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ABSTRACT

Academic misconduct is a problem that all institutions of higher education experience. Because few incidents are worthy of national attention, the media create the impression that cheating is rare. The truth is that, depending on the source, up to 75% of college students admit having cheated on exams, papers, and other academic activities.

One approach to promoting ethical behavior on campus is a framework based on student development theories. William Kibler of Texas A&M University has created a comprehensive program which includes intervention strategies designed to promote an ethos that nurtures academic integrity. Two components in this plan are a written honor code and the communication of behavioral expectations. This study focused on those two components and their potential to influence undergraduates' perceptions of the seriousness and frequency of cheating at Louisiana State University (LSU).

The experiment consisted of a single-factor multiple treatment design with four treatments. The treatments, or independent variables, are 1) presentation by the classroom instructor, 2) distribution of the written code of student conduct,
3) showing a video using student actors, and 4) no-treatment control. The dependent variables were the perception of the seriousness of cheating and of the frequency of cheating at LSU. A self-report survey was administered to four sample groups. The data collected from 674 subjects were analyzed by an ANOVA, the Tukey's (HSD) Test, a simple frequency count/percent, and an ANOVA item analysis.

On the analysis of items relating to seriousness of cheating, two patterns emerged. One illustrates the influence of the instructor and the other, the lack of influence of having students read the code of conduct. The item analysis relating to frequency of cheating revealed a significant statistical difference between the instructor's group and the group which saw the video.

These data indicate that the communication of expectations by the instructor is the most effective means of influencing student perceptions. That is good news for institutions unable, due to personnel or fiscal constraints, to create the comprehensive program Kibler outlines. It is both effective and inexpensive to utilize the power of faculty to promote an atmosphere of academic integrity.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

When the media focus on higher education, that focus is often on finances or on racism and sexism, and the dissatisfaction and, sometimes, violence surrounding these issues. Individually or collectively, these problems threaten the survival of institutions or, at the very least, distract the institution from its primary function. A less newsworthy threat, but a dangerous one because it causes decay from the inside, is academic misconduct.

Ylvisaker (1994) assigns to college administrators these three responsibilities: the examination of the "critical trends and influences" outside the institution; the translation of this information into institutional policy; and the monitoring of the social, political, and ethical performance of the institution (p. 6). One measure of an institution's ethical performance is the incidence of academic dishonesty evidenced by cheating, plagiarism, fabrication, and lying by students, or the intentional facilitation of these behaviors by others.

Definition of Terms

Definitions of academic dishonesty vary from institution to institution; no uniformity exists in
defining the offense, in educating students about policies or consequences, or in enforcement. The most basic definition is that academic dishonesty "usually refers to forms of cheating and plagiarism that involve students giving or receiving unauthorized assistance in an academic exercise or receiving credit for work that is not their own" (Kibler, Nuss, Paterson, & Pavela, 1988, p. 2). Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, the following examples:

- Copying from another student's exam
- Taking an exam for someone else
- Purchasing term papers and turning them in as own work
- Copying materials without footnoting
- "Padding" items on a bibliography
- Feigning illness to avoid a test
- Submitting the same term paper to another class without permission
- Studying a copy of an exam prior to taking make-up
- Giving another student answers during an exam
- Reviewing previous copies of an instructor's test
- Using notes or books during an exam when prohibited
- Reviewing a stolen copy of an exam
- Turning in a dry lab report without doing the experiment
- Sabotaging someone else's work (on a disk, in a lab, etc.)
- Failing to report grading errors
- Collaborating on homework or take-home exams when instructions call for independent work
- Giving test questions to students in another class
- Sharing answers during an exam by using a system of signals
- Using "cheat sheets" during an exam
- Developing a relationship with an instructor to get test information
- Committing plagiarism
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Studying tests or used term papers from fraternity or sorority files
Engaging in bribery or blackmail
Attempting to bias instructor's grading after an exam
Writing a term paper for another student
Hiring a ghostwriter
Altering or forging an official university document

(Maramark & Maline, 1993, p.4)

In addition, the definition now includes stealing non-circulating library holdings; cutting pages out of texts and journals to limit access by other students; using commercial, illegal "exam banks"; violating "computer ethics"; submitting false resumes to professional schools; and using an instructor's manual (Nuss, 1984, in Kibler, 1993a).

Students often plead ignorance or confusion as to what constitutes academic dishonesty, what the institutional policies are, and the consequences for misbehavior. Some behaviors seem obvious, such as copying from another's test paper, but Hawley (1984) admits that "concepts such as collaboration, fair-use, and especially plagiarism, are routinely misunderstood by students" (in Maramark & Maline, 1993, p. 5).

