analysis.

The survey instrument was adapted from Haines, et. al. (1986). Both groups of participants used the same survey, however, the survey was translated for the Japanese participants. Participants from both groups of students were originally compared on

demographic data such as age, gender, and year in school. The mean age of American students was 19.66, while the mean age for Japanese students was 20.81. Of the American participants, 40.8% were male and 59.2% female. In contrast, 53.6% of Japanese respondents were male, and 46.4% were female. The Japanese students were further along in their studies than were the American participants. Specifically, 11.6% of Japanese participants were freshmen, 33.7% sophomores, 35.5% juniors, and 17.8% seniors. Of the American students, 53.6% were freshmen, 28.3% were sophomores, 12.2% were juniors, and 17.8% were seniors.

Participants were surveyed to determine which of several listed forms of cheating they had engaged in as university students. Students were then classified as cheaters and non-cheaters based on a response to the question regarding cheating on exams. Diekhoff et. al (1999) stated that although “this was a limited way of defining academic dishonesty, it was the best option due the to differences in educational practices within Japanese and American universities” (p. 346). Student attitudes toward cheating were also assessed using survey items. Three categorizations were used regarding attitude toward cheating: neutralization of cheating (i.e., the tendency to justify or rationalize cheating), the effectiveness of various deterrents to cheating, and students’ reactions to cheating by others. Of these three categories, 11 survey items measured neutralization. In addition, rating scales were used to measure the effectiveness of cheating deterrents, and students checked boxes for a variety of options listed for cheating reactions.

The results of the study indicated that 55.4% of Japanese students admitted to cheating on one or more exam. In contrast, only 26% of American students admitted cheating on exams. The results of the 2 x 2 ANOVA for neutralization of cheating

indicated that Japanese students were significantly more likely to neutralize cheating than were their American counterparts. In addition, cheaters were more likely to neutralize cheating than non-cheaters. The results for the three 2 x 2 ANOVAs on cheating deterrents indicated that American students were more likely to be deterred from cheating by fear of punishment than were Japanese students. This result was only significant among non-cheaters. When comparing fear, guilt, and social stigma, Japanese students ranked guilt most effective, then fear and social stigma. In comparison American students ranked fear most effective, followed by guilt and social stigma. These results indicated that both Japanese and American students feel similarly in their perceptions of the relative effectiveness of cheating deterrents.

Diekhoff, et. al. (1999) found, based on the results of the four 2 x 2 ANOVAs, that resentment ranked highest among non-cheaters as the reaction to cheating. Another finding revealed that American students classified as non-cheaters were more likely to report incidents of cheating than were Japanese students classified the same way. Both American and Japanese cheaters were unlikely to report cheating.

The researchers concluded that among all groups of students, ignoring cheating showed the most significant effect. Furthermore, Diekhoff, et.al. (1999) concluded that Japanese students were more likely to cheat on exams than were American students. In addition, Japanese students were more likely than American students to neutralize cheating. This strategy can protect the cheater from the sense of social stigma or guilt that would otherwise bother them. Finally, both groups of students reported similarities in the perceived effectiveness of guilt, social stigma, and fear.

The strength of the study was the comparison among Japanese and American students. The results indicated that Japanese students feel more pressure to cheat than American students. In addition, cheating seems to be more commonplace among Japanese students.

Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999) studied the relationship between academic dishonesty and the college classroom environment. The purpose of the study was to determine if (1) cheaters differ from non-cheaters in their perceptions of college classroom environment, and (2) the tendency to neutralize or justify cheating is related to college classroom environment. Participants were 280 undergraduate students enrolled in 18 small classes at two liberal arts universities in the Midwest. The majority of the students (14 classes) were in the social and behavioral sciences, the remaining 4 classes were in criminal justice, economics, and physical education. The mean age of the participants was 22.55, with ages ranging from 17 to 50. The majority of the students (61.3%) were female, the remaining 38.7% were male. Distribution for year in school was as follows: 25.7% freshmen, 20.4% sophomores, 23.2% juniors, and 30.7% seniors.

Participants received two surveys for this study. They were a modified version of the Survey on Academic Dishonesty (Haines et al., 1986) and the College and University Classroom Environment Instrument (CUCEI; Frasier et. al, as cited in Pulvers and Diekhoff, 1999). The SAD consisted of questions regarding demographic data as well as questions regarding prior cheating, and 11 questions regarding neutralization. When students replied yes to cheating to one or more of the behaviors they were classified as cheaters. The remaining students were classified as non-cheaters. Students were asked to rate the 11 neutralization behaviors using a 5-point Likert type scale. The

CUCEI consisted of 49 items using Likert-type rating scales to evaluate perceptions of classroom environments. The 49 items were distributed across seven subscales: (1) personalization, (2) involvement, (3) student cohesiveness, (4) satisfaction, (5) task orientation, (6) innovation, and (7) individualization. Surveys were distributed between the 13th and 14th week of a 16-week semester.

Two hundred seventy seven students completed the portion of the SAD that asked about cheating behavior. Of these, 32 reported having cheated multiple ways in the specified class, and 245 reported never cheating. Respondents for the CUCEI included the 32 cheaters and only 244 non-cheaters. One non-cheater failed to complete the survey.

The results of the t-tests for the CUCEI indicated significant differences for cheaters and non-cheaters on three of the subscales: personalization, satisfaction, and task orientation. Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999) found that cheaters view their classes as less personalized, less task oriented, and less satisfying. Upon review of the t-tests, Pulvers and Diekhoff completed a discriminant analysis on all seven of the subscales regarding neutralization. The results of this analysis indicated positive correlations on six of the seven scales. The only scale not correlated with neutralization was innovation.

The results of this study confirm the results of Diekhoff et. al. (1999), in that cheaters were more likely to neutralize cheating than were non-cheaters. That is to say they were less likely to feel guilt for cheating. In addition, Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999) were able to conclude that students who cheat viewed their classes as less personalized, satisfying, and task oriented. Furthermore, the researchers were able to conclude that

students may cheat in order to punish the instructor for the lack of personalization in the course.

The strength of the study was the population and the correlation between cheating and classroom environment. It has been shown in prior studies that cheating occurs in large classrooms where students feel overwhelmed. The results of this study confirm that finding. As students perceive classrooms to be impersonalized, the propensity to cheat may be increased.

Schraw, Olafson, Kuch, Lehman, Lehman, and McCrudden (in press) studied the relationship between interest and cheating. The purpose of their study was to investigate how interest in learning affected cheating. The researchers collected three different types of data: survey, one-on-one interviews, and interviews of underachieving high school students. Survey participants consisted of 82 undergraduate students enrolled in English and mathematics courses at the within a university setting. The survey instrument consisted of 27 open-ended questions. The researchers chose to focus on the answers to two questions (i.e., questions 10 and 11). These questions focused on personal and situational interest in cheating. Personal interest is “individual or topic interest” (p. 5). Situational interest is situational and spontaneous.

Participants for the one-on-one interviews were 12 undergraduate students. The interviews consisted of three stages. In stage 1, participants responded to two general questions regarding the role of personal interest and situational factors with regard to cheating. In stage 2, participants responded to probes related to various personal interests and situational factors that affect cheating. Finally, in stage 3, participants were asked to indicate whether a list of specific factors would influence their willingness to cheat.

Ten underachieving high school students from Greeley, Colorado were the participants for the third type of data collection. These high school students participated in two focus groups and three were interviewed individually. Most of these students were classified ELL and all were of Hispanic origin.

The results for the survey indicated that 69 of 82 participants gave responses that were considered codeable. Schraw et.al. (2005) found that none of the participants indicated that interest increases cheating, while 21% of participants indicated that interest had no effect on cheating, and 63% indicated that interest decreased cheating. The results for the one-on-one interviews indicated that 100% of respondents agreed that interest was related to cheating. However, the researchers found no correlation between situational interest and cheating. The results for the high school interviews indicated that personal factors do indeed contribute to cheating. Personal factors for these students included financial incentives for good grades, class size, interest in course material, and pressure from others to cheat.

With regard to situational factors, Schraw et.al. (2005) found a negative correlation between situational factors and cheating. Specifically, there were some situations that had no effect on cheating. Situations in which students were interested in the course topic, had an effective instructor, or felt guilty decreased cheating. Situations in which students were unprepared for class, had trouble learning the material, and feared failure increased cheating. The researchers also found that cheating increased in on-line courses as compared to traditional courses.

As a result of this study, the researchers concluded that with regard to personal and situational factors related to cheating, there was little difference between the

responses of high school and university students. The researchers also concluded that some situations and personal factors do influence cheating. Some students were influenced by fear while others were influenced by peer pressure.

The comparison between interest and cheating was a strength in this study. It was interesting to learn that the more students are interested in a topic the less likely they are to cheat. Similarly, the more interesting and effective a professor is, the less likely students are to cheat. These findings support prior research (Fishbein, 1993) on situational factors that affect cheating.

Genereux and McLeod (1995) studied the circumstances surrounding cheating. The purpose of this study was to determine which circumstances students consider most influential in planned or spontaneous cheating. In addition they studied whether certain circumstances led to increased rather than decreased cheating. Finally, they studied different types of cheating such as cheating for others rather than yourself.

Participants for this study were 365 students attending a college in western Canada. Of the 365 students, 51% were females and 49% were males. Volunteer participants for this study came from myriad programs. Fifty-seven percent were from university transfer programs, specifically 23% bachelor of art, 16% bachelor of science, 13% bachelor of commerce, and 5% other. Thirty-two percent came from college diploma programs, specifically 10% business diploma, 7% environmental technology diploma, and 15% other diploma programs. The final 11% were from miscellaneous programs such as college preparation, high school upgrading, general interest, and certificate programs. Due to the disparity among participants, age ranged from 18 to 56

years, with a mean of 23.5 years. Forty-three percent of participants were first year students, 39% were second year students, and 18% were third year or higher.

The questionnaire consisted of three sections. When completing the first section participants were to imagine they were unprepared for an exam. They were then asked to rate 21 circumstances that would effect whether they would cheat on the exam using a 7-point Likert scale. The circumstances included items related to course characteristics, consequences of getting caught, pressures to obtain a good grade, instructor behavior, ease of cheating, and attitudes of friends toward cheating. Four versions of the questionnaire were used. One version of the questionnaire had the students imagine the exam was already in progress, the second questionnaire had the other half of the students imagine the exam was happening in the near future, and in the third version of the questionnaire the respondents rated circumstances that were likely to decrease cheating. Finally, the students who had the fourth questionnaire rated circumstances that were likely to increase cheating. Questionnaires were randomly distributed to 15 classes of students spanning a two-week period.

The second section of the questionnaire listed 12 cheating behaviors and asked respondents to indicate whether or not they had participated in the behaviors. Section three asked the respondents to estimate the percentage of college students who cheat regularly on exams and assignments and also the percentage who cheat occasionally on exams and assignments. Respondents were also asked to report demographic data such as age, gender, year in college and GPA.

Genereux and McLeod (1995) found that the top five circumstances for the planned/increase condition were the same as those for the spontaneous/increase

condition, and four of five were the same for the planned/decrease condition and the spontaneous/decrease condition. One difference found between the planned and spontaneous conditions was the tendency for respondents to rate circumstances surrounding cheating to increase in spontaneous rather than planned cheating. Additional results indicated a significant difference between circumstances rated for increasing cheating and decreasing cheating. Respondents tended to rank circumstances for decreasing cheating higher than those for increasing cheating.

The following circumstances were ranked high for increasing but not decreasing cheating: (a) instructor's attitude toward cheating, (b) effect of grades on financial support, and (c) effect of course grade on achieving long term goals. In contrast, the following behaviors were ranked high for decreasing rather than increasing cheating: (a) punishment for getting caught, (b) type of exam, (c) spacing in the room, and (d) value of course material.

The results for section two, self-report of different types of cheating indicated that the percentage of respondents varied considerably from 2% indicating that they had purchased papers to 58% who indicated that they had given exam questions to other students. In addition, 49% reported that they had gotten exam questions from a student who had already taken the exam, 29% reported that they had listed false references in a paper, 28% reported allowing another student to copy their answers in an exam, 27% reported plagiarizing part of a term paper, 21% reportedly made up research data, 20% reported copying exam answers from another student, 19% reported using an unauthorized cheat sheet, 16% reported allowing another student to hand in one of their

own assignments, 15% reported giving themselves a higher grade when self-marking a test, and 10% reported handing in a friends paper as their own.

In addition, Genereux and McLeod (1995) found 85% of males and 79% of females reported engaging in at least one of the 12 types of cheating behaviors. Using the demographic data, the authors were able to complete a multiple regression analysis to determine the relationship between cheating scores and other characteristics. The results indicated that respondents who were most likely to have a high cheating score were male with a high goal GPA and who had provided a high estimate of the percentage of college students who cheat.

The mean estimates of the percentage of college students who cheat on exams was 26.9% in comparison to 35.5% who cheat regularly on assignments. These estimates were significantly lower than those of students who cheat occasionally on tests (51.8%) and assignments (58.4%)(Genereux & McLeod, 1995).

The researchers were able to conclude, albeit surprisingly, that there seemed to be no difference of the circumstances surrounding planned versus spontaneous cheating. Genereux and McLeod expected to find the circumstances surrounding planned cheating to be more influential simply because the cheating is planned, which gives the cheater the opportunity to reflect longer on their own behavior.

The strengths of this study were the circumstances surrounding cheating. Students cheat for all types of reasons, yet instructor vigilance and fairness in exams were rated among the most influential circumstances. This would seem to indicate that when professors are vigilant in their instruction and expectations and create fair exams cheating occurs less often. The weakness of the study was the “imagine if” component of the

questionnaire, as everyone imagines differently. It would be difficult to determine if students are truly imagining that an exam is occurring or just answering the questions as they would in any given circumstance.

Influence of Honor Codes on Academic Dishonesty

McCabe and Trevino (1993) completed a study on academic dishonesty and honor codes. The purpose of the study was to determine whether the presence of honor codes effectively decreased incidences of academic dishonesty.

McCabe and Trevino (1993) studied 6,096 students from thirty-one colleges and universities in the United States. Admission standards of honor code and non-honor code schools were analyzed to determine which colleges and universities would participate in the study. An original 15,904 surveys were mailed in the fall of 1990. Of the original surveys mailed, 6,096 were returned, for an overall response rate of 38.8%. The response rate for honor code schools was 41.4%, while the response rate for non-code schools was 35.7%. Classification of the respondents was 88% seniors, 9% juniors, and 3% unable to be classified. Sixty-two percent of females returned the surveys in comparison to 38% of males.

The survey instrument consisted of twelve types of self-reported academic dishonesty. Respondents were asked to self-report their frequency of cheating on a Likert-type scale.

McCabe and Trevino (1993) analyzed the data and found that academic dishonesty was significantly correlated with: (1) understanding/acceptance of academic integrity policies; (2) the perceived certainty of being reported; (3) the perceived severity

of the penalties; and (4) the perceptions of peers behavior. In addition McCabe and Trevino found that peer behavior had the most significant effect on academic dishonesty.

McCabe and Trevino (1993) determined that peer influence is the biggest influence on cheating. In addition, peer influence provides a type of normative support for cheating. When peers are engaged in cheating behaviors, students may feel the need to cheat as well. As such, the non-cheater may feel as though they are left at a disadvantage when all those around them are cheating (McCabe & Trevino). Academic dishonesty in and of itself is viewed as a complex behavior. McCabe and Trevino found that it remains complex even when influenced by an honor code.

McCabe and Trevino (1993) suggested that the single most important thing an institution can do is to create an environment where academic dishonesty is socially unacceptable. In such an environment, academic dishonesty policies and procedures are clearly outlined and understood, and peer influence is stronger for not cheating than for cheating.

There were several strengths to this study. The first strength was the sheer number of participants. It is one of the largest studies completed on academic dishonesty. A second strength was the author's ability to compare populations from different types of colleges and universities, code and non-code schools. It is evident from this research that students at code schools are less likely to cheat than are those at non-code schools.

Hall and Kuh (1998) studied students enrolled in honor code schools. The purpose of this study was to better understand the role and influence of honor codes. Specifically, Hall and Kuh researched two questions: (1) the impact of academic honor

codes on faculty, student affairs administrators, and student perceptions of cheating, and (2) whether academic honor codes positively influence the academic integrity of students.

Hall and Kuh (1998) utilized a case-study format for this study. Universities were selected based on size, location, percentage of students living in campus housing, and length of time the honor code was in place. The honor code also had to meet two criteria: (1) students had to sign an honesty pledge or take an oath, and (2) students had to be represented on the body that adjudicated violations of the code. Three universities met these criteria. Each university was given a pseudonym. State Flagship University is located near the center of the state's capital and enrollment is more than 26,000 students. This university was founded in 1901 and is considered a Research II university. Regional State University is also located in an urban area and student enrollment is approximately 15,000 students. This university is less than 40 years old and is considered a Masters I university. State Liberal Arts University is classified as a Masters I institution and was founded in 1908 as a normal school for women. Enrollment at State Liberal Arts University is 11,000 students. This university is located in a medium sized city.

Data collection occurred in three phases. Phase I was pre-visit preparation and document analysis, phase II was an initial six-day campus visit, and phase III was a second one-day visit. Phase II, the initial campus visit took place between September and November 1995. Follow up visits, phase III, were completed to assure the reliability and fidelity of the data. Phase I consisted of reviewing pertinent documents including institutional histories, recruitment materials and honor code information. Other documents, such as student and faculty handbooks, assessment data, reports of student

academic dishonesty, and information regarding student life were gathered and analyzed upon arrival on campus.

The primary sources for data for this study were individual interviews and focus groups. Student participants were chosen from a group of key respondents (student judicial affairs officers, faculty members in charge of the honor code), a minimum of ten students from various cultural backgrounds and involvement in student life activities, five faculty members from different colleges, and at least five student affairs staff members. Student members from sororities and fraternities, as well as student government and residence life staff were also invited to participate. In order to obtain a true sampling of the students enrolled in these three universities, students were approached as they were eating, socializing, or studying and invited to participate. As a result of the above efforts, a total of 231 students and 72 faculty and staff members participated in the interviews and focus groups. Of the participants, 102 students and 22 faculty and staff were from Flagship, 58 students and 22 faculty and staff were from Regional State, and 71 students and 28 faculty and staff members were from Liberal Arts University. The majority of the interviews, 90 of 112 were recorded on tape and transcribed. Transcripts were then read a minimum of nine times to gather pertinent salient data regarding academic dishonesty and honor codes.

The results of the interviews and focus groups indicated that at Flagship University, two documents regarding academic dishonesty exist (i.e., the *Declaration* and *The Rule of Academic Responsibility*). Results indicated that some faculty members are not familiar with *The Rule* and most students had never heard of it. Cheating was rampant at Flagship University. Students indicated that large class size encouraged academic

dishonesty, particularly in the general education courses that all first and second-year students are required to take. In addition, student perceptions of those who cheat are not viewed as negative. Many expressed fear of being caught or guilt for cheating. No particular group seemed responsible for academic dishonesty at this university, despite the academic dishonesty documents.

In contrast with Flagship University, State Regional University faculty were responsible for academic integrity. Faculty developed the Academic Integrity Code (AIC) in 1984 in response to a cheating incident that they did not feel was handled properly. The AIC is said to be included in many syllabi, thus insuring knowledge of the Code by faculty and students. At Regional State University, students acknowledge that cheating is wrong, yet some said it was necessary at times. As a result, the extent to which cheating occurs at Regional State is unclear.