Unfortunately, while administrators may think offenses are obvious, their beliefs may be based on values which are not shared by younger generations. Even when a specific code exists, Nuss (1986) points out
that inconsistent application of penalties creates the impression among students that some forms of dishonesty are more acceptable than others (in Maramark & Maline, 1993).

The disinclination of faculty to report according to institutional guidelines, when they exist, also sends mixed messages to students. A study by Jendrek (1989) indicated that of the 337 faculty members surveyed, approximately 60% had observed cheating but only 20% of the observers complied with university policy for reporting such behavior. Factors influencing this resistance include inconclusive evidence, inappropriate sanctions (perceived as either too severe or not severe enough), fear of litigation, ignorance of institutional policy, the tendency to give students "the benefit of the doubt," concern that the institution will not back their stance, the time involved in making a case, and general apathy (Gehring, 1986, in Kibler, 1993a; Pavela & McCabe, 1993; Livorsky & Tauber, 1994; Jendrek, 1989, McCabe, 1993).

Added to the differing attitudes about reporting are the varying classroom policies developed by individual instructors. For example, whereas one professor may prohibit use of previous exams as a
study tool, another may actually leave a file of old tests on reserve at the library and encourage students to review them. In many courses, unauthorized work with another student is considered a form of cheating while structured collaborative learning is seen by some as an excellent preparation for teamwork in the professions (Drinan, 1995).

**Background**

Cheating has been a societal problem for hundreds of years. Brickman (1961) describes precautions taken in ancient China to prevent civil service examinees from looking at one another's papers. Even though the penalty for both examiners and examinees was death, apparently cheating still occurred (in Kibler, 1993a).

If a college campus is a microcosm of the larger society, one must consider the prevailing social climate which tolerates many forms of dishonesty (Collison, 1990). Having seen prominent citizens receive token penalties for offenses such as tax evasion, government fraud, and bribery, and knowing that authority figures such as teachers call in sick when they are not or routinely "borrow" supplies from the office for personal use, young people may well be confused.
College students’ values are formed long before they enter college. The present generation grew up hearing about Watergate and the Iran Contra hearings; often these young people did not grow up hearing about values at school. Administrators shied away from the controversy of values clarification to avoid litigation by those who claimed their children were being indoctrinated. No longer did children grow up internalizing a norm that cheating was "taboo" (Lamont in Mathews, 1985, p.2).

It is clear that higher education is not the only educational arena in which dishonesty prevails. In 1969 Schab polled students, 22% of whom admitted having cheated as early as first grade; 11% had started by the seventh grade; and another 16% began in the eighth grade (in Kibler, 1993a).

Lamont (1979) speculates that the decline in academic integrity may have been hastened by the increasing diversity of the student population, a larger student/teacher ratio, and the absence of honor codes (in Mathews, 1985). As universities face budget constraints, the environment changes; fiscal problems result in crowded classrooms, fewer proctors, and recycled exams due to paper shortage. In a world
where the end often justifies the means, students find ways to justify their dishonesty.

The Extent of the Problem

It is difficult to accurately assess the extent of academic misconduct because reporting methods are unreliable. Many professors do not enforce institutional policies or do not report infractions through designated channels. Furthermore, self-reporting by students is difficult to interpret; definitions of what constitutes cheating vary, and those who cheat in the classroom may also lie on surveys. The literature does, however, indicate that the lack of academic integrity is a common problem in higher education (Aaron & Georgia, 1994).

Maramark and Maline (1993) estimate that 60% to 75% of all college students admit to having cheated. Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992) report a range of from 9% to 64% of the 6,000 students they surveyed. Sixty-seven percent of over 6,000 students surveyed by McCabe (1992) at 31 of the nation's selective universities admitted some cheating behavior. When McCabe and Bowers (1996) conducted a followup study of nine institutions over a 30 year span, they found that cheating on tests had increased from 63% in 1963 to 70% in 1993.
Many researchers consider this situation an epidemic. A study published by Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce in 1996 indicates that over two-thirds of their sample of 1,672 undergraduates at the same institution had cheated during a typical semester. These researchers suggest that the bad news is that the "deviant" student may well be the one who does not cheat; the good news may be that the frequency of cheating is limited to once or twice a semester (p. 302).

Mathews (1985) found that self-report measures by undergraduates at large universities seem to produce numbers as large as from 40% to 95%. The Carnegie Council (1979) alerted educators to the problem in its report indicating that the percentage of undergraduates who cheat had increased from 7.5% in 1969 to 8.8% in 1979.

The Extent of the Problem at LSU

A review of academic misconduct cases handled by the Dean of Students' Office at Louisiana State University (LSU) during the 1994-1995 academic year encompasses Summer 1994, Fall 1994, and Spring 1995. Seventy cases were referred to Dr. Thomas Risch, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Dean of Students. Five were referred during the summer session, 33 were
referred during the fall semester, and 32 during the spring semester.

Fifty of the students involved were male, and 20 were female. Eleven were classified as freshmen; 17 as sophomores; 11 as juniors; 26 as seniors; and five as graduate students. Ethnicity of those 70 student offenders is as follows: 43 white, 12 African American, six Hispanic, five Asian American, one American Indian, and three "not reported."

LSU distinguishes between premeditated and unpremeditated offenses, with the former exacting more serious penalties. Of the 70 cases, 39 were considered unpremeditated and 31, premeditated. Dean Risch explains that most students choose to submit to administrative action rather than request going before a hearing panel. His experience is that student panels usually assess more severe penalties. Sixty-nine of the 70 1994-1995 student offenders chose administrative action. Twenty-six cases were deemed "non violations," 38 students were given probation, two were suspended from LSU, and five cases are still pending.

Consequences of the Problem

Because the protection of academic integrity is vital to the mission of higher education, both private
and public institutions must establish policies to address wrongdoing (Pavela, 1988). Cheating "conflicts with the core purposes of higher education: the search for knowledge and truth and the creation and communication of ideas" (Peterson, 1988, in Aaron, 1992, p.107). There is more at stake than transcripts which inaccurately reflect accomplishment. The student who cheats his or her way through college enters the workplace inadequately prepared, misrepresenting the institution and deceiving the employer and, sometimes, himself or herself (D. McCabe, personal communication, March 1995; Risacher & Slonaker, 1996).

Educators familiar with Erickson’s stages of psychosocial development (1968), Chickering’s seven vectors of student development (1969), and Kohlberg’s theory of moral development (1984) see the education of undergraduates as an opportunity to teach them ethical principles which can be applied to life situations outside the realm of higher education (Kibler, 1993a). A sound policy on academic integrity, when explained and enforced, can be a useful tool in preparing students for ethical decision-making throughout life. To focus on discipline after misbehavior is necessary, of course,
and may act as a deterrent to similar behaviors; but the focus of this study is on preventing academic fraud by students, for their sakes as well as for society's.

**Purpose of the Study**

A review of the literature reveals that few institutions of higher education expend energy and resources on prevention of academic dishonesty. The two most common references are to the efficacy of honor codes and to surveys of both faculty and students regarding the occurrence of cheating. Some researchers claim that honor codes do reduce the incidence of cheating, while others claim they make no difference (McCabe & Trevino, 1993; Pavela & McCabe, 1993). The surveys of faculty and students usually reflect how each group perceives what constitutes cheating and how frequently each thinks the behaviors occur.

The few studies on prevention indicate that the degree to which the instructor outlines and enforces university policies is the most potent deterrent (Kibler et al, 1988). Aaron's study (1992) highlights a major concern, which is "the limited extent to which faculty discuss student academic integrity in their syllabi or in class. Earlier research by Nuss [1984]
revealed a majority of surveyed faculty 'never or rarely discussed institutional policies or their own requirements pertaining to academic dishonesty'" (p. 142).

Aaron (1992) collected information from a random sample of 257 chief student affairs officers selected from the Higher Education Directory (1989). The sample included at least one institution from each of the 50 states and resulted in a 71.2% response rate. Aaron's purpose was to explore how institutions dealt with academic dishonesty. Most institutions (95%) possessed a code of conduct, and 98.3% had policies in place to handle allegations. The most common means of dissemination of guidelines to students were handbooks (79.4%), catalogs (42.3%), new student orientation (42.3%), and pamphlets (30.3%). The most frequent means of getting information on policies to faculty were in the faculty handbook (43.4%).

Aaron also found that institutions did not share statistics on cheating with the campus community, not even through their own student newspapers. Despite the codes and policies, fewer than 8% of institutions required faculty to address the issue in class or in syllabi. When the student affairs officers in Aaron's study were asked if they believed that the majority of
their faculty informed students of the policy on academic dishonesty and its consequences during the first class meeting, responses ranged from 49.3% at four-year public institutions to 73.8% at community colleges.

The present study focuses on Louisiana State University (LSU), which is a public four-year institution. In a pilot survey of 328 students at LSU in the spring of 1995, 41% of the respondents rated the faculty explanation of LSU’s policies to their classes "low," and 18% rated it "very low." In other words, 59% of LSU students surveyed rated as inadequate the information on academic misconduct given to them by the faculty; and 67% rated the effectiveness of the institution’s policies in preventing cheating "low" or "very low." These findings form the background for this research project.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses under study here are:

**H1:** A relationship exists between the type of information students receive about cheating and the students’ perception of the seriousness of cheating.
H2: A relationship exists between the type of information students receive about cheating and the students' perception of the frequency of cheating.