Hall and Kuh (1998) found State Liberal Arts University to have the strictest honor code. The definition for academic dishonesty included 16 behaviors viewed as inappropriate. The honor code at State Liberal Arts University stated that if at any time one of these behaviors was violated, suspension or expulsion could occur. Responsibility for enforcing the academic dishonesty policy fell on the shoulders of the Student Honor Council. This council was lead by student elected officers and a faculty member with a law degree. This panel was responsible for applying the Code.

Although a strict code exists, faculty were unhappy with the system and students displayed frustration regarding the severity of penalty for violating one of the 16 behaviors. Results indicated that the Code is violated more often than not. The students at

State Liberal Arts College stated that they do not feel guilty about cheating and the Code should be enforced, as long as it did not apply to them.

Hall and Kuh (1998) were able to conclude that although honor codes exist, they do not always deter students from performing acts of academic dishonesty. In addition, the reasons for violating the code were viewed differently among faculty and students. Faculty mentioned student inability to master the material as the main reason for violating the code, while students mentioned pressure to get good grades and irrelevant course material as reasons for violating the code. When students perceived cheating as tolerable, the tendency to cheat increased. Cheating was reported to happen in large lecture-style introductory classes. It is in this type of course that students attend because they have to, not because they want to, thus citing irrelevant course material as a reason for cheating. Hall and Kuh (1998) suggested further research into perceptions of why students cheat.

The strength of the study was the use of various types of institutions. This allows the reader the opportunity to compare students and faculty across institution type. An additional strength was the inclusion of guidelines for honor codes.

McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (1999) studied academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments. The purpose of the study was to examine student's thoughts on academic dishonesty. This study was a part of a larger study completed by McCabe and Trevino (as cited in McCabe, Trevino, Butterfield, 1999). Of the 31 colleges and universities utilized in the original study, 14 have traditional honor codes, while the remaining 17 utilize more traditional methods for dealing with acts of academic dishonesty. Surveys were sent to approximately 400 students at 30 of the 31

universities. Due to a misunderstanding, the 31st school only distributed 100 surveys; as a result, data from this school are not included in the study. A total of 4285 surveys were returned, for a response rate of 35.8%. Students enrolled in honor code schools returned 41.4% of their surveys, and students at non-honor code schools returned 30.9%. Sophomores accounted for 25% of respondents, juniors were 24.4% and seniors were 50.6% of respondents.

One of the researchers entered student responses to open-ended questions verbatim into two databases labeled code and non-code. Each researcher then separately analyzed the responses based on three phases. The first phase consisted of “thought units.” These thought units ranged from short phrases to longer complete sentences. The second phase was “categorizing.” In this phase, the thought units were organized into emergent categories. The third phase consisted of “classifying” the emergent groups into smaller unifying themes.

A total of 971 students from honor code schools supplied responses to the open ended questions. Upon analysis, these responses were broken down into 2,475 thought units, which yielded 37 categories. A total of 797 students from non-code schools responded to the open ended questions. These data consisted of 1,945 thought units which surprisingly also yielded 37 categories. A total of 27 categories from each group corresponded with the other. The remaining ten categories were specific to honor code schools. During the “classifying” step, the 27 categories were then grouped into three major underlying themes. The first theme was institutional and contextual factors related to academic integrity. The second theme regarded student attitudes and personal factors

on the decision to cheat or not cheat. The third theme consisted of institutional and contextual factors regarding academic dishonesty.

The results for Theme 1 indicated that 10.9% of the statements made by code students related to the existence of honor codes. An additional 10.4% of statements were related to the influence of honor codes on the culture of academic integrity. The results for Theme 2 indicated that 10.5% of statements made in regard to academic and personal factors related to academic integrity by non-code students were in reference to pressure for grades and intense competition. In comparison, less than 5% (4.8) of statements made by code students cited this reason. The largest percentage, 5.7% of statements made by code students were in reference to ethical standards, responsibility and character. Only 3.8% of statements made by non-code students were in reference to this. The results for Theme 3 indicated that the largest percentage of institutional and contextual factors in regard to academic integrity for non-code students were miscellaneous influences such as school/course size, major papers versus tests, and busy work or assignments considered trivial. The largest percentage of statements made by code students were in regard to the ineffectiveness of the code, specifically, that cheating does occur, or the code is too vague.

As a result of this component of the study, McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (1999) concluded that individual instructors may play a more important role in academic integrity on non-code campuses. In addition, they concluded that a portion of the respondents defined cheating behaviors differently, citing different definitions based on the type of assignment. Finally, they concluded that “students enrolled on code campuses

frame the issue of academic integrity in a fundamentally different way than students enrolled in non-code schools” (p.229).

The strengths of this study included the inclusion of open-ended questions. The responses as to why students cheat were especially important as they serve as a basis for understanding the motivation behind cheating.

Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty

Bates, Davies, Murphy, and Bone (2005) studied prevalence rates for self-reported cheating. The purpose of this study was two-fold (1) to measure the occurrence of different cheating behaviors across six courses, and (2) to investigate demographic and disciplinary differences among self-reported cheaters.

The participants for this study were 1161 undergraduate students who attend university in the UK. These students were enrolled in six courses across various disciplines. The disciplines included biomedical science, business studies, humanities, pharmacy, education, and physiotherapy. The overall response rate for the study was 76%. Twenty-seven percent of participants were enrolled in business studies. 27% were enrolled in pharmacy, and 4% were enrolled in biological science. The mean age for participants was 22, and the majority (71.3%) were female.

The survey instrument included 12 scenarios surrounding academic misconduct. For each scenario, three questions were asked (a) whether the student viewed the behavior as cheating, not cheating, or unsure; (b) whether s/he had participated in similar behavior during the course of their study; and (c) whether the student was aware of this type of behavior occurring in his/her course environment.

Data for this study were analyzed using a one-way ANOVA. The results of the study indicated that students were unsure about what constituted academic dishonesty. The results for scenario 2, leniently marking a peer's test, indicated that 23.1% of respondents were unsure if this was academically dishonest. Similarly, 21.1% of respondents were unsure as to whether scenario 5, borrowing a friend's work for ideas, was academically dishonest; 18.1% of respondents were unsure as to whether scenario 7, photocopying a friend's work with permission, was academically dishonest; 22.5% were unsure as to whether scenario 8, cutting and pasting from the internet without quotation marks, was academically dishonest; 18.6% were unsure as to whether scenario 10, making up lab results, constituted academic dishonesty; 17.1% were unsure whether scenario 11, talking to a neighbor during an exam, was academically dishonest; and 21.8% were unsure whether scenario 12, passing on completed work to students in subsequent years, was considered academically dishonest.

An overwhelming majority of respondents (98.8%) felt that scenario 1, accessing hidden notes during an end of year exam, was academically dishonest. Similarly, 97.7% of respondents felt that scenario 3, writing notes on one's arm prior to going into an exam, was academically dishonest. In contrast, 63.5% of respondents did not think that scenario 5, borrowing a friend's work for ideas, was academically dishonest, and 53.9% did not think that scenario 11, talking to a neighbor during an exam, was academically dishonest.

At least one student enrolled in the pharmacy program admitted to committing academically dishonest acts in each scenario. The highest percentage (63%) was for scenario 5, borrowing a friend's work for ideas. Students enrolled in biological science

admitted to committing academically dishonest acts in eleven of the scenarios, and students in physiotherapy admitted to committing academically dishonest acts in ten of the scenarios. Students enrolled in business studies and humanities admitted to academically dishonest acts in nine of the scenarios. Finally, education students admitted academically dishonest acts in only 6 scenarios. In education, the highest percentage (42%) was scenario 5, borrowing a friend's work for ideas.

The researchers concluded that pharmacy students were more likely to participate in academically dishonest behaviors than were education students. In addition, they concluded that there are indeed gray areas in determining what constitutes academic dishonesty.

The strengths of the study were the instrument, the sample size, and the results of the study. The instrument delineated 12 different scenarios for cheating. The results of the study indicated a clear need for further research into the gray areas related to academic dishonesty. The sample size was large and across disciplines. This allowed the researchers the ability to compare and contrast students enrolled in various academic colleges.

Lester and Diekhoff (2002) studied the differences between traditional and Internet cheaters. The purpose of their study was to determine the prevalence of on-line plagiarism in comparison to traditional cheaters. Participants for this study attended a four-year university in the southwest. They were enrolled in introductory sociology and psychology courses. A total of 449 students participated in the study. These participants received bonus points as an incentive for participation. The majority of the participants were female (63.3%). Student ages ranged from 17 to 57, with the mean age 22.8 years.

Thirty-nine percent of participants were freshmen, 26% sophomores, 18% juniors, and 16% seniors.

The survey instrument packet consisted of a written description of the study, the informed consent form, and a 43-item survey. The survey instrument had been validated in prior studies by the same researcher. The survey included items such as demographic descriptors, reasons for cheating, cheating incidence rates and methods, and a cheating justification scale. Some minor modifications were made to the original instrument, so the focus was on Internet based cheating.

Survey distribution was during the last 20 minutes of class. Students who chose not to participate were dismissed and the professor left the room. Surveys were completed and returned anonymously. An additional guarantee given to the students was that the surveys would not be looked at until course grades were given. This guarantee helped reduce student's fear of retribution.

The results of the study indicated 31.6% of respondents reported no cheating of any kind. In contrast 68.4% of respondents reported cheating either via the Internet or traditional methods. Of this group 87.9% reported using only traditional methods, while 12.1% reported using Internet methods to cheat. The researchers also determined that Internet cheaters were less likely (8.1%) than traditional cheaters (22.9%) to report that they resented the cheating of others. They were also more likely (81.1%) to report that they ignore the cheating of others than were traditional cheaters (57.2%).

The researchers were able to conclude that Internet cheaters not only use the same methods as traditional cheaters, but use the Internet as well; these cheaters are more versatile in their methods. Furthermore, the researchers were able to conclude that both

groups of cheaters were less reactive to the cheating of others. Finally, Internet cheaters were more likely to ignore the cheating of others.

The strength of the study was the comparison between traditional and Internet-based cheaters. This was the only study to compare the two groups of cheaters. Another strength is that the researchers also listed web sites/search engines that can be used to detect plagiarism.

Dawkins (2004) studied self-reported acts of academic dishonesty. The purpose of this study was to determine prevalence rates of test cheating on a small college campus located in a southern gulf coast state. There were 858 undergraduate, graduate, professional, and doctoral students. The analysis for this study was conducted using the Gamma statistic.

The majority of the participants were female (55%). The median age was 21. Eighty-two percent of respondents were residents of the same state, and approximately one-half (145%) were employed. Fifty-seven percent of respondents lived on-campus. Eighty-eight percent had at least one roommate. Twenty-nine percent of respondents were seniors, 19% juniors, 21% sophomores, 25% freshmen, 4% graduate students, and 3% professional students.

There were four categories of academic dishonesty studied (1) cheating on classroom tests, (2) copying from the Internet, (3) knowledge and awareness of others cheating, and (4) lying to avoid detection. The results of the study indicated that of the 858 respondents, 41% self reported cheating on classroom tests, 19% reported copying from the Internet, 70% were aware of others cheating, and 30% reported lying to avoid detection.

In addition, the results indicated that males are more likely to cheat than females. Older students are less likely to cheat than younger students. Students living on campus are more likely to cheat than students living off campus, and students living in smaller (less than 300 residents) dormitories are more likely to cheat than those living in larger (more than 300 residents) dormitories.

The researcher was able to conclude that test cheating and Internet cheating are linked. Dawkins (2004) was also able to conclude that the incidence of Internet based cheating is lower on small campuses. This may be a direct result of there being less technology available on small campuses than there is on larger more comprehensive campuses. In addition, awareness of others cheating increases the likelihood that one will cheat. Finally, lying to avoid detection seems to be more of an ethical decision, rather than a specific type of cheating behavior.

The strengths of this study included the survey instrument and the sample size. The survey instrument compared test cheating, Internet based cheating, and awareness of others who cheat. This allowed the researcher to compare students who cheat on exams to those who also use the Internet to cheat. The sample size was large enough to find significant effects within the categories.

Pino and Smith (2003) studied student attitudes and behaviors about learning. The purpose of their study was to determine whether academic locus of control, class attendance, resistance to partying and drinking, and rejection of the GPA perspective had an effect on academic dishonesty at Georgia Southern University.

Participants for this study were 675 undergraduate students enrolled in IDS 2210, Turning Points and Connections. This course was a 1 hour required core course

usually taken during sophomore, junior, or senior year. The majority of respondents were female (58%), while 42% were male. Sixty-eight percent of respondents were Caucasian, and 27.7% were African American.

The results of the study indicated that the majority of students at Georgia Southern (52.8%) had never committed an act of academic dishonesty. With regard to students who did report cheating, 3% reported cheating more than 5 times per year, 7.7% reported cheating 1 to 2 times per semester, and 36.9% reported cheating a few times during their academic career.

The researchers used multiple regression models to determine which variables predicted academic dishonesty. They found that males were significantly more likely to cheat than females, students who spent time watching television were more likely to cheat, fraternity or sorority membership increased the likelihood of cheating, and higher GPA and class standing increased the likelihood of cheating. Finally, they were able to conclude that one's age, social class, and work status have no influence on cheating behaviors.

The strengths of this study included the survey instrument and the sample size. The survey instrument compared academic locus of control, class attendance, resistance to partying and drinking, and rejection of the GPA perspective. This allowed the researcher to compare social as well as academic factors that increase the likelihood of academic dishonesty. The sample size was large enough to find significant effects within the four categories.

Summary of Literature Related To Student Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

Perceptions of what constitutes cheating differ among students and faculty.

Research has shown that students are unsure of what constitutes academic dishonesty.

For example, Bates, Davies, Murphy and Bone (2005) found that students were unsure of whether leniently marking a friend's paper, borrowing a friend's work for ideas, photocopying a friend's work, or cutting and pasting from the internet without citation was academic dishonesty. Furthermore, research has shown that several factors influence students with regard to cheating. Specifically, items such as professor's knowledge, time pressure, and fear of being caught influence students propensity to cheat (Genereux & McCloud, 1995; Love & Simmons, 1998,1997; Schraw, Olafson, Kuch, Lehman, Lehman, & McCrudden, 2005).

After reviewing research in the professional literature there is clearly a need for further research into student perceptions of academic dishonesty. Students are unsure of which behaviors constitute academic dishonesty. In an effort to diminish instances of academic dishonesty on college and university campuses, it is imperative that a delineation occur, so that students can be given clear examples of behaviors that constitute academic dishonesty.

Literature Involving Faculty and Administrator Perceptions Related to Academic

Dishonesty

Community College Faculty Investigations

Dowd (1992) investigated the perception of Community College faculty members with regard to cheating among their students. There were 88 faculty subjects surveyed in this study. All 88 faculty members taught at the same community college.

The results of the survey indicated that 67% of respondents indicated that they had experienced academic dishonesty in the past year. In addition, 19% indicated that academic dishonesty had occurred 7 or more times during that time. When asked about the forms of academic dishonesty, the respondents indicated the most common form of academic dishonesty was looking on another student's exam paper (44%). Other responses included (a) two students turning in identical homework (15%), (b) students using a crib sheet during an exam (14.7%), (c) students plagiarizing a minor writing assignment (12.5%), and (d) students plagiarizing a term paper (9%). When the respondents were asked when they would typically inform an administrator of an instance of dishonesty, over half (52%) responded, "when I need advice or support". In addition, 21.5% responded, "when I foresee an appeal by the student." When asked to respond to survey items regarding consequences for dishonesty, Dowd (1992) found 54.5% of respondents thought there should be recommended guidelines included in the faculty handbook. An additional 43% said there should be a uniform policy. Dowd (1992) also found that 67% of respondents felt there should be an appeal procedure for students who are accused of academic dishonesty. Finally, when asked whether academic dishonesty should be discussed at an in-service, 54.5% of respondents said yes.

Dowd (1992) concluded that the data represented in this study were similar to data presented in other professional literature. In addition, Dowd used the responses to the survey to help create a policy on academic dishonesty for this community college.

A strength of the study was the survey instrument used. The survey included questions related to prevalence, suggestions for curbing cheating, and appropriate consequences for violating academic dishonesty policies. One weakness of the study was the limited sample size. Although each faculty member of the community college was surveyed, it would be interesting for the author to have compared the data from one community college to data from another community college. In addition, student survey data would have made this article stronger. It would be interesting to compare student data to faculty data.

Administrative Investigations

Aaron and Georgia (1994) investigated administrator perceptions of student academic dishonesty. The purpose of their study was to ascertain how administrators assess faculty, student, and institutional responses to academic dishonesty. The participants of the study were from community and 4-year public and private colleges across the nation.

The survey was mailed to 257 chief student affairs officers in April and May 1989. A total of 175 usable questionnaires were returned from 45 states and the District of Columbia, for a response rate of 68.1%. Approximately 41% were from 4-year public institutions, 33% from 4-year private institutions, and 25% from public community colleges. Of those completing the survey, 38.7% were chief student affairs officers, 29.1% were associate or assistant deans of students, 14.9% were associate or assistant

academic affairs officers, 97.5% were judicial officers, 4% were chief academic officers, and 4.6% were other administrative personnel. Aaron and Georgia (1994) used chi-square tests to determine the differences among 4-year public and private institutions, community colleges, and also between academic affairs officers and student affairs practitioners.

The results of the study indicated that approximately 60% of all respondents stated that faculty members are most likely to handle incidents in their own way rather than follow institution guidelines. In addition, over 40% of respondents indicated that faculties were unaware of procedural guidelines for handling academic dishonesty among students. Sixty-two percent of respondents felt that faculty inform students of what cheating and plagiarism are and how they will be handled during the first class meeting.

When surveyed regarding institutional response, 54% believed that their institution had made an extensive commitment to addressing student academic dishonesty. However, 36% felt there should be a special grade or notation on a student's transcript to depict that the student failed due to academic dishonesty.

Perceptions of student behavior regarding academic dishonesty were also surveyed. Results indicated that 67% of respondents agreed that cheating increases when students perceive grading practices to be unfair. In addition, 66% agreed that the likelihood that any given student will be dishonest increases to the extent that fellow classmates cheat. Finally, 72.8% of respondents agreed that students look the other way when students cheat.

Aaron and Georgia (1994) also studied the difference among student affairs and academic affairs officers. When asked whether faculty members take decisions regarding

academic dishonesty into their own hands without regard for established policy, 66.7% of student affairs officers agreed in comparison to 43.7% of academic affairs officers. When comparing whether faculty are aware of procedural guidelines for handling academic dishonesty, 46% of student affairs officers agreed as opposed to 16% of academic affairs officers. Both sets of officers were in agreement regarding informing students of policies regarding academic dishonesty during the first class meeting. They also agreed with regard to the commitment of the institution toward decreasing academic dishonesty. However, when asked whether their institutions grading policy should include an official grade designation that denotes failure in a course due to academic dishonesty, 46.7% of academic affairs officers agreed in comparison to 33.6% of student affairs officers.

With regard to plagiarism, 50% of student affairs officers agreed that students plagiarized primarily because they do not know what constitutes plagiarism while only 35.5% of academic affairs officers agreed. When asked whether students look the other way when cheating occurs, 83.9% of academic affairs officers agreed in comparison to 70% of student affairs officers. Finally, when asked whether cheating increases when students perceive grading to be unfair, 71% of academic affairs officers agreed in comparison to 66% of student affairs officers.