The relationship between types of information and their hypothesized influence will be measured by a change in students' perceptions. The change in the perception of seriousness will be measured by an increase in knowledge of the categories of offenses and of the penalties for academic misconduct. An increase in knowledge should, likewise, result in a higher report of the incidence of cheating.

In this study the term "student" refers to the "traditional student," the undergraduate who enters higher education shortly after completion of secondary education and who is, therefore, likely to be between the ages of 18 and 24.

Importance of Study

Educators interested in academic integrity are concerned about the perceptions with which undergraduates enter college and the influence institutions of higher education may or may not have on those perceptions. If their perceptions about ethics in general influence their cheating behaviors, it is important to identify those programs and policies which most effectively introduce the
institution’s ethical guidelines and the consequences for misbehavior. Because two of the most prominent theories of moral and personal development of the traditional college student are nearly 30 years old, one might question whether administrators create policies appropriate for today’s college student.

Because this is not a longitudinal study, it cannot address changed behaviors or long-term change of perceptions of what constitutes cheating. Rather, the study concerns itself with this aspect of the issue: the possibility of changing those perceptions by classroom interventions in a way that affects 1) understanding of the seriousness of cheating behaviors and 2) the reporting of same. Although the participation of the instructor is vital to the process of prevention, many instructors do not choose to explicitly promote or discuss academic integrity in their classes. Finding alternative, effective means of informing students may be the next best strategy. I had hoped that a contribution of this study would be to identify a simple, uniform method or methods which even the disinterested instructor could use. The video with student actors and the code of student conduct are two alternatives to the instructor’s presentation that are evaluated in this study. I
believe that it is appropriate for the university to exercise its influence to encourage ethical behavior in students' pursuit of knowledge. That belief, however, is sometimes disputed.

The Role of Higher Education in Promoting Ethical Development

The loudest and most respected voices throughout American history have stood divided as to whether higher education should be valued for itself or for its utility. On the one side are those who believe that "pursuit of knowledge for its own sake creates fully-rounded men and women with sharp enough minds to succeed at anything they attempt" (Gallagher, 1995, p. 117). This goal of creating "a pure and clear atmosphere of thought," as Cardinal John Newman suggested in 1852, has, unfortunately, led to the perception of the university as an "ivory tower," an institution which detaches itself from the real world and its less scholarly citizens. The other school of thought "contends that pursuit of practical knowledge ... addresses the broad needs of the people" (Gallagher, 1995, p. 117). The concept is that the nation which sends its youth and its tax dollars to college is entitled to some recompense from higher education.
And what should that recompense be? Among other things, Thomas Jefferson assigned to the university the task of preparing citizens to be public servants "on whom public prosperity and individual happiness are so much to depend" (in Gallagher, 1995, p. 118). A century after Jefferson's challenge to the aristocracy to use their privilege and opportunity for the nation's good, Derek Bok has emerged as a strong proponent of national service, including the development of citizens capable of moral reasoning. An eloquent case for the teaching of ethics by institutions of higher education is made by Bok, under whose leadership Harvard University re-introduced applied ethics into the curriculum.

According to Bok, the inhabitants of the "ivory tower" have attempted to purify and quantify their inquiry by using scientific methods. The goal has been "to produce value-free teaching and research" ("Students need," 1997, p. 83). Bok points out that while analyzing and describing the concrete is "comfortable," addressing questions for which there is no logical answer is unsettling. "Issues of value have no logical answer" (p. 83).

In a move that is not entirely inconsistent with the notion of the academy as an environment for pure
and clear thought, colleges and universities are introducing applied ethics courses. The move is not to teach ethics per se, but to "help students become more sensitive to ethical issues and reason more carefully about those questions" (p. 83). Bok attributes the enthusiastic participation in these courses to students' interest in preparing themselves for the real world, presumably to avoid the ethical difficulties they have seen others encounter. Whether this "habit of inquiring more rigorously into ethics" will change human behavior has yet to be determined, but it is a legitimate effort.

If, for example, academic dishonesty is seen as a behavior which grows out of the student's immature or underdeveloped belief system, it seems logical to implement a program designed to foster growth in that area. When cheating is treated as a behavioral problem only and punishment is the reaction, changed behaviors may result but changed belief systems probably will not.

Bok assigns to the university great responsibility in this area. Whereas the church and the family are often characterized as increasingly ineffective, higher education as an institution has access to more citizens than ever before. This
"greater reach" carries with it greater responsibility to model ethical behavior (p. 83). That includes the manner in which we debate the purpose of higher education.