Aaron and Georgia (1994) concluded that there was general consensus that student academic dishonesty is a pervasive problem that has yet to be addressed adequately. There was consensus among four-year public and private institutions as well as community colleges that student academic dishonesty exists. The disagreement comes when student affairs and academic affairs officers are asked questions regarding student academic dishonesty. Student affairs officers were more likely to be lenient on

punishment than were academic affairs officers. In addition, student affairs officers were more likely to say that grading practices were unfair than were academic affairs officers.

A strength in this study was the comparison between faculty/staff and student affairs officers' perceptions of academic dishonesty. As was shown in the data from this study, perceptions differ. It is those perceptions that make it difficult for faculty and students to agree related to what constitutes academic dishonesty.

Kibler (1994) completed a study on what Institutes of Higher Education's (IHE) are doing to prevent academic dishonesty. The purpose of this study was two-fold, (a) to develop a framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student's perspective, and (b) to use the framework to describe current practices employed by four-year colleges and universities in addressing academic dishonesty. The framework developed by Kibler included three means of intervention: ethos, policies, and programs. These interventions were further evaluated and seven components of the interventions emerged: honor code, training, communication, promotion of academic integrity, disciplinary process/programs, disciplinary policies, and faculty assistance.

The survey was originally sent to 300 4-year public and private colleges and universities who were members of the Association for Student Judicial Affairs. The respondent at each institution was the student judicial affairs officer. A total of 191 surveys were returned for a response rate of 66%. The response rate for public colleges and universities was 84% in comparison to 47% from private colleges and universities.

The results of Kibler's study indicated that approximately 26% of the institutions had honor codes. The percentage was slightly higher for private 4-year colleges (35%) than for public 4-year colleges (20%). In addition, when asked where academic

dishonesty/integrity is discussed, 69% of all student judicial affairs officers said new student orientation, 51% stated beginning of each course, 50% stated new faculty/staff training/orientation, 23% stated graduate teaching assistant training/orientation, and 21% said faculty/staff in-service training.

When asked about communication of policies regarding academic dishonesty/integrity, respondents indicated the following four types of communication: (a) 96% of students read about the policies in the student handbook, (b) 62% read the policies in the catalog, (c) 58% read about the policies in the faculty/staff handbook, and (d) 22% read about the policies in the course syllabus. Faculty members reported receiving direct correspondence on academic dishonesty via the course catalog and faculty/staff handbook 55% of the time. Students reported receiving correspondence about academic dishonesty via the student handbook and course syllabi 50% of the time. Thirty percent of respondents listed efforts to reduce academic dishonesty as the main reason for correspondence. In an effort to increase awareness campus wide, general information about academic integrity was sent directly to the university press office for publication approximately 40.8% of the time. Furthermore, case decisions were published via university press 15.7% of the time.

When asked whether the institution provides training on academic dishonesty/integrity, 46% of all respondents stated that training does occur. Eighteen percent of those who received the training were new faculty members, 17% were faculty members, 15% were graduate teaching assistants, and 10% were considered anyone who teaches. Ninety-eight percent of the training revolved around strategies for handling violations, 87.5% revolved around definitions of academic dishonesty, 84% revolved

around sanctions, 70% revolved around prevention strategies, 57% revolved around classroom atmospheres that promote integrity, and 51% revolved around testing techniques that promote integrity. Ninety percent of the respondents to the questions regarding whether faculty assistance programs were provided indicated that they were provided with case assistance or consultation, while 26% indicated that they were provided with proctoring services, and a small percentage, 5% were provided recognition for handling cases properly.

When asked about the components of the academic dishonesty disciplinary policies, 88% of respondents indicated definitions of due process were included in the policy, and 86% indicated that information regarding academic dishonesty policies were disseminated in writing. Furthermore, 84% of university disciplinary policies contained a code of conduct. Finally, 11% of respondents indicated that the student affairs office was responsible for coordinating efforts to reduce or control academic dishonesty.

Three percent of institutions required offenders to attend programs regarding academic dishonesty. In addition, 35% of institutions offered seminars, programs, or group discussions to students who violated academic dishonesty policies. When asked about methods to promote academic integrity, two-thirds of all respondents indicated that faculty were involved in developing and enforcing standards. Approximately 57% indicated that having a convenient way for students to report incidents of academic dishonesty is a method for promoting academic integrity. Finally, 38% of respondents indicated that student involvement in developing and enforcing academic dishonesty policies is a way to promote academic integrity.

Kibler (1994) drew six major conclusions from this study (1) disciplinary policies are the primary source for institutions to address academic dishonesty, (2) honor codes are not a prevalent source for guiding institutions as they address academic dishonesty, (3) comprehensive programs to prevent academic dishonesty are not present in institutes of higher education, (4) student handbooks, catalogs, and new student orientation are the only prevalent methods for communicating policies regarding academic dishonesty, (5) there is little communication with faculty members about developing and enforcing academic dishonesty policies, and (6) there is little involvement from students in developing and enforcing academic dishonesty policies.

The survey instrument was a strength in this study. It covered many components of academic dishonesty. The weakness was the small number of respondents. It would be interesting to see if the results remain the same with a larger sample size.

Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) completed a study on faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty. The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) uncover underlying faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty, and (2) determine how faculty conceptualize academic dishonesty.

Participants for this study were 150 full-time and 150 adjunct faculty at a private university in the Northeast. Of the original 300 surveys mailed, a total of 212 (71%) were returned and usable. Forty-eight percent of respondents were full-time faculty, 45% were adjunct faculty, and 7% did not report their status. Sixty-three percent of respondents were male, and 36% were female. The majority of respondents (77%) taught undergraduate courses.

There were two survey instruments used in this study. The first, the multidimensional scaling analysis (MDS) was used to survey the similarity of 28 pair-wise cheating behaviors. The second instrument, the rating scale was used to survey the seriousness of the 28 cheating behaviors. The statistical analysis used for the MDS was a super mean matrix. In addition, a one-way ANOVA was used to determine the differences based on faculty status, and demographic data. A multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the rating scale.

The results of the study indicated that faculty view some cheating behaviors the same and some differently. Specifically, some viewed sabotaging someone else's work, forging a university document, stealing a test, and using crib notes as serious. Conversely, faculty viewed studying from someone else's notes, failing to report a grading error, delaying taking an exam or turning in a paper due to false excuse, and not contributing to a group project as less severe. The severity of using a term paper or exam from a fraternity/sorority test file was viewed differently among respondents. Some thought it was cheating and others viewed this type of behavior as an excellent study tool.

The researchers concluded that faculty perceptions of academically dishonest behaviors fall into two categories: clear-cut continuum of seriousness, and ambiguous papers vs. exams. Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) were able to conclude that these behaviors are similar to others found in the literature and that faculty do not perceive academic dishonest acts as an all or nothing situation. In comparing the results of this study to results of a prior study on student perceptions, Pincus and Schmelkin concluded that behaviors considered serious by faculty (i.e. sabotaging someone else's work) is not considered serious by students.

The strength of this study was the results. Clearly not all cheating behaviors are viewed similarly. Therefore, Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) suggested further research into the ambiguous cheating behaviors. Research into these ambiguous behaviors will assist faculty in clearly defining academic dishonesty.

Summary of Literature Related To Faculty and Administrator

Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

As a result of their study into faculty and administrative perceptions of academic dishonesty, Aaron and Georgia (1994) concluded that academic dishonesty is a problem that has yet to be addressed appropriately. In addition, Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) concluded that there is disparity among faculty member responses to what constitutes academic dishonesty. They found that some faculty members thought that using an old copy of an exam was cheating while others thought it was a good study tool. A review of the research related to faculty and administrative perceptions of academic dishonesty clearly shows a need for further research to clarify the details surrounding the divergent thinking. Subsequent to understanding the differences in thought, study of consensus building efforts may begin.

Literature Involving Faculty and Student Perceptions Related to Academic Dishonesty

Roth and McCabe (1994) completed a study on communication strategies for addressing academic dishonesty. The purpose of this study was to determine whether a relationship exists between communication strategies and addressing academic dishonesty.

The participants of the survey were faculty and 2nd year students at a large public university in the East. There were 1,258 second-year students residing in campus housing. These students were enrolled in the full range of majors offered by the university. Five hundred ninety-two surveys were sent to a randomly selected group of faculty members in the colleges of arts and sciences. Student surveys were distributed and collected in a sealed envelope by the resident advisers in each dormitory. Resident advisers were asked to follow-up on two separate occasions. A total of 416 surveys were returned, of those 411 (32.7%) were used. Faculty surveys were distributed and collected via school mail. Of the 592 surveys mailed, 246 (41.6%) were deemed usable. Demographic data regarding respondents indicated that 96% of respondents were traditional college age and citizens of the United States, 53.5% were Catholic, and 14.9% were Jewish. Student respondents were pursuing a myriad of majors, 14.6% in psychology, 9.2% in English, 8.8% in political science, and 8.3% in biology. Fifty-seven percent of student respondents were female. In contrast, 78% of faculty respondents were male. Forty-three percent taught in the social sciences and humanities, and 30% taught in math. The mean tenure for faculty was 15.9 years.

Roth and McCabe (1994) created a student survey that consisted of four scales: trust/distrust, organizational climate, cheating behavior, and demographic/open response questions. The faculty survey consisted of the trust/distrust scale only. Student respondents were asked to estimate how often they had engaged in four test-related cheating behaviors. The behaviors were (a) helping someone cheat on an exam, (b) using unfair methods to learn what was on a test or exam before it was given, (c) using crib notes during a test or exam, and (d) copying from a classmate during a test or exam. The

student respondents were asked to complete a Likert-type scale for these behaviors. The composite score for each question ranged from 4 to 20.

Roth and McCabe (1994) found gender to be the only demographic variable to have a significant relationship with the dependent variable. Roth and McCabe (1994) were also able to conclude that the values students bring from home are a stronger predictor of cheating behaviors than context specific measures such as task reliability. In addition, student involvement in establishing and maintaining academic integrity policies may diminish a student's need to cheat. The most significant finding is that student perceptions of what constitutes cheating varied widely from university faculty perceptions.

A strength of this study was the measurement of both faculty and student perceptions related to what constitutes cheating. Another strength of this study was that the findings clearly lead to practical implications for university faculty (e.g. involving students in creating environments where academic integrity is valued). The description of the statistical analysis was vague. The correlations among variables were hard to track and thus it was difficult to assess the appropriateness of the analysis used.

Sims (1995) completed a study on the severity of academic dishonesty. The purpose of the study was to determine how closely student and faculty views on the severity of academic dishonesty agree. The participants of the study were 54 full-time faculty members who taught at a small independent university. Of the 54 faculty members, 45 returned the questionnaire, (32 males, 13 females). In addition, 131 undergraduate students (73 females, 58 males) were surveyed. The student participants were registered as full-time students across colleges. Student respondents volunteered to

participate in this study and completed the survey only once. To create a reliability measure, faculty were asked to complete the survey on two separate occasions.

The survey instrument consisted of 18 behaviors, each of which was stated as a dishonest behavior. Respondents were asked to rate each behavior using a 6-point Likert-type scale. As faculty were asked to complete the survey twice, upon the second completion only 26 returned their survey. The reliability test measure was calculated at 0.91. Spearman ranking correlation was used to analyze student and faculty data. ANOVA was the statistical measure used to determine differences between year in school (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior).

Sims (1995) found that students and faculty agreed on the placement of the 18 behaviors in regard to the severity of the behavior. The behaviors were ranked in order of severity, and increasing the margins or font size to make a term paper appear longer was ranked the highest between both groups. Faculty rated using cheating notes during an exam as second highest, while students rated purchasing a paper to turn in as their own as second highest. Students ranked using someone else's paper for their class as the least severe, while faculty ranked asking another student to take an exam using their name as the least severe. When Sims analyzed severity according to class standing, the average freshman severity level was significantly lower than that of the faculty. In addition, the average total severity level for sophomores and juniors was significantly less than that for faculty. The average total severity level for seniors did not indicate a significant result in comparison to the average total faculty response.

Sims (1995) concluded that faculty and student rankings of academic dishonesty are similar. This research is in contrast to other studies. Sims also found that students do

learn about academic dishonesty during their undergraduate years. The severity level for freshmen, sophomores, and juniors is significantly lower than that of faculty. This suggests that students in these classes are under educated regarding the severity of academic dishonesty.

The strengths of this study were the results. The rankings of both groups were found to be similar. This suggests that at this university, student and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty do not differ. These results are important as they contradict other studies in which student and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty do differ. The weakness of this study is the small population studied.

Kennedy, Nowak, Raghuraman, Thomas, and Davis (2000) studied academic dishonesty and distance learning. The purpose of this study was to examine student and faculty views of cheating and distance learning. Participants for this study were 172 students enrolled at a medium size, regional university located in the Midwest. Of the 172 participants, 127 were women, 44 men, and 1 undeclared. The mean age for the participants was 32.3, with ages ranging from 18 to 70. Demographic data in regard to class standing indicated that 8 students were freshmen, 7 sophomores, 24 juniors, 35 seniors, and 95 were graduate students. The remaining two students did not list their classification. In regard to completing a course via distance learning, 25 men and 84 of the women indicated yes, while 19 men and 42 women answered no. Participants for the faculty component of the study were 69 faculty members. Of them, 36 were women and 33 were men.

There were two survey instruments created for this study. The student survey consisted of six questions related to academic dishonesty. Specific questions surveyed

frequency of cheating in high school and college (Questions 1 and 2), whether cheating improved one's score (Question 3), and whether the student had taken an electronic course and the ease and methods for cheating in an electronic course (Questions 4, 5, and 6).

The faculty survey consisted of three questions related to academic dishonesty. Specifically, question 1 asked whether the instructor had taught an electronic course, question 2 asked if the faculty member believed that cheating would be exacerbated in electronic courses, and question 3 asked what measures faculty take to counteract cheating in electronic courses.

Student participants completed the survey during regular classes and via the mail. Faculty members received the survey in their mailboxes and returned completed surveys via campus mail.

The results of faculty question 2 indicated that faculty felt that in electronic courses someone beside the enrolled student could be responsible for completing course assignments. In addition, methods currently used in traditional courses would continue to be used. Finally, students could download/purchase papers from the Internet.

The results of faculty question 3, indicated that faculty could (1) use interactive video finals or supervised on-site exams; (2) change exams and assignments each semester; (3) use verification software and personalized assignments; (4) administer open-book, practical exams; and (5) require frequent interaction via email and group discussions, to counteract cheating behaviors in electronic courses.

The results of the student survey indicated that faculty and students did not differ in their perception of ease of cheating in an electronic course. In addition, student

perceptions of the ease of cheating in an electronic course were linked to taking an electronic course in the past. Furthermore, seniors and graduate students felt it was easier to cheat in electronic courses than did freshmen, sophomores, and juniors.

The researchers were able to conclude that both faculty and students felt it was easier to cheat in an electronic course. As a result, the researchers were able to surmise that as the number of electronic courses increases, so does the incidence of cheating in electronic courses.

Strengths of this study included the survey instruments and the results. The researchers were able to create simple surveys to determine both faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty. The results indicated that similarities exist in faculty and student perceptions to the ease of cheating in electronic courses.

Hendershott, Drinan, & Cross (2000) studied the culture of academic integrity. The purpose of this study was to assess the academic integrity climate of a private, Catholic university located in the Southwest. This study consisted of three stages. In the first stage, over 200 university community members (administrators, faculty, and students) participated in a town hall meeting. The second stage consisted of individual interviews involving faculty and students. During this interview, participants were asked to discuss concerns regarding adherence to the Universities mission and goals. Concerns related to academic integrity among students were expressed. University community members also participated in four focus groups to help with survey construction. During these groups, students revealed their concerns regarding cheating on campus. Finally, data collection began.

The final survey consisted of five major areas (1) Academic Excellence, (2) Values Based Education, (3) Individual Dignity, (4) Holism, and (5) Commitment to the Catholic identity. These goals were in accordance with university goals.

Students took the survey during class. During this time, faculty were out of the room. A total of 915 students participated in the study. Demographic data revealed that 27% of students were first-year, 19.8% were second-year, 20.2% were third-year, 20% were fourth-year, 6% were fifth-year, and 7% were graduate students. Student participants were enrolled in various colleges. Fifty-eight percent of students were enrolled in Arts and Sciences, 21.6% were enrolled in the School of Business, 9.3% were enrolled in the School of Education, 6.8% were enrolled in the School of Law, and 4.2% were enrolled in the School of Nursing.

The results of the study indicated that students enrolled in the School of Business were most likely (66%) to observe others cheating. The breakdown for the other colleges is as follows: 60% of students enrolled in the Colleges and Arts of Sciences, 41% of students enrolled in the School of Education, 22% of students enrolled in the School of Law, and 18% of students enrolled in the School of Nursing reported observing others cheating.

When asked whether they would help another student cheat on exam, 23% of students in the School of Business indicated that they would either give him/her the answer or say nothing but expose his/her paper so the other student could cheat. Sixteen percent of students enrolled in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, 9.5% of students enrolled in the School of Law, 6.5% of students enrolled in the School of Nursing, and 5.4% of students enrolled in the School of Education indicated they would do the same.

Furthermore, when asked what the student would do if they saw another student cheating, 61% of education students, 57.7% of arts and sciences students, 53.2% of business students, 49% of law students and 42% of nursing students admitted they would ignore it.

With regard to who should monitor academic integrity issues, a large percentage (89%) of students felt that someone other than faculty should be involved in dealing with academic integrity cases. Twenty-four percent of students felt that they should be involved in dealing with these issues, and a small percentage of faculty 11% felt they should be involved in dealing with issues of cheating.

The researchers concluded that additional work needs to be done within the community to educate students on their participation in the academic integrity climate. Clearly, students enrolled in the School of Education need the most work.

The strength of the study was the participants. The study involved students in varying disciplines. This allowed the reader the opportunity to compare students across colleges.

Summary of Literature Related to Faculty and Student Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

The results of the research related to faculty and student perceptions of what constitutes academic dishonesty are inconsistent. For example, Sims (1995) found faculty rated using crib notes during an exam a more severe form of cheating than did students. In that same study students rated using someone else's paper as their own as less severe than did faculty. Students and faculty not only have difficulty determining what constitutes academic dishonesty, but they have difficulty determining the appropriate

deterrents and disciplinary courses of action to take. For instance, Hendershott, Drinan, and Cross (2000) studied the culture surrounding academic integrity. They found that education students were less likely than students enrolled in other colleges to report incidences of cheating. They also found that students believed they should be involved in disciplinary actions with regard to violating academic integrity policies. Similarly, Roth and McCabe (1994) found that on campuses where students were involved in disciplinary actions related to violations of academic integrity policies, incidences of academic dishonesty decreased. In order to curb cheating, further research must be conducted to determine clear-cut guidelines for students and faculty to use.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the procedures and methodology used in this study. The chapter has been organized into six sections including: (1) subjects, (2) setting, (3) instrumentation, (4) design and procedures, (5) interscorer reliability or interobserver reliability, and (6) treatment of data.

Research Questions

Special education student and faculty perceptions related to cheating were measured using the *Student Perspectives Survey* (see Appendix A) and the *Faculty Perspectives Survey* (see Appendix B). Both *Perspectives Surveys* consisted of items related to demographic data and faculty and student perspectives related to the issue of cheating. Specifically, these instruments included items related to what constitutes cheating in traditional and online courses, deterrents to cheating, and scenarios that address what constitutes cheating and the appropriate action for the faculty member to take.

The research questions for this study were:

1. Is there a difference between special education faculty and special education student perceptions related to what constitutes online cheating?

2. Is there a difference between special education faculty and special education student perceptions related to what constitutes in-class cheating?
3. Is there a difference between adjunct and full-time special education faculty members' perceptions related to what constitutes online cheating?
4. Is there a difference between adjunct and full-time special education faculty members' perceptions related to what constitutes in-class cheating?
5. Is there a difference between special education undergraduate and graduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty related to:
 - a. What constitutes cheating?
 - b. Deterrents to cheating?
 - c. Appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating?
6. Is there a difference between special education faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty related to:
 - a. Deterrents to cheating?
 - b. Appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating?

Participant Demographics

The participants for this study were 14 full-time special education faculty, 16 adjunct special education faculty, 111 undergraduate, and 124 graduate students affiliated with one institution of higher education in a large urban area in the southwest. See Table 1 for specific characteristics of these participants.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

	Undergraduate	Graduate	Faculty	Adjunct	Total
Gender					
Female	91	89	10	15	205
Male	19	33	3	1	56
Not Reported	1	2	1		4
Ethnicity					
AI/AN	2	2	0	0	4
API	9	11	0	1	21
Latino	12	6	1	0	19
White	76	87	10	14	187
AA	8	13	1	0	22
Not Reported	4	5	2	1	12
Online Courses Taken or Taught					
0/Not Reported	35	64	3	3	105
1	23	26	0	8	57
2	10	14	1	2	27
3	14	7	1	0	22
4	3	7	2	0	12
5	26	6	7	3	42

Note: AI/AN – American Indian/Alaska Native, API – Asian Pacific Islander, AA –

African American

Setting

The study took place at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Using the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classification system, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas is considered a *Comprehensive Doctoral with Medical/Veterinary* institution.

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) is the largest comprehensive university in the State of Nevada. It is a doctoral degree-granting institution with more than 800 full time faculty who hold terminal degrees. The university offers 24 Doctoral Degree programs and 55 Master Degree programs as well as a variety of undergraduate programs. The Northwest Association of Schools and colleges accredits all programs at UNLV. The university underwent a full-scale review in 2000 and the Association's Commission on Colleges reaffirmed its accreditation.

The university completed construction of a new library in 2001 that houses more than 650 educational journals, 11,000 journals, and 990,000 books. More than 4,800 graduate students (Doctoral, Specialists, and Master's) and more than 22,000 undergraduate students are enrolled.

The Department of Special Education has 18 full-time and 20 adjunct faculty. In addition, there are 48 doctoral students, 360 master's students, and approximately 200 undergraduate students enrolled. The Department of Special Education offers 2 doctoral programs, 2 masters degree programs, and 2 undergraduate degree programs. In addition, it offers 6 alternative programs.

Instrumentation

There were two instruments used in this study (1) *Student Perspectives Survey*, and (2) *Faculty Perspectives Survey* (see Appendices A and B).

Student Perspectives Survey

The *Student Perspectives Survey* consists of demographic items including number of online courses taken, number of traditional courses taken, year in school, and gender. In addition, there are 12 items related to cheating behaviors in traditional (face to face) courses, 12 items related to cheating behaviors in online courses, 19 items related to cheating deterrents, and five scenarios that seek to determine whether a student has cheated, and the appropriate course of action the professor should take. The *Student Perspectives Survey* includes a Likert scale that ranges from 1 to 4 for questions 1 through 43 and a Likert scale that ranges from 1 to 5 for questions 44 to 56. The Likert scale is not used for the questions pertaining to demographic information.

Faculty Perspectives Survey

The *Faculty Perspectives Survey* consists of demographic items including tenure status, number of years at UNLV, number of years teaching, and gender. In addition, there are 12 items related to cheating behaviors in traditional (face to face) courses, 12 items related to cheating behaviors in online courses, 19 items related to cheating deterrents, and five scenarios that seek to determine whether a student has cheated, and the appropriate course of action the professor should take. The *Faculty Perspectives Survey* includes a Likert scale that ranges from 1 to 4 for questions 1 through 43 and 1 to 5 for questions 44 through 56. The Likert scale is not used for the questions pertaining to demographic information.

Design and Procedures

Phase One: Instrumentation Development

The researcher constructed the two instruments (i.e., *Student Perspectives Survey*, and *Faculty Perspectives Survey*) used for this study. A panel of experts reviewed both instruments and provided feedback. This panel included four faculty members from the Department of Special Education, and two doctoral students in the Department of Special Education. After the review, specific changes to the instrument were made. These changes included minor wording changes for each of the 24 traditional and online cheating behaviors and the 19 deterrents. The revised instruments were piloted during Fall semester 2005 with 16 preservice early childhood special education students. These students were enrolled in an early childhood course and were not eligible to participate in the study. The participants in the pilot administration were asked to provide feedback on any questions that were unclear or needed changes. From the pilot administration an option of no consequence for each of the 13 cheating scenarios was added.

Phase Two: Study Preparation

The *Student Perspectives Survey*, *Faculty Perspectives Survey*, and the protocol for human subjects were submitted to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Institutional Review Board in January 2006 for approval. Upon receiving approval, the stamped consent forms were attached to both surveys.

Surveys were color coded to streamline data collection. Student surveys were color-coded based on classification in school and faculty surveys were color-coded based on employment status. For example, undergraduate student surveys were blue, graduate

student surveys were yellow, full-time faculty surveys were green and adjunct faculty surveys were pink.

The Department of Special Education chair was contacted to obtain permission to attend a faculty meeting to disseminate the Faculty Perspectives Survey. In addition, the Special Education chair was contacted to obtain permission to mail (via US Mail) surveys to the adjunct faculty. Department faculty members were contacted via email to obtain permission to disseminate the Student Perspectives Survey in their respective courses. Of the 18 full-time faculty members, 8 agreed to allow dissemination of the surveys in their classes. A second email was sent to follow up with those faculty members who did not originally reply. A total of 3 additional faculty members responded. In addition the researcher used a copy of the spring schedule to email adjunct faculty members to recruit participation of the students enrolled in their courses. As a result of the email sent to adjunct faculty, the researcher was able to recruit participants from 4 more courses. A second email was sent as a follow up, there were no additional respondents.

Phase Three: Implementation

A doctoral student within the Department of Special Education attended the Spring 2006 faculty retreat in place of the researcher to recruit study participants. The doctoral student explained the purpose of the study to the faculty members. Those who were willing to participate were asked to sign the consent form (See Appendix C), separate it from the survey and hand it to the researcher. The researcher then placed the informed consent forms in a large brown envelope. Participants were given 15 minutes to complete the survey. The researcher then collected the surveys and placed them in a large brown envelope that was labeled full-time faculty.

The researcher or a fellow doctoral student attended each of the undergraduate and graduate courses (Doctoral and Masters level) in which the instructors agreed to allow access. Participants in a total of 7 undergraduate courses were recruited and participants from a total of 11 graduate courses were recruited. The instructor left the room and the researcher informed the students of the purpose of the study and recruited their participation. Those who were willing to participate were asked to sign the consent form, separate it from the survey, and hand it to the researcher. The researcher placed the informed consent forms in a large brown envelope. Participants were given 15 minutes to complete the survey. The researcher collected the surveys and placed them in a large brown envelope that was labeled either graduate or undergraduate.

Interscorer Reliability

Interscorer reliability was determined by having a second researcher review 20% of the data that was input by the first researcher. Reliability was established by using the standard formula (i.e., $\text{Agreements} \div (\text{Agreements} + \text{Disagreements}) \times 100$) and was determined to be 89%. Furthermore, Cronbach's alpha was calculated and the internal validity of the instrument was .845.

Treatment of Data

Data for the surveys were input into SPSS, a statistical software package. Each set of data was separated by undergraduate, graduate, adjunct faculty and full-time faculty

responses. Demographic information was input into SPSS to gain cumulative totals for each group.

Data from both the *Student Perspectives Survey* and *Faculty Perspectives Survey* were analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference between special education faculty and special education student perceptions related to what constitutes online cheating? The statistical procedure used was a t-test. The level of confidence for this question was $p < .05$. Questions 13 through 24 were used as a composite and individually to answer this question.
2. Is there a difference between special education faculty and special education student perceptions related to what constitutes in-class cheating? The statistical procedure used was a t-test. The level of confidence for this question was $p < .05$. Questions 1 through 12 were used as a composite and individually to answer this question.

Data from the *Faculty Perspectives Survey* were analyzed to answer the following research questions:

3. Is there a difference between adjunct and full-time special education faculty members' perceptions related to what constitutes online cheating? The statistical procedure used was a t-test. The level of confidence for this question was $p < .05$. Questions 13 through 24 were used as a composite and individually to answer this question.
4. Is there a difference between adjunct and full-time special education faculty members' perceptions related to what constitutes in-class cheating? The

statistical procedure used was a t-test. The level of confidence for this question was $p < .05$. Questions 1 through 12 were used as a composite and individually to answer this question.

Data from the *Student Perspectives Survey* were analyzed to answer the following research question:

5. Is there a difference between special education undergraduate and graduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty related to:
 - a. What constitutes cheating? Questions 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 54, and 55 were used as a composite and individually to answer this question.
 - b. Deterrents to cheating? Questions 25 through 43 were used as a composite and individually to answer this question.
 - c. Appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating? Questions 46, 48, 50, 53, and 56 were used as a composite and individually to answer this question.

The statistical procedure used was a t-test. The level of confidence for this question was $p < .05$.

Data from both the *Student Perspectives Survey* and the *Faculty Perspectives Survey* were analyzed to answer the following research question:

6. Is there a difference between special education faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty related to:
 - a. Deterrents to cheating? Questions 25 through 43 were used as a composite and individually to answer this question.

- b. Appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating? Questions 46, 48, 50, 53, and 56 were used as a composite and individually to answer this question.

The statistical procedure used was a t-test. The level of confidence for this question was $p < .05$.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purposes of this study were: (a) to compare faculty and student perceptions of academically dishonest acts; (b) to determine what perceptions exist with regard to deterrents to academic dishonesty; and (c) to determine what perceptions exist with regard to consequences for academic dishonesty. Faculty and student perceptions related to academic dishonesty were measured using two instruments: (a) *the Faculty Perspectives Survey* (Appendix A), and (b) *the Student Perspectives Survey* (Appendix B). Both the *Faculty and Student Perspectives Surveys* focused on perceptions of academic dishonesty. Specifically they included questions related to acts of academic dishonesty, deterrents to academic dishonesty, and consequences for violating academic dishonesty policies.

Data Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistical procedures were applied to the research data to answer the questions in this study. A $p < .05$ level of confidence was used to test for significant differences among Likert scale type items. The results of the analyses are organized by the research questions. A Bonferroni post hoc adjustment was used to control for experimentwise error. This resulted in an adjusted level of significance of $\alpha =$

0.004 for all tests. This level of significance is very conservative due to a large effect size and as a result only differences that met these criteria were considered statistically significant.

Research Question 1. Is there a difference between special education faculty (full-time and adjunct faculty) and special education student (undergraduate and graduate) perceptions related to what constitutes online cheating?

Results from the student (undergraduate and graduate) and faculty (full-time and adjunct) responses were entered into SPSS to identify which behaviors, based on a composite score, derived from survey items 13 through 24 were considered cheating. These behaviors were rated on a four-point Likert-type scale (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree).

A *t*-test was completed comparing faculty (full-time and adjunct) and student (undergraduate and graduate) responses to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in how they rated specific behaviors related to cheating in online courses. The results of the *t*-test indicate a statistically significant difference occurred ($t_{(152)} = 3.612, p < .000$) between how faculty and students viewed academic dishonesty in online learning, with the faculty believing more strongly than students that the behaviors identified in the survey questions represented cheating.

When comparing individual items, a statistically significant difference was found between faculty and students for item 14 ($t_{(160)} = 3.69, p < .000$) and item 19 ($t_{(157)} = 5.36, p < .000$). Specifically, faculty believed more strongly than students that students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without the authorization of the instructor (student $M = 2.27, SD = 1.011$, faculty $M = 3.08, SD = .997$) and students who submit

the same paper during consecutive semesters (student $M = 2.34$, $SD = 1.104$, faculty $M = 3.56$, $SD = .583$) are cheating.

For the remaining 10 items related to online cheating there were no statistically significant differences between faculty and student opinions. These 10 items were: students who use crib notes during a test or quiz (students $M = 2.91$, $SD = 1.153$, faculty $M = 3.13$, $SD = .992$), students who fail to document proper paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper (students $M = 3.35$, $SD = .783$, faculty $M = 3.64$, $SD = .569$), students who plagiarize a large section of a paper (students $M = 3.73$, $SD = .602$, faculty $M = 3.80$, $SD = .645$), students who have a friend lend significant help in writing or revising a paper (students $M = 2.37$, $SD = .968$, faculty $M = 2.83$, $SD = .963$), students who submit the same paper during the same semester (students $M = 2.55$, $SD = 2.025$, faculty $M = 3.36$, $SD = .757$), students who submit a paper written by someone else (students $M = 3.73$, $SD = .725$, faculty $M = 4.00$, $SD = .000$), students who use internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted (students $M = 3.80$, $SD = .623$, faculty $M = 3.96$, $SD = .200$), students who use internet sources to plagiarize a portion of a paper to be submitted (students $M = 3.79$, $SD = .552$, faculty $M = 3.88$, $SD = .600$), students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate (students $M = 1.71$, $SD = .827$, faculty $M = 2.04$, $SD = .935$), and students who have someone else take a test or exam for them (students $M = 3.84$, $SD = .505$, faculty $M = 3.92$, $SD = .277$). See Table 2 for means, standard deviations, and p values related to online cheating items (i.e., questions 13 – 24).

Table 2

Between group Means, Standard Deviations, t and p values for Online Items

Item Number	Student		Faculty		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Online item composite	36.51	6.117	41.17	3.595	3.612	.000*
Students who use crib notes	2.91	1.153	3.13	.992	.856	.393
Collaboration without authorization	2.27	1.011	3.08	.997	3.691	.000*
Failure to reference paraphrases	3.35	.783	3.64	.569	1.793	.075
Students who plagiarize	3.73	.602	3.80	.645	.544	.587
Having a friend lend help in writing a paper	2.37	.968	2.83	.963	2.161	.032
Submitting the same paper in the same semester	2.55	2.025	3.36	.757	1.965	.051
Submitting the same paper in consecutive semesters	2.34	1.104	3.56	.583	5.361	.000*
Submitting a paper written by someone else	3.73	.725	4.00	.000	1.835	.068
Purchasing a paper to be submitted	3.80	.623	3.96	.200	1.282	.202
Using Internet sources to plagiarize	3.79	.552	3.88	.600	.779	.437
Using email to discuss assignments	1.71	.827	2.04	.935	1.789	.076
Having someone else take a test or exam for you	3.84	.505	3.92	.277	.787	.433

* $p < .004$

Research Question 2. Is there a difference between special education faculty and special education student perceptions related to what constitutes in-class cheating?

Results from the student (undergraduate and graduate) and faculty (full-time and adjunct) responses were entered into SPSS to identify which behaviors, based on a

composite score, derived from survey items 1 through 12 were considered cheating.

These behaviors were rated on a four-point Likert-type scale (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree).

A *t-test* was completed comparing faculty (full-time and adjunct) and student (undergraduate and graduate) responses to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in how they rated specific behaviors related to cheating in traditional courses. The results of the *t-test* indicate a statistically significant difference occurred ($t_{(247)} = 3.264, p < .001$) between how faculty and students viewed academic dishonesty in traditional learning, with the faculty believing more strongly than students that the behaviors identified in the survey questions represented cheating.

When comparing individual items, a statistically significant difference was found between faculty and students for item 6 ($t_{(257)} = 3.10, p < .002$) and item 7 ($t_{(258)} = 3.72, p < .000$). Specifically, faculty believed more strongly than students that students who submit the same paper during the same semester (student $M = 2.52, SD = 1.136$, faculty $M = 3.22, SD = .892$) and students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters (student $M = 2.44, SD = 1.098$, faculty $M = 3.26, SD = .903$) are cheating.

For the remaining 10 items related to in-class cheating behaviors there were no statistically significant differences between faculty and student opinions. These 10 items were: students who use crib notes during a test or quiz (student $M = 3.53, SD = .841$, faculty $M = 3.54, SD = .779$), students who fail to document proper paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper (student $M = 2.29, SD = .972$, faculty $M = 2.64, SD = 1.114$), students who plagiarize a large section of a paper (student $M = 3.21, SD = .817$, faculty $M = 3.41, SD = .636$), students who have a friend lend significant help in writing or revising a paper

(student $M = 2.31$, $SD = .934$, faculty $M = 2.73$, $SD = .919$), students who submit a paper written by someone else (student $M = 3.80$, $SD = .637$, faculty $M = 4.00$, $SD = .000$), students who use internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted (student $M = 3.75$, $SD = .669$, faculty $M = 4.00$, $SD = .000$), students who use internet sources to plagiarize a portion of a paper to be submitted (student $M = 3.74$, $SD = .634$, faculty $M = 4.00$, $SD = .000$), students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate (student $M = 1.71$, $SD = .815$, faculty $M = 1.89$, $SD = .801$), and students who have someone else take a test or exam for them (student $M = 3.83$, $SD = .603$, faculty $M = 3.93$, $SD = .385$). See Table 3 for means, standard deviations, and p values related to traditional cheating items (i.e., questions 1 – 12).

Research Question 3. Is there a difference between adjunct and full-time special education faculty members' perceptions related to what constitutes online cheating?

Results from the faculty (full-time and adjunct) responses were entered into SPSS to identify which behaviors, based on a composite score, derived from survey items 13 through 24 were considered cheating. These behaviors were rated on a four-point Likert-type scale (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree).

A *t-test* was completed comparing full-time and adjunct faculty to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in how they rated specific behaviors related to cheating in online courses. The results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between full-time and adjunct faculty views of cheating in online courses.

Table 3

Between group Means, Standard Deviations, t and p values for Traditional Items

Item Number	Student		Faculty		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Traditional item composite	36.60	5.998	41.20	3.671	3.264	.001*
Use of crib notes while taking a test	3.53	.841	3.54	.779	.053	.958
Collaborating without authorization	2.29	.972	2.64	1.114	1.684	.093
Failure to reference paraphrases	3.21	8.17	3.41	.636	1.232	.219
Students who plagiarize	3.74	.633	3.74	.192	1.807	.072
Having a friend lend help in writing a paper	2.31	.934	2.73	.919	2.179	.030
Submitting the same paper during the same semester	2.52	1.136	3.22	.892	3.095	.002*
Submitting the same paper during consecutive semester	2.44	1.098	3.26	.903	3.724	.000*
Submitting a paper written by someone else	3.80	.637	4.00	.000	1.656	.099
Purchasing a paper	3.75	.669	4.00	.000	1.913	.057
Using Internet sources to plagiarize	3.74	.634	4.00	.000	2.216	.035
Using email to discuss assignments	1.71	.815	1.89	.801	1.093	.276
Having someone else take a test or exam for you	3.83	.603	3.93	.385	.784	.433

* $p < .004$

Research Question 4. Is there a difference between adjunct and full-time special education faculty members' perceptions related to what constitutes in-class cheating?