Both proponents of education as an end unto itself and proponents of education for its usefulness can reconcile the encouragement of moral development in college students. Seventy years after Cardinal Newman advocated "an almost monastic ideal of the college," Alfred North Whitehead attempted to effect that reconciliation: "What education has to impart is an intimate sense for the power of ideas, for the beauty of ideas, and for the structure of ideas, together with a particular body of knowledge which has peculiar references to the life of the being possessing it" (Gallagher, 1995, p. 118).

That, then, may be the link, the purpose: an understanding that all ideas are somehow connected and accessible and subject to being evaluated clearly by the individual capable of higher level thinking.

It is in this respect that opportunities to define and refine one's own code of ethics and morality can be a valuable aspect of the traditional student's education.
Conclusion

The purpose of Chapter One was to introduce the problem under study, including the purpose and importance of the study, the objectives and hypotheses, a definition of terms, and limitations of the study. In Chapter Two I provide a review of relevant literature and lay the foundation for the experiment. I explain the research design chosen and the methodology to be used for data analysis in Chapter Three. I report the results of the study in Chapter Four and discuss those results, make recommendations based on those results, and suggest implications for further research in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

In this chapter I discuss the reasons students cite for cheating, the kinds of students who cheat, situational influences, and models for classifying cheating behaviors. Legal issues related to alleged academic dishonesty are outlined. The resurgence of traditional student development theory suggested by Kibler (1993b) as the framework for a comprehensive program to educate students and remediate offenders is discussed in some detail, and serves as the foundation for this experiment.

Reasons Students Cheat

There are no easy answers to the question of why students cheat. For decades, students have cited pressure and competition (Gehring, Nuss, & Pavela, 1986). They compete for admission to colleges and to programs, for scholarships, class rank, admission to graduate and professional schools, and for jobs after graduation. The report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990) suggested that students are more concerned with success than with knowledge.

Other reasons students name are insufficient study time because of job schedules, excessive work
loads, procrastination, perceived teacher fairness and effectiveness, and the irrelevance of subject matter. The likelihood of not getting caught actually encourages some who did not cheat in high school to begin cheating in college (Aaron, 1994). Gehring (1986) added changed values, inability to resist frequent temptation, and casual attitudes of faculty as reasons for cheating.

**Personal Characteristics of Cheaters**

The characteristics of those who cheat are as complex as the reasons for cheating. No one profile can be defined, although many studies have attempted to do so. The most frequently researched variables include gender, age, year in school, race, intelligence, academic achievement, major, need to succeed, fear of failure/need for approval from parents and teachers, expectations, general honesty, religion/religiosity, guilt or anxiety, locus of control, moral reasoning, peer pressure, relevancy or irrelevancy of coursework, membership in Greek organizations, socioeconomic status, and the proclivity to cheat one way or another matched with personality.

Mathews (1985) studied LSU students who had been identified as cheaters in order to construct a program.
designed not to punish but to rehabilitate. This two-year study included an extensive review of the literature available on personality factors. The conclusions Mathews drew in her study continue to be supported by more recent studies. Her work is cited for that reason and because the work was with students representative of undergraduates at this university.

The literature does not indicate that gender is a predictor of honesty; when differences are found, they seem to be contingent on other factors such as age, motivation, and opportunity. Kelly and Worrell (1978) found that female students cited the excitement of breaking the rules as a part of the attraction; male students were more likely to want the better grade in order to elevate their status (in Mathews, 1985).

It appears, however, that cheating has become an increasingly equal opportunity behavior over the last 30 years. One conclusion from the McCabe and Bowers' followup on a 1963 study is that while cheating on tests has increased significantly, from 63% in 1963 to 70% in 1993, on the nine campuses included in this study, "...change is related to the substantial increase in cheating on tests among women, from 59% to 70% of the respondents. There was virtually no change
among men (from 69% to 70%)" (p. 289). The authors speculate that as women compete with men for traditionally male occupations, the pressure of competition may create the perceived need for women to cheat.

Although research findings vary, the majority of those addressing academic ability indicate that students with lower levels of intelligence may cheat more frequently to survive (Kibler, 1993a). In terms of intelligence and sensitivity to the situation and to its consequences, Leming (1980) explained, "There is a point at which average students judge the advantages of cheating to be not worth the risk. Only above average students were sensitive to variables in the testing condition" (p.85, in Mathews, 1985).

Mathews concluded that high need achievers tend to be less likely to cheat because the sense of accomplishment is important to them. On the other hand, those with a low need for personal achievement cheat to avoid failure. If perception of situational influences is a part of personality, the combination of low probability of success, importance of the exam, and reduced risk of detection can be factored in. Most studies indicate that guilt alone does not act as a deterrent, but the difference between internal and
external loci of control may (Rotter, 1966, in Mathews, 1985).

Citing a study by Pederson (1990), Smith and Fossey (1995) note that there are few differences between students who will steal or damage library holdings and those who will not. In fact, students interpreted these acts as "acts of thoughtlessness, not "expression[s] of hostility toward the institution" (Smith & Fossey, 1995, p. 124).

Over the last five decades, other researchers have investigated members of fraternities and sororities. In general, the Greek affiliation seems to form a closeness which makes it more difficult for members to resist temptation (Drake, 1941; Bonjean & McGee, 1965; Hartshorne & May, 1928; Mathews, 1985). A 1993 study by McCabe and Bowers reinforced findings of Stannard and Bowers' earlier study (1970), but this study is unique in that it is the first study in 30 years to administer a multicampus survey and to include sororities as well as fraternities. The authors found that when peer disapproval of cheating is strong on a campus, all students -- non-members as well as fraternity and sorority members -- report lower occurrences of cheating. However, the converse is also true; as peer disapproval decreases, as it

An example of the diversity of opinion regarding Greek members and academic misconduct is the contrast between the 1970 Stannard and Bowers study and the 1993 McCabe and Trevino study, the results of which were confirmed in the 1996 McCabe and Bowers report. Whereas Stannard and Bowers indicate that fraternities and sororities may be misjudged, the other two studies support the perception that Greek members engage in "organizational behaviors that at least condone, if not directly support, questionable academic behaviors among their members" (McCabe & Trevino, 1993, in McCabe & Bowers, 1996, p. 290). On the other hand, the proclivity of the individual to cheat may exist before the fraternal affiliation is formed (McCabe & Bowers, 1996). Another suggestion is that the more social a student is, the more likely he or she is to join a fraternal organization, and the more likely that student may be to look for shortcuts to make up for study time lost while socializing. McCabe and Bowers conclude their report bysuggesting that to focus on just one group, which in this case would be
the fraternity or sorority membership, is not expedient; the attitudes toward academic misconduct of the student body as a whole must be addressed (p. 291).

Sutton and Huba (1995) examined student perceptions of academic dishonesty as a function of ethnicity and religious participation. African American and white students responded to surveys of their perceptions of what constitutes cheating, how frequently it occurs, and situations under which cheating might be justified. Their responses were then examined in respect to students' religiosity as measured by participation.

Poinsett (1990) identified an increase in participation in religious activities on campuses by African Americans, a trend perhaps related to the "deep spiritual roots of African American culture" which have sustained the group through a difficult and troubled past (in Sutton & Huba, 1995, p. 20). At predominantly white institutions religious activities offer black students support in an otherwise often hostile atmosphere. On the other hand, the participation of white students typically declines as they use the college experience to "challenge previously held beliefs" (Sutton & Huba, 1995, p. 31).
The samples were not proportionate to enrollment at the large, public, midwestern, predominantly white university. Of the 7,482 students in the residence halls the total population of African Americans (n=267) was contacted as was the same number of white students who were selected through systematic random sampling through the Registrar's Office. The responses consisted of 161 black and 161 white students; no explanation of how those 161 were chosen is provided. Overall, there appeared to be no differences related to ethnicity in perceptions of cheating. The students in both groups who were more involved in religious activities did rate as cheating a few of the more ambiguous behaviors than did the less active. When religiosity was the independent variable, no additional differences were found related to ethnicity.

When reports in frequency of cheating behaviors were examined, 50% to 60% of respondents agreed that unauthorized collaboration, getting information about an exam from someone who has already taken it, and not footnoting a few sentences taken from a source occurred fairly often. Significant differences seemed to be related to ethnicity but only on specific items. For example, blacks perceived that getting information
about a test from someone who had already taken it occurred more frequently than whites did. White students perceived that padding a bibliography occurred more frequently than did blacks. Again, no interaction between ethnicity and religiosity appeared to affect responses.

Most students in this study did not believe that cheating is ever justified regardless of circumstances. However, the greater the religiosity of African American respondents, the more they agreed with the statement. The same was not true for white students. Between 12% and 24% of the total sample indicated that cheating might be justified when a person needs to pass in order to graduate or to keep a scholarship or to stay in school, when a friend asks for assistance, or when an individual needs a better grade in a course. African Americans were slightly more likely to consider cheating in these situations justifiable; the authors speculate that inadequate academic support may lead these students to deem cheating an acceptable survival tactic. The more religious of all respondents stated most strongly that cheating is never justified.