Results from the faculty (full-time and adjunct) responses were entered into SPSS to identify which behaviors, based on a composite score, derived from survey items 1

through 12 were considered cheating. These behaviors were rated on a four-point Likert-type scale (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree).

A *t-test* was completed comparing full-time and adjunct faculty to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in how they rated specific behaviors related to cheating in traditional courses. The results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between full-time and adjunct faculty views of cheating in traditional courses.

Research Question 5. Is there a difference between special education undergraduate and graduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty related to:

- a. What constitutes cheating?
- b. Deterrents to cheating?
- c. Appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating?

Results from the student (undergraduate and graduate) responses were entered into SPSS to identify which behaviors, based on a composite score, derived from survey items 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 54, and 55 were considered cheating. These behaviors were rated on a four-point Likert-type scale (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree).

A *t-test* was conducted comparing undergraduate and graduate students to determine whether there was statistically significant difference in how they rated specific behaviors related to what constitutes cheating (items 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 54, and 55), deterrents to cheating (items 25 through 43) and the appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating (items 44 through 56). The results indicate that there was no

statistically significant difference between graduate and undergraduate students views of cheating.

Research Question 6. Is there a difference between special education faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty related to:

- a. Deterrents to cheating?
- b. Appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating?

Results from the student (undergraduate and graduate) and faculty (full-time and adjunct) responses were entered into SPSS to identify which behaviors, based on a composite score, derived from survey items 25 through 43 were considered deterrents to cheating. These behaviors were rated on a four-point Likert-type scale (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree).

A *t-test* was conducted comparing faculty (full-time and adjunct) and students (undergraduate and graduate) to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in how they rated deterrents to cheating. The results indicate that there was a statistically significant difference between faculty and students views on deterrents to cheating, ($t_{(204)} = 2.54, p < .01$), with, the students believing more strongly than faculty that the items identified on the survey were deterrents to cheating.

When comparing individual items, a statistically significant difference was found between faculty and students for item 33 ($t_{(256)} = 3.066, p < .002$). Specifically, students believed more strongly than faculty that use of honor codes is an effective deterrent of cheating in traditional classes (student $M = 2.56$, $SD .818$, faculty $M = 2.07$, $SD .753$). See Table 8 for means, standard deviations, and *p* values related to deterrent items (i.e., questions 13 through 24).

For the remaining 18 items related to cheating deterrents there were no statistically significant differences between faculty and student opinions. These 18 items were: it is easier to cheat in an online course than in a traditional course (students $M = 3.29$, $SD = .738$, faculty $M = 3.17$, $SD = .791$), proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in an online course (students $M = 2.98$, $SD = .787$, faculty $M = 2.69$, $SD = .660$), proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in a traditional course (students $M = 3.08$, $SD = .745$, faculty $M = 2.86$, $SD = .639$), fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in online courses (students $M = 2.39$, $SD = 1.000$, faculty $M = 2.18$, $SD = .905$), fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in traditional courses (students $M = 3.08$, $SD = .863$, faculty $M = 2.77$, $SD = .858$), instructors in online courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear (students $M = 2.77$, $SD = .918$, faculty $M = 2.57$, $SD = .817$), instructors in traditional courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear (students $M = 3.30$, $SD = .782$, faculty $M = 2.90$, $SD = .845$), honor codes are an effective deterrent in online courses (students $M = 2.34$, $SD = .788$, faculty $M = 1.97$, $SD = .731$), university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses (students $M = 2.51$, $SD = .890$, faculty $M = 2.23$, $SD = .898$), university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses (students $M = 2.75$, $SD = .872$, faculty $M = 2.40$, $SD = .932$), policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses (students $M = 2.75$, $SD = .872$, faculty $M = 2.40$, $SD = .932$), policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses (students $M = 2.63$, $SD = .888$, faculty $M = 2.52$, $SD = .875$), failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course (students $M = 3.18$, $SD = .824$, faculty $M = 3.10$, $SD = .803$), failure of course is an effective

deterrent to cheating in a traditional course (students $M = 3.27$, $SD = .774$, faculty $M = 3.20$, $SD = .714$), failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course (students $M = 2.91$, $SD = .844$, faculty $M = 2.90$, $SD = .845$), failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course (students $M = 3.00$, $SD = .825$, faculty $M = 2.97$, $SD = .809$), redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course (students $M = 2.30$, $SD = .970$, faculty $M = 2.07$, $SD = .828$), redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course (students $M = 2.37$, $SD = .966$, faculty $M = 2.10$, $SD = .803$). See Table 4 for means, standard deviations, and p values related to online cheating items (i.e., questions 13 – 24).

A *t-test* was conducted comparing faculty and student responses to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in how they viewed appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating (items 44 through 56). The results of the *t-test* indicate that there was no statistically significant difference in how faculty and students viewed appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating.

Table 4

Between group Means, Standard Deviations, t and p values for Deterrent Items

Item Number	Student		Faculty		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Deterrent item composite	52.88	8.633	48.11	7.763	2.54	.01
It is easier to cheat in an online course	3.29	.738	3.17	.791	.871	.385
Proctoring exams in an online course is effective	2.98	.787	2.69	.660	1.906	.058
Proctoring exams in a traditional course is effective	3.08	.745	2.86	.639	1.477	.141
Fear prevents students from cheating in online courses	2.39	1.000	2.18	.905	1.076	.283
Fear prevents students from cheating in traditional courses	3.08	.863	2.77	.858	1.840	.067
Instructors of online courses make their policies concerning cheating clear	2.77	.918	2.57	.817	1.164	.246
Instructors of traditional courses make their policies concerning cheating clear	3.30	.782	2.90	.845	2.583	.010
Honor codes are an effective deterrent in online courses	2.34	.788	1.97	.731	2.396	.017
Honor codes are an effective deterrent in traditional courses	2.56	.818	2.07	.753	3.066	.002
University policies are an effective deterrent in online courses	2.51	.890	2.23	.898	1.589	.113
University policies are an effective deterrent in traditional courses	2.72	.872	2.40	.932	2.053	.041
Policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent in online courses	2.50	.852	2.37	.765	.785	.433
Policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent in traditional courses	2.63	.888	2.52	.785	.649	.517

Table 4 continued

Between group Means, Standard Deviations, t and p values for Deterrent Items

	Student		Faculty		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Failure of an online course is an effective deterrent	3.18	.824	3.10	.803	.503	.615
Failure of a traditional course is an effective deterrent	3.27	.774	3.20	.714	.467	.641
Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent in an online course	2.91	.844	2.90	.845	.073	.942
Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent in a traditional course	3.00	.825	2.97	.809	.236	.814
Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent in an online course	2.30	.970	2.07	.828	1.267	.206
Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent in a traditional course	2.37	.966	2.10	.803	1.464	.145

Item Analysis Using Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were run by survey item for each of the participant groups. Item analysis based on all responses can be found in Tables 5 through 20. Specifically, tables 5 through 8 summarize data related to participant perceptions of academic dishonesty in traditional courses. Tables 9 through 12 summarize data related to participant perceptions of academic dishonesty in online courses. Tables 13 through 16 summarize data related to participant perceptions of deterrents to academic dishonesty. Tables 17 through 20 summarize data related to participant perceptions of academically dishonest behaviors and the subsequent sanctions.

Table 5

Item Analysis of Undergraduate Responses to Traditional Course Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use crib notes during a test or quiz	1(1%)	5(4.5%)	7(6.3%)	17(15.3%)	81(72.9%)
Students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without authorization	0(0%)	22(19.8%)	48(43.2%)	24(21.6%)	17(15.3%)
Students who fail to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper	1(1%)	5(4.5%)	16(14.4%)	48(43.2%)	41(36.9%)
Students who plagiarize a large section of a paper	1(1%)	4(3.6%)	3(2.7%)	16(14.4%)	87(78.3%)
Students who have a friend give them significant help in writing or revising a paper	0(0%)	26(23.4%)	39(35.1%)	32(28.8%)	14(12.6%)
Students who submit the same paper during the same semester	1(1%)	33(29.7%)	32(28.8%)	19(17.1%)	26(23.4%)
Students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters	0(0%)	34(30.6%)	33(29.7%)	19(17.1%)	25(22.5%)
Students who submit a paper written by someone else	2(1.8%)	5(4.5%)	3(2.7%)	9(8.1%)	92(82.8%)

Table 5 continued

Item Analysis of Undergraduate Responses to Traditional Course Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted	1(1%)	5(4.5%)	0(0%)	16(14.4%)	89(80.1%)
Students who use Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted	2(1.8%)	3(2.7%)	4(3.6%)	15(13.5%)	87(78.3%)
Students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate	0(0%)	53(47.7%)	41(36.9%)	11(9.9%)	6(5.4%)
Students who have someone else take a test or exam for them	0(0%)	5(4.5%)	1(.9%)	7(6.3%)	98(88.3%)

Table 6

Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Traditional Course Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use crib notes during a test or quiz	1(.8%)	6(4.8%)	13(10.4%)	19(15.3%)	85(68.5%)
Students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without authorization	1(.8%)	30(24.1%)	48(38.7%)	28(22.5%)	17(13.7%)
Students who fail to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper	2(1.6%)	4(3.2%)	15(12%)	47(37.9%)	56(45.1%)
Students who plagiarize a large section of a paper	2(1.6%)	2(1.6%)	3(2.4%)	14(11.2%)	103(83%)
Students who have a friend give them significant help in writing or revising a paper	3(2.4%)	25(20.1%)	44(35.4%)	41(33%)	11(8.8%)
Students who submit the same paper during the same semesters	2(1.6%)	23(18.5%)	31(25.4%)	30(24.1%)	38(30.6%)
Students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters	2(1.6%)	22(17.7%)	40(32.2%)	30(24.1%)	30(24.1%)
Students who submit a paper written by someone else	2(1.6%)	3(2.4%)	1(.8%)	6(4.8%)	112(90.3%)

Table 6 continued

Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Traditional Course Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted	3(2.4%)	4(3.2%)	3(2.4%)	8(6.4%)	106(85.4%)
Students who use Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted	2(1.6%)	3(2.4%)	8(6.4%)	15(12%)	106(85.4%)
Students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate	2(1.6%)	58(46.7%)	48(38.7%)	12(9.6%)	4(3.2%)
Students who have someone else take a test or exam for them	2(1.6%)	3(2.4%)	1(.8%)	4(3.2%)	114(92%)

Table 7

Item Analysis of Faculty Responses to Traditional Course Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use crib notes during a test or quiz	4(28.5%)	0(0%)	2(14.3%)	2(14.3%)	6(42.9%)
Students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without authorization	2(14.2%)	2(14.2%)	2(14.2%)	3(21.4%)	5(35.7%)
Students who fail to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	1(7.7%)	5(35.7%)	7(50%)
Students who plagiarize a large section of a paper)	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	13(92.9%)
Students who have a friend give them significant help in writing or revising a paper	2(14.3%)	2(14.3%)	3(21.4%)	3(21.4%)	4(28.5%)
Students who submit the same paper during the same semester	2(14.3%)	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	2(14.3%)	9(64.3%)
Students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters	1(7.1%)	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	3(21.4%)	9(64.3%)
Students who submit a paper written by someone else	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	13(92.9%)
Students who use Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	13(92.9%)
Students who use Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	13(92.9%)

Table 7 continued

Item Analysis of Faculty Responses to Traditional Course Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate	1(7.1%)	6(42.8%)	4(28.6%)	3(21.4%)	0 (0%)
Students who have someone else take a test or exam for them	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	1 (7.1%)	0 (0%)	12(85.7%)

Table 8

Item Analysis of Adjunct Responses to Traditional Course Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use crib notes during a test or quiz	2(12.5%)	0(0%)	2(12.5%)	1(6.3%)	11(68.7%)
Students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without authorization	3(18.7%)	2(12.5%)	7(43.8%)	1(6.3%)	3(18.7%)
Students who fail to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper	2(12.5%)	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	7(43.8%)	6(37.5%)
Students who plagiarize a large section of a paper	2(12.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	13(81.2%)
Students who have a friend give them significant help in writing or revising a paper	2(12.5%)	0(0%)	6(37.5%)	6(37.5%)	2(12.5%)
Students who submit the same paper during the same semester	2(12.5%)	1(6.3%)	2(12.5%)	8(50%)	3(18.7%)
Students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters	2(12.5%)	1(6.3%)	2(12.5%)	7(43.8%)	4(28.1%)
Students who submit a paper written by someone else	2(12.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	14(87.5%)
Students who use Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted	2(12.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	14(87.5%)
Students who use Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted	2(12.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	14(87.5%)

Table 8 continued

Item Analysis of Adjunct Responses to Traditional Course Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate	2(12.5%)	3(18.7%)	9(56.3%)	1(6.3%)	1(6.3%)
Students who have someone else take a test or exam for them	2(12.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	14(87.5%)

Table 9

Item Analysis of Undergraduate Responses to Online Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use crib notes during a test or quiz	39(35.1%)	12(10.8%)	21(18.9%)	10(9%)	29(26.1%)
Students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without the authorization from the instructor	38(34.2%)	19(17.1%)	30(27%)	15(13.5%)	9(8.1%)
Students who fail to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper	39(35.1%)	0(0%)	12(10.8%)	27(24.3%)	33(29.7%)
Students who plagiarize a large section of a paper	39(35.1%)	2(1.8%)	2(1.8%)	15(13.5%)	53(47.7%)
Students who have a friend give them significant help in writing or revising a paper	39(35.1%)	17(15.3%)	27(24.3%)	17(15.3%)	11(9.9%)
Students who submit the same paper during the same semester	40(36%)	24(21.6%)	23(20.7%)	12(10.8%)	12(10.8%)
Students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters	40(36%)	25(22.5%)	22(29.8%)	13(11.7%)	11(9.9%)
Students who submit a paper written by someone else	39(35.1%)	5(4.5%)	3(2.7%)	8(7.2%)	56(50.5%)

Table 9 continued

Item Analysis of Undergraduate Responses to Online Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted	39(35.1%)	3(2.7%)	2(1.8%)	6(7.2%)	61(54.9%)
Students who use Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted	39(35.1%)	2(1.8%)	2(1.8%)	10(9%)	58(52.2%)
Students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate	39(35.1%)	39(35.1%)	24(21.6%)	6(5.4%)	3(2.7%)
Students who have someone else take a test or exam for them	39(35.1%)	2(1.8%)	1(.9%)	10(9%)	59(53.2%)

Table 10

Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Online Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use crib notes during a test or quiz	62(50%)	8(6.5%)	14(11.3%)	6(4.8%)	34(27.4%)
Students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without the authorization from the instructor	60(48.4%)	16(12.9%)	21(16.9%)	15(12.1%)	12(9.7%)
Students who fail to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper	60(48.4%)	2(1.6%)	8(6.5%)	16(12.9%)	38(30.6%)
Students who plagiarize a large section of a paper	60(48.4%)	1(.8%)	0(0%)	9(7.3%)	54(43.5%)
Students who have a friend give them significant help in writing or revising a paper	61(49.2%)	11(8.9%)	21(16.9%)	23(18.5%)	8(6.5%)
Students who submit the same paper during the same semester	61(49.2%)	12(9.7%)	17(13.7%)	15(12.1%)	19(15.3%)
Students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters	61(49.2%)	12(9.7%)	21(16.9%)	12(9.7%)	18(38.7%)
Students who submit a paper written by someone else	61(49.2%)	1(.8%)	1(.8%)	2(1.6%)	59(47.6%)

Table 10 continued

Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Online Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted	62(50%)	1(.8%)	1(.8%)	3(2.4%)	57(46%)
Students who use Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted	61(49.2%)	0(0%)	1(.8%)	7(5.7%)	55(44.3%)
Students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate	61(49.2%)	25(20.1%)	29(23.5%)	5(4%)	4(3.2%)
Students who have someone else take a test or exam for them	60(48.4%)	0(0%)	1(.8%)	2(1.6%)	61(49.2%)

Table 11

Item Analysis of Faculty Responses to Online Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use crib notes during a test or quiz	3(21.4%)	0(0%)	2(14.2%)	2(14.2%)	7(50%)
Students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without the authorization from the instructor	2(14.2%)	1(7.1%)	2(14.2%)	3(21.4%)	6(42.8%)
Students who fail to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper	2(14.2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	4(28.5%)	8(57.1%)
Students who plagiarize a large section of a paper	2(14.2%)	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	10(71.4%)
Students who have a friend give them significant help in writing or revising a paper	3(21.4%)	2(14.2%)	2(14.2%)	2(14.2%)	5(35.7%)
Students who submit the same paper during the same semester	2(14.2%)	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	3(21.4%)	8(57.1%)
Students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters	2(14.2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	3(21.4%)	9(64.3%)
Students who submit a paper written by someone else	2(14.2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	12(85.7%)
Students who use Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted	2(14.2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	11(78.6%)

Table 11

Item Analysis of Faculty Responses to Online Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted	2(14.2%)	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	11(78.6%)
Students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate	2(14.2%)	6(42.8%)	1(7.1%)	4(28.5%)	1(7.1%)
Students who have someone else take a test or exam for them	2(14.2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	2(14.2%)	10(71.4%)

Table 12

Item Analysis of Adjunct Responses to Online Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use crib notes during a test or quiz	3(18.6%)	1(6.3%)	5(31.3%)	2(12.5%)	5(31.3%)
Students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without the authorization from the instructor	3(18.6%)	1(6.3%)	3(18.6%)	4(25%)	5(31.3%)
Students who fail to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper	3(18.6%)	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	3(18.6%)	9(56.3%)
Students who plagiarize a large section of a paper	3(18.6%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	12(75%)
Students who have a friend give them significant help in writing or revising a paper	3(18.6%)	0(0%)	5(31.3%)	6(37.5%)	2(12.5%)
Students who submit the same paper during the same semester	3(18.6%)	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	8(50%)	4(25%)
Students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters	3(18.6%)	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	6(37.5%)	6(37.5%)
Students who submit a paper written by someone else	3(18.6%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	13(81.3%)
Students who use Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted	3(18.6%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	13(81.3%)

Table 12 continued

Item Analysis of Adjunct Responses to Online Cheating

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Students who use Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted	3(18.6%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	13(81.3%)
Students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate	3(18.6%)	2(12.5%)	9(56.3%)	1(6.3%)	1(6.3%)
Students who have someone else take a test or exam for them	3(18.6%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	13(81.3%)

Table 13

Item Analysis for Undergraduate Responses to Deterrents

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
It is easier to cheat in an online course than in a traditional course	7(6.3%)	0(0%)	6(5.4%)	44(39.63%)	54(48.6%)
Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in an online course	7(6.3%)	4(3.6%)	16(14.4%)	55(49.5%)	29(26.1%)
Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in a traditional course	4(3.6%)	3(2.7%)	17(15.3%)	51(45.9%)	36(32.4%)
Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in online courses	8(7.2%)	27(24.3%)	26(23.4%)	32(28.8%)	18(16.2%)
Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in traditional courses	2(1.8)	8(7.2%)	12(10.8%)	47(42.3%)	42(37.8%)
Instructors in online courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	17(15.3)	10(9%)	25(22.5%)	34(30.6%)	25(22.5%)
Instructors in traditional courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	2(1.8)	1(.9%)	8(7.2%)	43(38.7%)	57(51.3%)
Honor codes are an effective deterrent in online courses	11(9.9%)	18(16.2%)	42(37.8%)	33(29.7%)	7 (6.3%)