Sutton and Huba recommend that student affairs practitioners consider the moral dilemma facing the
African American student who, because of religious convictions and activity, believes cheating is wrong but needs to succeed. In addition, they suggest that examination of students' perceptions of cheating be conducted using theories of moral and faith development.

Despite attempts to profile the most likely cheaters, studies about the influence of student background variables on cheating behaviors have been inconsistent (Maramark & Maline, 1994). Situational characteristics of the classroom or institution seem to be more influential.

**Situational Influences**

Situational influences include such characteristics as seating patterns; the type, weight, and difficulty of the exams; the use of duplicate exams from section to section or semester to semester; and the presence or absence of proctors (Maramark & Maline, 1994).

Inadequate library holdings, limited access to materials on reserve, and the high cost of copying lead some students to steal or mutilate books and journals (Smith & Fossey, 1995). Other environmental factors include reduced risk of detection, campus norms, the absence of an instructor from the room
during an exam, personality and teaching styles of faculty, and totalitarian or authoritarian classroom atmospheres (Bushway & Nash, 1977; Weldon, 1966; Butcher, 1971; in Kibler, 1993a). An atmosphere where honesty is valued and expected seems to be a potent deterrent to cheating (Singhai & Johnson, 1983, in Mathews, 1985).

**Systems of Classifying Cheating**

The ways by which researchers organize dishonest behaviors offers some insight into why students cheat. For example, Kibler (1993) cites the following system developed by Hetherington and Feldman (1964):

1. Individualistic-opportunistic: unplanned, impulsive.
2. Individualistic-planned: advance planning and activity.
3. Social-active: instigated by two or more students.
4. Social-passive: two or more students permitting others to copy from them.

A similar system was used by Livorsky & Tauber (1994) in their study on views of cheating:

1. Intent: premeditation (cheat sheet, seating, etc.).
2. Intent plus Commission: planning and carrying out plan.
3. Commission without Intent: spontaneous, impulsive, "unable to resist" when "opportunity knocked."

The purpose of the Livorsky and Tauber study (1994) was to compare the views of cheating among college students and faculty. When differences exist
in those perceptions, the differences "may foster incidents of dishonesty" (Livorsky & Tauber, 1994, p. 79). The closer the perceptions, the more likely the two groups are to work together on prevention and rehabilitation programs. Shared norms lead to better enforcement of and compliance with policies.

The authors surveyed faculty and students using ten exam-related situations which respondents were asked to rate from (1) not cheating to (5) serious example of cheating. The instrument was administered in both 1986 and 1990 with 95% of the students contacted agreeing to participate. Approximately 40% of the faculty responded, but some responses were not useable because the yes/no response pattern was ignored and replaced by written comments. The faculty return rate then dropped to 28%, which the authors claim is a typical return rate for a mail survey, but which they recognize as a limitation of the study.

Another limitation which restricts generalizability is that only exam-related incidents were described. Other studies indicate that there is more divergence of opinion between faculty and students over lab exercises, take-home exams, and writing assignments (Wright & Kelly, 1974, in Livorsky & Tauber, 1994).
Final tabulations, based on 446 students and 97 faculty, were consistent with most such research which indicates that students and faculty are not as far apart in their perceptions of what cheating is as one might think. However, students in the Livorsky and Tauber study tended to take a more strident stand overall on cheating than did the faculty (1994, p.78). The time and possible litigation involved in wrongful accusation by a faculty member as well as the inclination of faculty to give students "the benefit of the doubt" may contribute to that difference (Livorsky & Tauber, 1994, p. 78).

Authors suggest that the data indicate that regardless of crowded testing conditions or difficulty of material, "we still expect individuals to resist the urge" to cheat (Livorsky & Tauber, 1994, p.79). They interpret that as making the student fully responsible while perhaps absolving the institution of its responsibility. Nonetheless, they conclude that when views are similar, faculty and students can reach consensus on how to deal with academic dishonesty. When views are dissimilar, formulating and implementing policies is more difficult. Very little change was found between the 1986 and 1990 surveys.
Legal Aspects Surrounding Academic Dishonesty

It is a sad reality that administrators and other educators cannot make decisions regarding academic dishonesty based purely on what is in the best interest of the student and the institution. In a litigious society, reputation is not all that is at stake; litigation is both time-consuming and expensive. The protection of academic integrity is vital to the mission of higher education, requiring both private and public institutions to establish policies to address wrongdoing (Pavela, 1988). There are, however, differences in how such policies are created and enforced.