Table 13 continued

Item Analysis for Undergraduate Responses to Deterrents

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Honor codes are an effective deterrent in traditional courses	3(2.7%)	12(10.8%)	32(28.8%)	50(45%)	14(12.6%)
Stated university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses	11(9.9%)	18(16.2%)	30(27%)	36(32.4%)	16(14.4%)
Stated university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses	1(.9%)	11(9.9%)	23(20.7%)	48(43.2%)	28(25.2%)
Stated policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses	10(9%)	15(13.5%)	40(36%)	31(27.9%)	15(13.5%)
Stated policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses	1(.9%)	14(12.6%)	35(31.5%)	37(33%)	24(21.6%)
Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	8(7.2%)	7(6.3%)	10(9%)	48(43.2%)	38(34.2%)
Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	1(.9%)	4(3.6%)	11(9.9%)	47(42.3%)	48(43.2%)
Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	8(7.2%)	10(9%)	25(22.5%)	39(37.1%)	29(26.1%)

Table 13 continued

<i>Item Analysis for Undergraduate Responses to Deterrents</i>					
	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	2(1.8%)	8(7.2%)	24(21.6%)	39(35.1%)	38(34.2%)
Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	11(9.9%)	28(25.2%)	35(31.5%)	24(21.6%)	13(11.7%)
Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	2(1.8%)	28(25.2%)	39(35.1%)	27(24.3%)	15(13.5%)

Table 14

Item Analysis for Graduate Responses to Deterrents

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
It is easier to cheat in an online course than in a traditional course	14(11.3%)	5(4%)	15(12.1%)	51(41.1%)	40(32.2%)
Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in an online course	14(11.3%)	6(4.8%)	22(17.7%)	57(46%)	25(20.1%)
Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in a traditional course	7(5.6%)	3(2.4%)	19(15.3%)	66(53.2%)	29(23.3%)
Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in online courses	13(10.5%)	21(16.9%)	41(33%)	34(27.4%)	15(12%)
Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in traditional courses	7(5.6%)	8(6.5%)	16(12.9%)	58(46.8%)	35(24.1%)
Instructors in online courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	28(22.6%)	10(8%)	21(16.9%)	47(37.9%)	18(14.5%)
Instructors in traditional courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	3(2.4%)	7(5.6%)	14(11.2%)	51(41.1%)	49(39.5%)
Honor codes are an effective deterrent in online courses	16(12.9%)	12(9.6%)	47(37.9%)	45(36.3%)	4(3.2%)

Table 14 continued

<i>Item Analysis for Graduate Responses to Deterrents</i>					
	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Honor codes are an effective deterrent in traditional courses	3(2.4%)	13(10.5%)	42(33.8%)	57(47.1%)	9(7.3%)
Stated university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses	12(9.7%)	10(8%)	47(37.9%)	42(46%)	13(10.5%)
Stated university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses	2(1.6%)	8(6.5%)	44(35.5%)	51(41.1%)	19(15.3%)
Stated policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses	(7.2%)	10(8%)	45(36.2%)	49(39.5%)	11(8.8%)
Stated policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses	2(1.6%)	10(8%)	43(34.6%)	53(42.8%)	16(12.9%)
Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	11(8.8%)	5(4%)	11(8.8%)	51(41.1%)	46(37%)
Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	4(3.2%)	4(3.2%)	11(8.8%)	53(42.8%)	52(41.9%)

Table 14 continued

Item Analysis for Graduate Responses to Deterrents

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	11(8.8%)	3(2.4%)	23(18.5%)	61(49.1%)	26(21%)
Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	4(3.2%)	2(1.6%)	23(18.5%)	65(52.4%)	30(24.2%)
Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	9(7.2%)	22(17.7%)	43(34.6%)	35(28.2%)	15(12.1%)
Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	3(2.4%)	21(16.9%)	39(31.5%)	45(36.3%)	16(12.9%)

Table 15

Item Analysis for Faculty Responses to Deterrents

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
It is easier to cheat in an online course than in a traditional course	0(0%)	0(0%)	5(37.5%)	6(42.9%)	3(21.4%)
Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in an online course	0(0%)	0(0%)	6(42.9%)	6(42.9%)	2(14.3%)
Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in a traditional course	0(0%)	0(0%)	4(28.6%)	8(57.1%)	2(14.3%)
Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in online courses	1(7.1%)	3(21.4%)	4(28.6%)	4(28.6%)	2(14.3%)
Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in traditional courses	0(0%)	2(14.3%)	3(21.4%)	6(42.9%)	3(21.4%)
Instructors in online courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	0(0%)	2(14.3%)	3(21.4%)	8(57.1%)	1(7.1%)
Instructors in traditional courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	0(0%)	2(14.3%)	3(21.4%)	6(42.9%)	3(21.4%)
Honor codes are an effective deterrent in online courses	1(7.1%)	5(37.5%)	4(28.6%)	4(28.6%)	0(0%)
Honor codes are an effective deterrent in traditional courses	1(7.1%)	5(37.5%)	3(21.4%)	5(37.5%)	0(0%)
Stated university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses	0(0%)	5(35.7%)	5(35.7%)	3(21.4%)	1(7.1%)

Table 15 continued

Item Analysis for Faculty Responses to Deterrents

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Stated university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses	0(0%)	5(35.7%)	5(35.7%)	3(21.4%)	1(7.1%)
Stated policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses	0(0%)	3(21.4%)	5(35.7%)	6(42.9%)	0(0%)
Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	1(7.1%)	7(50%)	5(35.7%)
Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	1(7.1%)	7(50%)	5(35.7%)
Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	2(14.3%)	7 (50%)	4(28.6%)
Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	3(21.4%)	6(42.9%)	4(28.6%)
Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	0(0%)	4(28.6%)	3(21.4%)	7(50%)	0(0%)
Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	0(0%)	4(28.6%)	3(21.4%)	7(50%)	0(0%)

Table 16

Item Analysis for Adjunct Faculty Responses to Deterrents

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
It is easier to cheat in an online course than in a traditional course	0(0%)	0(0%)	2(12.5%)	5(31.3%)	9(56.3%)
Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in an online course	1(6.3%)	0(0%)	6(37.5%)	8(50%)	1(6.3%)
Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in a traditional course	1(6.3%)	0(0%)	4(25%)	9(56.2%)	2(12.5%)
Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in online courses	1(6.3%)	4(25%)	7(43.8%)	4(25%)	0(0%)
Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in traditional courses	0(0%)	0(0%)	6(37.5%)	7(43.8%)	3(18.8%)
Instructors in online courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	7(43.8%)	6(37.5%)	2(12.5%)
Instructors in traditional courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	0(0%)	0 (0%)	3(18.8%)	9(56.3%)	4(25%)
Honor codes are an effective deterrent in online courses	1(6.3%)	3(18.8%)	19(56.2%)	3(18.8%)	0(0%)

Table 16 continued

Item Analysis for Adjunct Faculty Responses to Deterrents

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Honor codes are an effective deterrent in traditional courses	0(0%)	2(12.5%)	10(62.5%)	4(25%)	0(0%)
Stated university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	9(56.3%)	4(25%)	2(12.5%)
Stated university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses	0(0%)	0(0%)	7(43.8%)	6(37.5%)	3(18.8%)
Stated policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	7(43.8%)	7(43.8%)	1(6.3%)
Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	1(6.3%)	10(62.5%)	4(25%)
Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	10(62.5%)	5(31.3%)
Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	4(25%)	8(50%)	3(18.8%)

Table 16 continued

Item Analysis for Adjunct Faculty Responses to Deterrents

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	0(0%)	4(25%)	10(62.5%)	1(6.3%)	1(6.3%)
Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	0(0%)	3(18.8%)	11(68.8%)	1(6.3%)	1(6.3%)

Table 17

Item Analysis for Undergraduate Responses to Scenarios (items 44 through 56)

John Doe took Special Education 401 in the Fall Semester, 1997. His friend, Samantha, took Special Education 401 in the Spring Semester, 1998. John gave Samantha all his prior work from the course. Samantha found John's answers to prior exams and uses these to prepare for tests in the course.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that John has cheated?	1(9%)	28(25.2%)	43(38.7%)	23(20.7%)	16(14.4%)
Do you believe that Samantha has cheated?	1(9%)	22(19.8%)	26(23.4%)	36(29%)	26(23.4%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	1(9%)	3(2.7%)	27(24.2%)	40(36%)	40(36%)

Table 17 continued

Item Analysis for Undergraduate Responses to Scenarios (items 44 through 56)

Samantha also discovered that John had received good grades on some written assignments for the class. Many of these assignments required John to go to the library to look up articles about various topics. Samantha decides to forego the library work and uses John's articles for her papers in the class.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Samantha has cheated?	0(0%)	10 (9%)	16(14.4%)	44 (39.6%)	41 (36.9%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	2(1.8%)	1(.9%)	24(21.6%)	60(39.6%)	24(21.6%)

Table 17 continued

Item Analysis for Undergraduate Responses to Scenarios (items 44 through 56)

Billy has a research paper due in Special Education 700 tomorrow. He is having trouble writing and asks his friend Bob for help. Bob reads and does major editing on Billy's paper. Billy submits the paper.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Billy has cheated?	0(0%)	38(34.2%)	44(39.6%)	25(22.5%)	4(3.6%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	0(0%)	0(0%)	5(4.5%)	36(32.4%)	70(63.1%)

A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Maria has cheated?	0(0%)	41(36.9%)	46(41.4%)	16(14.4%)	8(7.2%)
Do you believe that Yvette has cheated?	0(0%)	42(37.8%)	46(41.5%)	16(14.4%)	7(6.3%)

Table 17 continued

Item Analysis for Undergraduate Responses to Scenarios (items 44 through 56)

		Dismissal from University n (%)	Failure of class n (%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (%)	No consequence n (%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	1(9%)	0(0%)	5(4.5%)	21(18.9%)	84(75.7%)

A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed independently and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Maria has cheated?	1(9%)	10(9%)	19(18%)	48(43.2%)	33(29.7%)
Do you believe that Yvette has cheated?	0(0%)	10(9%)	18(16.3%)	51(45.9%)	32(28.8%)
		Dismissal from University n (%)	Failure of class n (%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (%)	No consequence n (%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	2(1.8%)	0(0%)	7(6.3%)	74(65.7%)	28(25.2%)

Table 18

Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

John Doe took Special Education 401 in the Fall Semester, 1997. His friend, Samantha, took Special Education 401 in the Spring Semester, 1998. John gave Samantha all his prior work from the course. Samantha found John's answers to prior exams and uses these to prepare for tests in the course.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that John has cheated?	1(.8%)	23(18.5%)	56(45.1%)	29(23.3%)	15(12%)
Do you believe that Samantha has cheated?	4(3.2%)	17(13.7%)	44(35.8%)	26(20.9%)	33(26.6%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	2(1.8%)	5(4%)	21(16.9%)	44(35.4%)	52(41.9%)

Samantha also discovered that John had received good grades on some written assignments for the class. Many of these assignments required John to go to the library to look up articles about various topics. Samantha decides to forego the library work and uses John's articles for her papers in the class.

Table 18 continued

<i>Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)</i>					
	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Samantha has cheated?	2(1.8%)	11(8.9%)	31(25%)	35(28.2%)	45(36.3%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	4(3.2%)	5(4%)	27(21.8%)	49(39.5%)	39(31.5%)

Billy has a research paper due in Special Education 700 tomorrow. He is having trouble writing and asks his friend Bob for help. Bob reads and does major editing on Billy's paper. Billy submits the paper.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Billy has cheated?	2(1.8%)	30(24.2%)	58(46.8%)	27(21.8%)	7(5.6%)

Table 18 continued

Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	2(1.8%)	4(3.2%)	3(2.4%)	49(30.7%)	77(62.1%)

A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Maria has cheated?	1(.9%)	30(24.2%)	65(52.4%)	18(14.5%)	10(8.1%)
Do you believe that Yvette has cheated?	1(.9%)	33(26.6%)	62(50%)	18(14.5%)	10(8.1%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	4(3.2%)	3(2.4%)	5(4%)	22(17.4%)	90(72.6%)

Table 18 continued

Item Analysis of Graduate Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed independently and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Maria has cheated?	2(1.8%)	11(8.8%)	16(12.9%)	55(44.3%)	40(32.3%)
Do you believe that Yvette has cheated?	1(.9%)	11(8.9%)	18(14.5%)	53(42.7%)	40(32.3%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	2(1.6%)	4(3.2%)	11(8.9%)	82(60.9%)	25(20.2%)

Table 19

Item Analysis for Faculty Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

John Doe took Special Education 401 in the Fall Semester, 1997. His friend, Samantha, took Special Education 401 in the Spring Semester, 1998. John gave Samantha all his prior work from the course. Samantha found John's answers to prior exams and uses these to prepare for tests in the course.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that John has cheated?	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	5(35.7%)	3(21.4%)	5(35.7%)
Do you believe that Samantha has cheated?	0(0%)	2(14.3%)	5(35.7%)	0(0%)	7(50%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	4(28.5%)	7(49.9%)	2(14.3%)

Table 19 continued

Item Analysis for Faculty Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

Samantha also discovered that John had received good grades on some written assignments for the class. Many of these assignments required John to go to the library to look up articles about various topics. Samantha decides to forego the library work and uses John's articles for her papers in the class.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Samantha has cheated?	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	2(14.3%)	5(35.7%)	6(42.9%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	0(0%)	0(0%)	2(14.3%)	8(57.1%)	4(28.6%)

Billy has a research paper due in Special Education 700 tomorrow. He is having trouble writing and asks his friend Bob for help. Bob reads and does major editing on Billy's paper. Billy submits the paper.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Billy has cheated?	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	5(35.7%)	3(21.4%)	5(35.7%)

Table 19 continued

Item Analysis for Faculty Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	5(35.7%)	9(64.3%)
A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.					
	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Maria has cheated?	0(0%)	2(14.3%)	4(28.6%)	2(14.3%)	6(42.9%)
Do you believe that Yvette has cheated?	0(0%)	2(14.3%)	4(28.6%)	2(14.3%)	6(42.9%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	0(0%)	0(0%)	2(14.3%)	6(42.9%)	6(42.9%)

Table 19 continued

Item Analysis for Faculty Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed independently and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Maria has cheated?	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	6(42.8%)	6(42.8%)
Do you believe that Yvette has cheated?	1(7.1%)	0(0%)	1(7.1%)	6(42.8%)	6(42.8%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	2(14.3%)	0(0%)	3(21.4%)	9(64%)	1(7.1%)

Table 20

Item Analysis for Adjunct Faculty Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

John Doe took Special Education 401 in the Fall Semester, 1997. His friend, Samantha, took Special Education 401 in the Spring Semester, 1998. John gave Samantha all his prior work from the course. Samantha found John's answers to prior exams and uses these to prepare for tests in the course.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that John has cheated?	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	7(43.8%)	4(25%)	4(25%)
Do you believe that Samantha has cheated?	(0%)	1(6.3%)	5(31.3%)	4(25%)	6(37.5%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	1(6.3%)	0(0%)	7(43.4%)	4(25%)	4(25%)

Table 20 continued

Item Analysis for Adjunct Faculty Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

Samantha also discovered that John had received good grades on some written assignments for the class. Many of these assignments required John to go to the library to look up articles about various topics. Samantha decides to forego the library work and uses John's articles for her papers in the class.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Samantha has cheated?	0(0%)	0(0%)	4(25%)	7(43.8%)	5(31.3%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	0(0%)	0(0%)	3(18.8%)	9(46.3%)	4(25%)

Billy has a research paper due in Special Education 700 tomorrow. He is having trouble writing and asks his friend Bob for help. Bob reads and does major editing on Billy's paper. Billy submits the paper.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Billy has cheated?	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	10(62.5%)	5(31.3%)	0(0%)

Table 20 continued

Item Analysis for Adjunct Faculty Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	1(6.3%)	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	5(31.3%)	9(56.3%)
A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.					
	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Maria has cheated?	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	12(75%)	3(18.8%)	0(0%)
Do you believe that Yvette has cheated?	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	12(75%)	3(18.8%)	0(0%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	1(6.3%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	3(18.8%)	12(75%)

Table 20 continued

Item Analysis for Adjunct Faculty Responses to Scenarios (items 44 – 56)

A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed independently and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.

	No Response n (%)	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you believe that Maria has cheated?	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	9(56.3%)	6(37.5%)
Do you believe that Yvette has cheated?	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(6.3%)	9(56.3%)	6(37.5%)
		Dismissal from University n (0%)	Failure of class n (0%)	Failure of assignment/Redo/ Average Grades n (0%)	No consequence n (0%)
Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take	0(0%)	0(0%)	2(12.5%)	13(81.3%)	1(6.3%)

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Academic dishonesty is a difficult concept to define. Much of the research related to academic dishonesty has focused on the characteristics of (Brownell, 1921; Singhal, 1982) and attitudes toward cheating (Drake, 1941; Jenson, 1972). Included among the prominent characteristics are neuroses and lower intelligence. Also identified in the literature are reasons for cheating (Finn and Frone, 2004; Olt, 2002). Students are more likely to cheat when enrolled in large introductory classes and when they feel less connection with the institution (Fishbein, 1993). A few researchers (Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor, 1992; Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce, 1996; Love and Simmons, 1997, 1998) studied deterrents to cheating and found separate forms of an exam, desk arrangement, and proctoring to be effective. Researchers (Ashworth and Bannister, 1997; Brown and Howell, 2001) also investigated sanctions for cheating. They found that understanding the student perspective and providing clear statements on plagiarism allows faculty the opportunity to fully discuss appropriate norms with their students.

Much of the literature focused on student perceptions of academic dishonesty (Bates, Davies, Murphy, and Bone, 2005; Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor, 1992; Ferrell and Ferguson, 1993; Love and Simmons, 1997, 1998; Partello, 1993) and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty (Aaron and Georgia, 1994; Pincus and Schmelkin,

2003) without considering whether student and faculty perceptions differ. Research in the area of comparing faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty in both traditional and online environments has been limited. Only two studies were located that involved a comparison of faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty (Roth and McCabe, 1994; Sims, 1995). These two studies involved a comparison of faculty and student perceptions related to academic dishonesty within traditional settings. Roth and McCabe found that student and faculty perceptions differed whereas Sims found the perceptions to be the same. There has been little to no research to date that focused on faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty in online environments. Also, studies involving education students and faculty are limited (Ashworth and Bannister, 1997; Ferrell and Ferguson, 1993) and studies involving special education students and faculties appear to be nonexistent. Additionally, studies comparing the perceptions of full and adjunct faculty as well as comparing undergraduate and graduate student perceptions related to academic dishonesty appear to be nonexistent.

The purposes of this study were: (a) to investigate the perceptions of academic dishonesty among special education faculty and students particularly related to the subtleties or gray areas that surround issues of academic dishonesty, (b) to determine how to decrease incidences of academic dishonesty, and (c) to find potential solutions to the problem of academic dishonesty. Two instruments were developed for use in this study: (1) the *Faculty Perspectives Survey* (see Appendix A), and (2) the *Student Perspectives Survey* (see Appendix B).

Both the *Faculty Perspectives Survey* and the *Student Perspectives Survey* were designed to gather responses regarding perceptions of academic dishonesty, deterrents to

academic dishonesty, and sanctions for committing academically dishonest acts.

Responses were measured using a Likert type scale.

Faculty and Student Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

Faculty and students enrolled at a university in the southwest were surveyed to determine their views on academic dishonesty in traditional and online courses.

Specifically, they were asked whether certain behaviors were considered academically dishonest, what behaviors were viewed as appropriate deterrents, and the type of sanction required for a student who committed an academically dishonest act. The remainder of this chapter includes discussion related to each research question, study conclusions, recommendations for future research, and a brief summary.

Research Question 1. Is there a difference between special education faculty (full-time and adjunct faculty) and special education student (undergraduate and graduate) perceptions related to what constitutes online cheating?

The results obtained from the t-test indicated there was a statistically significant difference between how faculty and students viewed academic dishonesty in online learning. Faculty members had a more stringent view of academic dishonesty in online courses than students. Specifically, faculty believed that students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without the authorization of the instructor are cheating. Without further study, it is difficult to determine why this difference in perception emerged. Perhaps faculty members assume that students understand that individual performance is expected without explicitly stating it. It is also possible that students assume that collaboration with peers is an acceptable way to learn course content. It would be

interesting to determine whether the nature of special education course content influences student perception related to collaboration on assignments. Much of the special education teacher preparation curriculum focuses on the importance and likely benefits of collaborative activities with parents, general education teachers, and other professionals. Additionally, instructional activities used in special education courses frequently involve having students work in small groups in a collaborative manner. Within online classes, instructors have the option of establishing small discussion and work groups within the class. The discussion features available through online teaching platforms are frequently used in an attempt to establish a classroom community. Because class participants do not meet face to face, instructors use strategies to try to build a collaborative community within an online environment. The expectation is that students will learn from one another. Group assignments within special education courses also are common practice among some faculty members. This dichotomy between course content and related instructional practices and the expectation that students complete assignments independently may mean that instructor expectations for each assignment need to be stated very clearly. Another difference between faculty and student perceptions related to online cheating involved the submission of papers. Faculty believed that students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters are cheating. Students did not believe that this was cheating. Again, it seems that expectations related to the submission of papers need to be explicitly stated. It seems that without this explicitness students either genuinely assume that turning in the same paper if it meets the requirements for two different classes is acceptable or they choose to take advantage of the lack of

explicitness on the part of the instructors. Further study could help determine which is the case.

Results of the t-test indicated that there was no significant difference in how faculty members and students view academic dishonesty related to students who use crib notes during a test or quiz, students who fail to document proper paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper, students who plagiarize a large section of a paper, students who have a friend lend significant help in writing or revising a paper, students who submit the same paper during the same semester, students who submit a paper written by someone else, students who use internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted, students who use internet sources to plagiarize a portion of a paper to be submitted, students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate, and students who have someone else take a test or exam for them. This result suggests that with regard to cheating behaviors in online courses, faculty and student views are similar. It is interesting, however, to note that several of the items in which faculty and student perceptions were similar involve issues surrounding plagiarism. It is possible that more time is spent clarifying what constitutes plagiarism, as this is a concept that has had a generally accepted definition for years. Professional writers understood the rules that govern plagiarism, university administrations typically develop policy statements related to plagiarism, and subsequently faculties and students seem to have clear understandings related to this concept.

Research Question 2. Is there a difference between special education faculty and special education student perceptions related to what constitutes in-class cheating?

Results from the t-test indicated there was a statistically significant difference in how faculty and students viewed academic dishonesty in traditional learning.

Specifically, the faculty believed that students who submit the same paper during the same semester and students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters are cheating. These results are similar to those of cheating in online courses. This result indicates faculty believe that when students are given an assignment to write a paper, they should submit an original work, rather than an assignment completed for another class.

In order to decrease the incidence of students submitting the same paper twice, either in the same or different semesters, dialogue needs to occur between faculty members and students. Since students believe that it is acceptable to submit an identical paper for two assignments, it seems as though faculty members need to explicitly state that the assignment meets only the criteria for the current class. Students need to hear that it is unacceptable for one assignment to be submitted twice. It is also important for faculty members to agree on the sanction for an assignment that is submitted without revision more than once. Once a sanction is decided upon, students need to be informed. It would seem that since students feel that submitting a paper twice is acceptable that they should continually be told that the behavior is unacceptable and the consequence for continuing the behavior. Further study could help decipher why students feel this behavior is acceptable.

Results from the t-test indicated there were no statistically significant differences between faculty and student opinions related to students who use crib notes during a test or quiz, students who fail to document proper paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper,

students who plagiarize a large section of a paper, students who have a friend lend significant help in writing or revising a paper, students who submit a paper written by someone else, students who use internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted, students who use internet sources to plagiarize a portion of a paper to be submitted, students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate, and students who have someone else take a test or exam for them. These results are similar to those for cheating in online courses. These findings add to previous literature related to comparisons of faculty and students perceptions of cheating. Roth and McCabe (1994) and Sims (1995) also assessed faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty in traditional settings. As a result of their study, Roth and McCabe (1994) were able to conclude that faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty are different. On the other hand, Sims (1995) was able to conclude that faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty are similar. The results of the current study contradict Roth and McCabe's results and support Sims results. In this study, on the majority of items, faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty are similar.

Research Question 3. Is there a difference between adjunct and full-time special education faculty members' perceptions related to what constitutes online cheating?

Results from the t-test indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between full-time and adjunct faculty views of cheating in online courses. It appears that regardless of whether university teaching is a full-time or part-time endeavor consensus exists with regard to what constitutes cheating in online environments. It was encouraging to see this level of consensus in spite of the limited amount of time the two faculty groups have to interact and in spite of online instruction being a relatively new

approach to teaching. This type of consensus across types of faculty members is important in terms of communicating consistent messages to students with regard to cheating.

Research Question 4. Is there a difference between adjunct and full-time special education faculty members' perceptions related to what constitutes in-class cheating?

Results from the t-test indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between full-time and adjunct faculty views of cheating in traditional courses.

These results are similar to the results of research question 3. They suggest that full-time and adjunct faculty view cheating in online and traditional courses similarly. Many of the adjunct faculty are current or recently graduated doctoral students. Thus these results are important because they suggest that adjunct faculty members take their position seriously and that they are able to distinguish between being an adjunct faculty member and a student. The level of confidence placed upon adjunct faculty is high and adjunct faculty members are able to uphold the standard of academic honesty.

Bates, Davies, Murphy and Bone (2005) found that the majority of respondents did not think that borrowing a friend's work for ideas was academically dishonest. In a similar study, Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) found faculty did not feel studying from someone else's notes was academically dishonest. The results of the current study support the findings of Bates et al. and Pincus and Schmelkin. Faculty and students did not believe that borrowing a friend's work for ideas was an act of academic dishonesty.

Research Question 5. Is there a difference between special education undergraduate and graduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty related to:

- a. What constitutes cheating?

b. Deterrents to cheating?

c. Appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating?

Results from the t-test analysis indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between graduate and undergraduate students views of what constitutes cheating, deterrents to cheating, and appropriate actions to take regarding cheating. These results indicate that student perceptions of academic dishonesty are similar regardless of the number of years within a higher education setting. The results also indicated that the beliefs about academic dishonesty among the types of individuals who decide to pursue graduate education are no different than the beliefs among individuals who may or may not decide to pursue graduate education.

The literature also addresses the issue of deterrents to cheating (Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor, 1992; Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce, 1996; Love and Simmons, 1997, 1998). Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992) and Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce (1996) found that students felt that faculty should arrange seating so students are separated, walk up and down aisles during an exam, and watch the students. In other words, they should proctor their exams. The results of the current study support this finding. Love and Simmons (1997, 1998) found that submitting the same paper for two classes and collaborating on individual assignments were not seen as cheating. The results of the current study directly contradict this finding. In the current study, faculty believed that submitting the same paper for two classes and collaborating on individual assignments are viewed as cheating.

Research Question 6. Is there a difference between special education faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty related to:

- a. Deterrents to cheating?
- b. Appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating?

Results from the t-test indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between faculty and students views on deterrents to cheating. Specifically, the students believed that use of honor codes is an effective deterrent of cheating in traditional classes. These results suggest that students are more willing to believe that honor codes work than are faculty. This could be the result of faculty prior experience with honor codes or cynicism that has developed as a result of observing acts of dishonesty among students over time.

There were no statistically significant differences between faculty and student opinions related to it being easier to cheat in an online course than in a traditional course, proctored exams being an effective way to prevent cheating in an online and traditional courses, fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in online and traditional courses, instructors in online courses and traditional courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear, honor codes being an effective deterrent in online courses, university policies being an effective deterrent to cheating in online and traditional courses, policies on syllabi being an effective deterrent to cheating in online and traditional courses, failure of course being an effective deterrent to cheating in online and traditional courses, failure of assignment being an effective deterrent to cheating in online course and traditional courses, redoing the assignment being an effective deterrent to cheating in online and traditional courses. These results indicate that faculty and student views of deterrents to cheating are similar. For example, faculty and students agree that fear of getting caught prevents students from cheating. In addition, they agree

that stated policies on syllabi are effective deterrents to cheating. These results indicate that faculty and students believe that with the exception of using honor codes as a deterrent in traditional courses, all other deterrents are effective.

The results of the t-test indicate that there was no statistically significant difference in how faculty and students viewed appropriate actions to take with regard to cheating. This result indicates that when faculty and students agree on cheating behaviors, they also agree on the consequence for the behavior.

Conclusions

Four conclusions can be drawn from this study. These conclusions are based on the quantitative data that were collected.

1. Faculty and students agree on most of the cheating behaviors in online courses.

They disagreed on only two items, that students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without the authorization of the instructor are cheating and students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters are cheating. Faculty agreed that these behaviors were cheating and students did not.

2. Faculty and students agree on most of the cheating behaviors in traditional courses. They again disagreed on two items, that students who submit the same paper during the same semester and students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters are cheating. Faculty agreed that these behaviors were indeed cheating, students did not.

3. Faculty and students agree on most of the deterrents to cheating. They disagreed on the use of honor codes in traditional courses. Students believed that honor codes were an effective deterrent while faculty did not.
4. Undergraduate and graduate students as well as full-time and adjunct faculty agreed on most behaviors that constitute cheating, deterrents to cheating, and sanctions for cheating.

Recommendations for Future Research

This current study extended previous research by (a) comparing faculty and student perceptions of academically dishonesty acts; (b) determining what perceptions exist with regard to deterrents to academic dishonesty; and (c) determining what perceptions exist with regard to consequences for academic dishonesty. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations for future research are made:

1. Research is needed to determine why cheating still occurs given that faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty are similar.
2. Research is needed to determine why faculty and students disagree on the use of honor codes as an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses.
3. Research similar to this study should be replicated on a larger scale (local, state, or national) to determine whether the results can be generalized beyond one university.

Summary

The methodology, data collection procedures and data analysis were appropriate for meeting the stated purposes of this study. Findings revealed that in most cases, faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty are similar. These perceptions were related to academic dishonesty in online and traditional courses, deterrents to cheating, and sanctions for cheating. Differences occurred related to submitting the same paper during consecutive semesters in both online and traditional courses, collaborating on an out of class assignment without the authorization of the instructor in an online course, submitting the same paper in the same semester in traditional courses, and use of honor codes as an effective deterrent in traditional courses. Faculty believed that submitting the same paper during consecutive semesters in both online and traditional courses, collaborating on an out of class assignment without the authorization of the instructor in an online course, submitting the same paper in the same semester in traditional courses was considered cheating and students did not. Students believed that use of honor codes is an effective deterrent in traditional courses and faculty did not.

Based on the review of the literature conducted for this study, only two studies have been conducted that compared faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty (Roth and McCabe, 1994; Sims, 1995) in traditional settings. These two studies provided a basis for comparing faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty in traditional courses. There has been little to no literature to date in which researchers studied faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty in online environments. In addition, there were no studies to date related to special education faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty. This current study represents an

extension of the existing literature. Differing from the previous research, this study included perceptions of academic dishonesty in online courses as well as perceptions of faculty and students in a department of special education.

Although faculty and student perceptions were similar in most areas related to academic dishonesty, there were a few areas that seem to need explicit statements from faculty members to students or further dialogue between faculty and students. These areas relate to what constitutes cheating. Specifically, differences between faculty and student perceptions about submitting the same paper twice in the same or consecutive semesters and collaborating on assignments need to be addressed.

Future research related to faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty will provide valuable information in how to decrease incidents of academic dishonesty in higher education. Specifically, it will allow faculty and students the opportunity to dialogue about what constitutes academic dishonesty and deterrents to academic dishonesty.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT PERSPECTIVES SURVEY

Student Perspectives Survey

Directions: Please circle the response that most represents your experience or opinion.

Have you taken both online and traditional (face-to-face) courses? Yes No

If you have taken traditional courses only, skip questions 13 through 24.

TRADITIONAL COURSES (EVERYONE COMPLETES THIS SECTION)

Directions: The following questions address academic dishonesty. Please indicate whether you believe these behaviors are cheating. Circle the number that corresponds with your perceptions.

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Using crib notes during a test or quiz | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Collaborating on an out of class assignment without the authorization from the instructor | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Failing to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Plagiarizing (i.e., copy without giving the original author credit) a large section of a paper | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Having a friend give you significant help in writing or revising a paper | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Submitting the same paper during the same semester | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Submitting the same paper during consecutive semesters | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Submitting a paper written by someone else | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Using Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Using Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. Using email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Having someone else take a test or exam for you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

ONLINE COURSES (ONLY THOSE WHO HAVE TAKEN AN ONLINE OR HYBRID COURSE COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

Directions: The following questions address academic dishonesty. Please indicate whether you believe these behaviors are cheating. Circle the number that corresponds with your perceptions.

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 13. Using crib notes during a test or quiz | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. Collaborating on an out of class assignment without the authorization from the instructor | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. Failing to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. Plagiarizing (i.e., copy without giving the original author credit) a large section of a paper | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17. Having a friend give you significant help in writing or revising a paper | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. Submitting the same paper during the same semester | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19. Submitting the same paper during consecutive semesters | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20. Submitting a paper written by someone else | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21. Using Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22. Using Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23. Using email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 24. Having someone else take a test or exam for you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

DETERRENTS (EVERYONE COMPLETES THIS SECTION)

Directions: Please Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. Circle the number that corresponds with your perception.

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 25. It is easier to cheat in an online course than in a traditional course | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26. Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in an online course | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree				
27. Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in a traditional course	1	2	3	4
28. Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in online courses	1	2	3	4
29. Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in traditional courses	1	2	3	4
30. Instructors of online courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	1	2	3	4
31. Instructors of traditional courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	1	2	3	4
32. Honor codes are an effective deterrent in online courses	1	2	3	4
33. Honor codes are an effective deterrent in traditional courses	1	2	3	4
34. University policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses	1	2	3	4
35. University policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses	1	2	3	4
36. Policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses	1	2	3	4
37. Policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses	1	2	3	4
38. Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	1	2	3	4
39. Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	1	2	3	4
40. Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	1	2	3	4
41. Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	1	2	3	4
42. Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course	1	2	3	4
43. Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course	1	2	3	4

SCENARIOS (EVERYONE COMPLETES THIS SECTION)

Directions: Please read the following scenarios and determine whether or not the student has cheated. Circle the number that corresponds with your perception.

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

John Doe took Special Education 401 in the Fall Semester, 1997. His friend, Samantha, took Special Education 401 in the Spring Semester, 1998. John gave Samantha all his prior work from the course. Samantha found John's answers to prior exams and used them to prepare for tests in the course.

44. Do you believe that John has cheated? 1 2 3 4

45. Do you believe that Samantha has cheated? 1 2 3 4

46. Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take

- a. Recommend dismissal from University
- b. Failure of class
- c. Failure of assignment
- d. Give an "F" on the original assignment, have the student re-do the assignment and average the two grades
- e. No consequence

Samantha also discovered that John had received good grades on some written assignments for the class. Many of these assignments required John to go to the library to look up articles about various topics. Samantha decides to forego the library work and uses John's articles for her papers in the class.

47. Do you believe that Samantha has cheated? 1 2 3 4

48. Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take

- a. Recommend dismissal from University
- b. Failure of class
- c. Failure of assignment
- d. Give an "F" on the original assignment, have the student re-do the assignment and average the two grades
- e. No consequence

Billy has a research paper due in Special Education 700 tomorrow. He is having trouble writing and asks his friend Bob for help. Bob reads and does major editing on Billy's paper. Billy submits the paper.

49. Do you believe that Billy has cheated? 1 2 3 4

50. Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take

- a. Recommend dismissal from University

- b. Failure of class
- c. Failure of assignment
- d. Give an "F" on the original assignment, have the student re-do the assignment and average the two grades
- e. No Consequence

A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.

51. Do you believe that Maria has cheated? 1 2 3 4

52. Do you believe that Yvette has cheated? 1 2 3 4

53. Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take

- a. Recommend dismissal from University
- b. Failure of class
- c. Failure of assignment
- d. Give an "F" on the original assignment, have the student re-do the assignment and average the two grades
- e. No Consequence

A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed independently and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.

54. Do you believe that Maria has cheated? 1 2 3 4

55. Do you believe that Yvette has cheated? 1 2 3 4

56. Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take

- a. Recommend dismissal from University
- b. Failure of class
- c. Failure of assignment
- d. Give an "F" on the original assignment, have the student re-do the assignment and average the two grades
- e. No Consequence

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

57. How many online courses have you taken? 1 2 3 4 5 or more

58. How many traditional courses have you taken? 1 2 3 4 5 or more

59. What is your class standing?

- _____ Freshman
- _____ Sophomore
- _____ Junior
- _____ Senior
- _____ Graduate Student

60. What is your ethnicity?
- ☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
 - ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
 - ☐ Hispanic or Latino
 - ☐ White (not Hispanic)
 - ☐ Black or African American

61. What is your gender?
- ☐ Male
 - ☐ Female

Adapted with permission from Russian and American college students' attitudes, perceptions and tendencies toward cheating by Dr. Robert A. Lupton and Dr. Kenneth J. Chapman, 2002.

Adapted with permission from Academic dishonesty in traditional and online courses as self reported by students in online courses, by Dr. D. Carole Shaw, 2004.

APPENDIX B

FACULTY PERSPECTIVES SURVEY

Faculty Perspectives Survey

Directions: Please circle the response that most represents your experience or opinion.

Have you taught both online and traditional (face-to-face) courses? Yes No

If you have taught traditional courses only, skip questions 13 through 24.

TRADITIONAL COURSES (EVERYONE COMPLETES THIS SECTION)

Directions: The following questions address academic dishonesty. Please indicate whether you believe these behaviors are cheating. Circle the number that corresponds with your perception.

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Students who use crib notes during a test or quiz | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without authorization from the instructor | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Students who fail to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Students who plagiarize (i.e., copy without giving the original author credit) a large section of a paper | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Students who have a friend give them significant help in writing or revising a paper | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Students who submit the same paper during the same semester | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Students who submit a paper written by someone else | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Students who use Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Students who use Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. Students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Students who have someone else take a test or exam for them | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

ONLINE COURSES (ONLY THOSE WHO HAVE TAUGHT AN ONLINE OR HYBRID COURSE COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

Directions: Please indicate whether you believe these behaviors are cheating. Circle the number that corresponds with your perception.

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13. Students who use crib notes during a test or quiz | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

14. Students who collaborate on an out of class assignment without the authorization from the instructor	1	2	3	4
15. Students who fail to document paraphrases or direct quotes in a paper	1	2	3	4
16. Students who plagiarize (i.e., copying without giving the original author credit) a large section of a paper	1	2	3	4
17. Students who have a friend give them significant help in writing or revising a paper	1	2	3	4
18. Students who submit the same paper during the same semester	1	2	3	4
19. Students who submit the same paper during consecutive semesters	1	2	3	4
20. Students who submit a paper written by someone else	1	2	3	4
21. Students who use Internet sources to purchase a paper to be submitted	1	2	3	4
22. Students who use Internet sources to plagiarize a significant portion of a paper to be submitted	1	2	3	4
23. Students who use email to discuss individual assignments with a classmate	1	2	3	4
24. Students who have someone else take a test or exam for them	1	2	3	4

DETERRENTS (EVERYONE COMPLETES THIS SECTION)

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. Circle the number that corresponds with your perception.

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

25. It is easier to cheat in an online course than in a traditional course	1	2	3	4
26. Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in an online course	1	2	3	4
27. Proctored exams are an effective way to prevent cheating in a traditional course	1	2	3	4
28. Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in online courses	1	2	3	4
29. Fear of getting caught prevents many students from cheating in traditional courses	1	2	3	4
30. Instructors in online courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	1	2	3	4
31. Instructors in traditional courses make their policies concerning cheating very clear	1	2	3	4

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 32. Honor codes are an effective deterrent in traditional courses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 33. Stated university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 34. Stated university policies are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 35. Stated policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in online courses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 36. Stated policies on syllabi are an effective deterrent to cheating in traditional courses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 37. Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 38. Failure of course is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 39. Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 40. Failure of assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 41. Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in an online course | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 42. Redoing the assignment is an effective deterrent to cheating in a traditional course | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

SCENARIOS (EVERYONE COMPLETES THIS SECTION)

Directions: Please read the following scenarios and determine whether or not the student has cheated. Circle the number that corresponds with your perception.

John Doe took Special Education 401 in the Fall Semester, 1997. His friend, Samantha, took Special Education 401 in the Spring Semester, 1998. John gave Samantha all his prior work from the course. Samantha found John's answers to prior exams and uses these to prepare for tests in the course.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 43. Do you believe that John has cheated? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 44. Do you believe that Samantha has cheated? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 45. Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take | | | | |
| a. Recommend dismissal from University | | | | |
| b. Failure of class | | | | |
| c. Failure of assignment | | | | |

- d. Give an "F" on the original assignment, have the student re-do the assignment and average the two grade
- e. No consequence

Samantha also discovered that John had received good grades on some written assignments for the class. Many of these assignments required John to go to the library to look up articles about various topics. Samantha decides to forego the library work and uses John's articles for her papers in the class.

46. Do you believe that Samantha has cheated? 1 2 3 4

47. Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take

- a. Recommend dismissal from University
- b. Failure of class
- c. Failure of assignment
- d. Give an "F" on the original assignment, have the student re-do the assignment and average the two grades
- e. No consequence

Billy has a research paper due in Special Education 700 tomorrow. He is having trouble writing and asks his friend Bob for help. Bob reads and does major editing on Billy's paper. Billy submits the paper.

48. Do you believe that Billy has cheated? 1 2 3 4

49. Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take

- a. Recommend dismissal from University
- b. Failure of class
- c. Failure of assignment
- d. Give an "F" on the original assignment, have the student re-do the assignment and average the two grades
- e. No consequence

A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.

50. Do you believe that Maria has cheated? 1 2 3 4

51. Do you believe that Yvette has cheated? 1 2 3 4

52. Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take

- a. Recommend dismissal from University
- b. Failure of class
- c. Failure of assignment
- d. Give an "F" on the original assignment, have the student re-do the assignment and

- average the two grades
e. No consequence

A professor gives instructions to a class for an assignment to be completed independently and turned in the following week. Maria and Yvette decide to complete the assignment together and turn in their work separately.

53. Do you believe that Maria has cheated? 1 2 3 4

54. Do you believe that Yvette has cheated? 1 2 3 4

55. Select the most appropriate action for the faculty member to take
- a. Recommend dismissal from University
 - b. Failure of class
 - c. Failure of assignment
 - d. Give an "F" on the original assignment, have the student re-do the assignment and average the two grades
 - e. No consequence

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

56. How many online courses have you taught? 1 2 3 4 5 or more

57. Tenure status:

- ☐ Tenured
- ☐ Non-tenured (tenure track)
- ☐ Non-tenured (non-tenure track)
- ☐ Adjunct faculty

58. Number of years as a professor

- ☐ Less than one year
- ☐ 1-2 years
- ☐ 3-4 years
- ☐ 5-11 years
- ☐ more than 11 years

59. What is your ethnicity?

- ☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
- ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ Hispanic or Latino
- ☐ White (not Hispanic)
- ☐ Black or African American

60. What is your gender?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

Adapted with permission from Russian and American college students' attitudes, perceptions and tendencies toward cheating by Dr. Robert A. Lupton and Dr. Kenneth J. Chapman, 2002.

Adapted with permission from Academic dishonesty in traditional and online courses as self reported by students in online courses, by Dr. D. Carole Shaw, 2004.

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM



INFORMED CONSENT

Department of Special Education

TITLE OF STUDY: Investigating the Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty among Special Educators

INVESTIGATOR(S): Dr. Susan Miller and Jane M. Sileo

CONTACT PHONE NUMBER: 895-1108

Purpose of the Study

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of academic dishonesty among special education faculty and students at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Participants

You are being asked to participate in the study because you are an adjunct faculty member, full-time faculty member, undergraduate student, or graduate student within the Department of Special Education.

Procedures

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following: complete a 15-minute survey during the Spring 2006 semester.

Benefits of Participation

There *may not* be direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. However, we hope to learn more about faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty within the Department of Special Education. This information has the potential to improve communication between students and the faculty related to issues surrounding academic dishonesty.

Risks of Participation

There are risks involved in all research studies. This study may include only minimal risks. You may become uncomfortable answering some of the questions.

Cost /Compensation

There *will not* be financial cost to you to participate in this study. The study will take 15 *minutes* of your time. You *will not* be compensated for your time.

Contact Information

If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact **Dr. Susan Miller** at **895-1108** or **Jane M. Sileo** at **799-8600**. For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact **the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects** at **702-895-2794**.



INFORMED CONSENT

Department of Special Education

TITLE OF STUDY: Investigating the Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty among Special Educators

INVESTIGATOR(S): Dr. Susan Miller and Jane M. Sileo

CONTACT PHONE NUMBER: 895-1108

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relations with the university. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the research study.

Confidentiality

All information gathered in this study will be kept completely confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility at UNLV for at least 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be shredded and discarded.

Participant Consent:

I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. I am at least 18 years of age. A copy of this form has been given to me.

Signature of Participant

Date

Participant Name (Please Print)

Participant Note: Please do not sign this document if the Approval Stamp is missing or is expired.

APPENDIX D

PERMISSION EMAIL FROM ROBERT LUPTON

Robert Lupton luptonr@cwu.edu

Re: Survey Instrument

kchapman@csuchico.edu

Jane M. Sileo

Jane

Hello. Attached is the survey instrument in MS Word. I have no problem with you using the instrument, but would refer you to Dr. Chapman for his approval. Please make sure to cite our work accordingly.

Good luck with your dissertation.

Bob Lupton

Robert A. Lupton, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Retail Management
Information Technology and
Administrative Management Dept.
Central Washington University
400 E. University Way
Ellensburg, WA 98926-7488
Office: 509.963.1789
Fax: 509.963.1721
www.cwu.edu/~luptonr
www.cwu.edu/~itam
www.cwu.edu

APPENDIX E

PERMISSION EMAIL FROM KENNETH CHAPMAN

"Chapman, Kenneth" KChapman@csuchico.edu

RE: Survey Instrument

Jane M. Sileo

Yes, that will be fine. Good luck with your research.

From: Jane M. Sileo [mailto:jsileo@interact.ccsd.net]
Sent: Sat 11/5/2005 12:29 PM
To: Chapman, Kenneth
Subject: Survey Instrument

Dr. Chapman,

I am writing to request permission to use the some or all of the survey instrument you used in your study with Dr. Lupton. I am completing a dissertation on academic dishonesty in schools of special education.

I have already obtained Dr. Lupton's permission to use the survey instrument. I will cite both you and Dr. Lupton as the original authors.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jane Sileo

Jane M. Sileo
Early Childhood Special Educator/Liaison
Wengert Elementary School
702-799-8600
702-799-0116 (fax)

APPENDIX F

PERMISSION EMAIL FROM D. CAROLE SHAW

"Shaw, Carole" DCSHAW@NortheastState.edu

RE: Survey permission

Jane M. Sileo

Ms. Sileo,

I appreciate your asking to use my survey instrument and I give you permission to do so. Best wishes for a successful research project and dissertation.

Carole Shaw

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

From: Jane M. Sileo [mailto:jsileo@interact.ccsd.net]

Sent: Saturday, November 05, 2005 3:15 PM

To: Shaw, Carole

Subject: Survey permission

Dr. Shaw,

I am in the process of putting together the survey instrument for my doctoral dissertation study on Academic dishonesty in Special Education.

I

would like permission to use some or all of the sections of your survey instrument on academic dishonesty for my survey instrument.

Thank you for your assistance.

Jane Sileo

Jane M. Sileo
Early Childhood Special Educator/Liaison
Wengert Elementary School
702-799-8600
702-799-0116 (fax)

REFERENCES

- Aaron, R. M. & Georgia, R. T. (1994). Administrator perceptions of student academic dishonesty in collegiate institutions. *NASPA Journal*, 31(2), 83-91.
- 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), 1-16.
- Baird, J. S. Jr. (1980). Current trends in college cheating. *Psychology in the Schools*, 17, 515-522.
- Bates, I. P., Davies, J. G., Murphy, C., & Bone, A. (2005). A multi-faculty exploration of academic dishonesty. *Pharmacy Education*, 5(1), 69-76.
- Brown, V. J. & Howell, M. E. (2001). The efficacy of policy statements on plagiarism: Do they change students' views? *Research in Higher Education*, 42(1), 103-118.
- Brownlee, B.J. (1987). Coping with plagiarism requires several strategies. *Journalism Educator*, 41, 25 – 29.
- Burns, S. R., Davis, S. F., Hoshino, J., & Miller, R. L. (1998). Academic dishonesty: A delineation of cross-cultural patterns. *College Student Journal*, 32(4), 590-597.
- Bushway, A. & Nash, W. R. (1977). School cheating behavior. *Review of Educational Research*, 47, 623-632.
- Carnevale, D. (1999). How to proctor from a distance: Experts say professors need savvy to prevent cheating in on-line courses. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*

retrieved April 7, 2004

<http://www.chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v46/i12/12a04701.htm>

Carnevale, D. (1999). Web services help professors detect plagiarism. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* retrieved April 7, 2004

<http://www.chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v46/i12/12a04901.htm>

Center for Academic Integrity (1999). *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 452 778).

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

Dean, G. R. (2000). Academic dishonesty and the community college. ERIC Digest: EDO-JC-00-7.

Davis, S. F. (1993). *Cheating in college is for a career: Academic dishonesty in the 1990's*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA, March 24-27. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 358382).

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.

Dawkins, R. L. (2004). Attributes and statuses of college students associated with classroom cheating on a small-sized campus. *College Student Journal*, 38(1), 116-130.

Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., Shinohara, K., & Yasukawa, H. (1999). College cheating in Japan and the United States. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(3), 343-353.

- Dowd, S. (1992). *Academic integrity: A review and case study*. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 349060).
- Drake, C. A. (1941). Why students cheat. *Journal of Higher Education*, 12(8), 418-420.
- Fain, M., & Bates, P. (2001). Cheating 101: Paper mills and you. Retrieved April 4, 2004 from: <http://www.coastal.edu/library/papermil.htm>
- Ferrell, C. M. & Daniel, L. G. (1995). A frame of reference for understanding behaviors related to the academic misconduct of undergraduate teacher education students. *Research in Higher Education*, 36(3), 345-375.
- Ferrell, C. M. & Ferguson, W. F. (1993). *Addressing graduate education students' propensity toward academic misconduct*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360370).
- Finn, K. V. & Frone, M. R. (2004). Academic performance and cheating: Moderating role of school identification and self-efficacy. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97, (3). 115-122.
- Fishbein, L. (1993). Curbing cheating and restoring academic integrity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved March 11, 2004 from: <http://chronicle.com/prm/che-data/articles.dir/articles-40.dir/15a05201.htm>
- Fox, H. K. (1988). Due process and student academic misconduct. *Academic Business Law Journal*, 25, 671 – 700.
- Fussell, J. A. (2005, May 18). Cheaters use new array of gadgets to get that A: Old fashioned diligence best defense against wily students. *Anchorage Daily News*, A1 and A4.

- Gearhart, L. (2001). Ethics in distance education: Developing ethical policies. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 9(1). (online version).
- Genereux, R. L. & McLeod, B. A. (1995). Circumstances surrounding cheating: a questionnaire study of college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 36(6), 687-704.
- Gibbons, A., Mize, C. D., Rogers, K. L. (2002). That's my story and I'm sticking to it: Promoting academic integrity in the online environment. Paper presented at the 14th Annual World Conference on Multimedia, Hypermedia, and Telecommunications, June 24 – 29, 2002. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 477 016).
- Haines, V. J., Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., & Clark, R. E. (1986). College cheating: Immaturity, lack of commitment, and the neutralizing attitude. *Research in Higher Education*, 25(4), 342-354.
- Hall, T. L. & Kuh, G. D. (1998). Honor among students: Academic integrity and honor codes at state-assisted universities. *NASPA Journal*, 36(1), 2-18.
- Heberling, M. (2002). Maintaining academic integrity in online education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 5(1), 1-7.
- Hendershott, A., Drinan, P., & Cross, M. (2000). Toward enhancing a culture of academic integrity. *NASPA Journal*, 37(4), 587-597.
- Higbee, J. L. & Thomas, P. V. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of behaviors that constitute cheating. *NASPA Journal*, 40 (1), 39-52.

- Hollinger, R. C. & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (1996). Academic dishonesty and the perceived effectiveness of countermeasures: an empirical survey of cheating at a major public university. *NASPA Journal*, 33(4), 292-306.
- Jendrek, M. P. (1992). Students' reactions to academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33(3), 260-273.
- Jenson, L. M. (1972). Student and faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty offenses. *College Student Journal*, 6(2), 137-141.
- Kennedy, K., Nowak, S., Raghuraman, R., Thomas, J. & Davis, S. F. (2000). Academic dishonesty and distance learning: Student and faculty views. *College Student Journal*, 34(2), 309-314.
- Kibler, W. L. (1994). Addressing academic dishonesty: What are institutions of higher education doing and not doing? *NASPA Journal*, 31(2), 92-101.
- Kibler, W., Nuss, E., Paterson, B., and Pavela, G. (1988). Academic integrity and student development: Legal issues and policy perspectives. *College Administration Publications, Inc.*
- Lester, M. C. & Diekhoff, G. M. (2002). A comparison of traditional and internet cheaters. *Journal of College Student Development*, 4(6), 906-911.
- Love, P. G. & Simmons, J. M. (1998). Factors influencing cheating and plagiarism among graduate students in a college of education. *College Student Journal*, 32(4), 1-9.
- Love, P. G. & Simmons, J. M. (1997). *The meaning and mediated nature of cheating and plagiarism among graduate students in a college of education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education,

Albuquerque, NM, November 6-9, 1997. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 415826.).

Lupton, R. A., & Chapman, K. J., (2002). Russian and American college students' attitudes, perceptions, and tendencies toward cheating. *Educational Research*, 44(1), 17 – 27.

McCabe, D. L. (2001). Cheating: Why students do it and how we can help them stop. *American Educator*, Winter, 1-7.

McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), 522-538.

McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change*, 28, (1), 28-33.

McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(3), 379-395.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K. & Butterfield, K. D. (1999). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 70(2), 211-234.

Olt, M. (2002). Ethics and distance education: Strategies for minimizing academic dishonesty in online assessment. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 5, (3), 1-7.

Partello, P. (1993). First-year students and cheating: A study at Keene State College. *Research Strategies*, 11(3), 174-179.

- 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.
- Pino, N. W. & Smith, W. L. (2003). College students and academic dishonesty. *College Student Journal*, 37(4), 490-501.
- Pulvers, K. & Diekhoff, G. M. (1999). The relationship between academic dishonesty and college classroom environment. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(4), 487-498.
- Renard, L. (2000). Cut and paste 101: Plagiarism and the Net. *Educational Leadership*, 38-42.
- Roberts, D., & Rabinowitz, W. (1992). An investigation of student perceptions of cheating in academic situations. *Review of Higher Education*, 15(2), 179-190.
- Roth, N. L. & McCabe, D. L. (1994). Communication strategies for addressing academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36(6), 531-541.
- Scanlon, P. M. & Neumann, D. R. (2002). Internet plagiarism among college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(3), 374-385.
- Schab, F. (1991). Schooling without learning: Thirty years of cheating in high school. *Adolescence*, 26, 839-847.
- Schraw, G., Olafson, L., Kuch, F., Lehman, T., Lehman, S., and McCrudden, M. T. (In press). Interest in academic cheating. In E. Anderman & T. Murdock (Eds.), *Perspectives on academic cheating*. St. Louis, MO: Elsevier
- Shaw, D. C. (2004). Academic dishonesty in traditional and online courses as self-reported by students in online courses. *Dissertation Abstracts International* AAT 3120331. Retrieved December 22, 2005 from

<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=765273061&sid=1&Fmt=2&clientId=17675&RQT=309&Vname=POD>

- Shyles, L. (2002). Authenticating, identifying, and monitoring learners in the virtual classroom: Academic integrity in distance learning. Paper presented at the 88th Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, New Orleans, LA November 21-24, 2002. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 472807).
- Sims, R. L. (1995). The severity of academic dishonesty: A comparison of faculty and student views. *Psychology in the Schools*, 32(3), 233-238.
- Singhal, A. C. (1982). Factors in students' dishonesty. *Psychological Reports*, 51, 775-780.
- Stafford, T. H. Jr. (1976). *Academic dishonesty at North Carolina State University: A student-faculty response*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 169 846).
- Whitley, B. E. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review. *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 235-274.
- Whitley, B. E. Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

VITA

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Jane M. Sileo

Local Address:

6 Huguenot Street
Tillson, NY 12486

Degrees:

Bachelor of Science, Business Administration/Psychology, 1989
Roger Williams University
Bristol, Rhode Island

Masters of Arts, Special Education, 1998
San Diego State University
San Diego, California

Publications:

Juried:

Sileo, J. M. (2003). Co-teaching: Rationale for best practices. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Special Education*, 3(1), 17-26.

Sileo, T. W., Stockhouse, J. A., & Sileo, J. M. (2000). Heightening educators' awareness about adoption: Are some children and youth at-risk for educational failure? *Counseling and Human Development*, 32 (9), 1-15.

Conference Proceedings (non-juried):

Sileo, J. M. (2005). Co-teaching: Best practices for all. *Inclusive and Supportive Special Education Congress*. Available:

http://www.isec2005.org.uk/isec/abstracts/papers_s/sileo_j.shtml

Dissertation Title: Investigating the Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty among Special Educators

Dissertation Examination Committee:

Chairperson, Dr. Susan Miller, Ph.D.

Committee Member, Dr. Thomas Pierce, Ph.D.

Committee Member, Dr. Jeff Gelfer, Ph.D.

Graduate Faculty Representative, Dr. Gregg Schraw, Ph.D.