Private institutions are not held accountable for guaranteeing the constitutional rights of faculty or students. Students in the private sector may find other reasons to sue but the suit cannot be brought on grounds of violation of constitutional rights. Nevertheless, between state laws and the guidelines of accrediting agencies, they are held to the common law principle of fairness which often looks very much like due process (Smith & Fossey, 1995, pp. 210-211). At the least, a hearing affording the student a chance to speak is a wise choice.
Public universities and colleges are, on the other hand, considered agents of the state and therefore required to comply with the Constitution. Specifically, public institutions are required to provide due process to students who face the possibility of discipline because of a cheating allegation. At a minimum, the constitution requires that a student be informed of charges, be given a chance to speak, and be heard by a fair tribunal. This discussion focuses on public institutions of higher learning and the main legal issue surrounding allegations of cheating: due process.

Rights and Responsibilities of the Institution

Experts in education and in law continue to debate whether academic dishonesty is a "disciplinary offense or an academic judgment" (Pavela, 1988). Chief Justice Rehnquist makes this distinction in Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz (1978): an academic evaluation is less adversarial and more subjective than the average disciplinary proceeding. Rehnquist goes on to demand "a careful and deliberate" decision in academic fraud cases because being found guilty of such an offense carries with it a stigma. While that stigma may act as a deterrent to other students and some punishment
certainly seems appropriate, the process should be a teaching tool as well. The academy must balance carefully the best interests of all involved.

The institution which makes no formal statement is, in truth, creating the impression that academic integrity is not important. Administrators face a serious challenge: to create a definition which is specific enough to insure understanding but flexible enough to allow some professional judgement on a case by case basis (Morrissey v. Brewer, 1972). The institution's stand on honesty should be included in all official publications, recruitment materials, and orientation programs.

Rights of the Accused

If a student is in danger of being deprived of life, liberty, or property, that student is entitled to due process. In Board of Regents v. Roth (1972), the definition of property was expanded to include more than real property, and the Supreme Court has made it clear that a student is entitled to some form of due process before being suspended or expelled from school (Goss v. Lopez, 1975). It is widely understood that a student who leaves an institution before graduating does so for either personal, academic, or disciplinary reasons (Picozzi, 1987). Liberty
interests may include "a person's good name, reputation, honor and integrity" (Wisconsin v. Constantineau, 1973).

The essence of due process is the principle of fairness. Individuals should not be deprived of important rights, including the right to an education, except through fair procedures (Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 1961; Levitt v. University of Texas, 1986). At a minimum, the student is entitled to: 1) notification in advance of the charges [oral or written], 2) an opportunity for the student to speak on his or her own behalf, and 3) a hearing before a fair tribunal. In the 1990's, institutions rarely dispute this issue. The process can, of course, be abbreviated or expanded by the institution bringing charges (Nash v. Auburn University, 1987; Osteen v. Henley, 1993).

If a hearing is held, the accused is usually given access to an advisor or ombudsperson to help prepare testimony and secure witnesses. Although some institutions allow an accused student to have an attorney or other counsel present and to confer with that person during the hearing, institutions are not required to allow that individual to speak during the hearing (Gabrilowitz v. Newman, 1978). However, the
privilege may be granted. As the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals wrote in Osteen v. Henley (1993), allowing the student "to be represented in the sense of having a lawyer who is permitted to examine or cross-examine witnesses, to submit and object to documents, to address the tribunal, and otherwise perform the traditional function of a trial lawyer," "... would increase the cost of hearings and encourage bureaucratization of higher education" (Smith & Fossey, 1995, p. 211).

To meet the requirement of a tribunal at least "free from the appearance of bias," the person or persons who hear the charges should not have been involved in any administrative or investigative action prior to the hearing. So that an appeal can be made, if appropriate, there should be a taped and/or written transcript of the hearing.

Responsibilities of Faculty

Among the reasons faculty members cite for not reporting through channels is fear of litigation charging the individual with being "personally responsible for violating a student's due process rights" (Pavela, 1988). Ironically, not reporting dishonesty through established procedures is exactly what might put an educator out on a limb.
Another faculty concern is that formal sanctions against the guilty student are sometimes seen as being too severe. The faculty must bear in mind that this is a lesson in ethics and that once the penalty is paid (ethics seminar, probation, etc.), the student may be restored to his or her original status. The university will, of course, impose more severe punishments for more serious offenses. However, many now choose to remove from the transcript the grade penalty code which denotes cheating (Picozzi, 1987). When a professor uses only informal means of dealing with cheating, that professional may conduct an ethical dialogue with the student but the campus community has no way to track repeat offenders or to use the results as a deterrent to dishonesty by other students (Bahr v. Jenkins, 1982). Collection of this data is also an excellent assessment tool (Pavela, 1994).

The best protection faculty members have is to incorporate the university’s policies into their syllabi, to use the administration’s procedures to report incidents of dishonesty, and to nurture an atmosphere of mutual accountability.

In conclusion, the courts allow institutions of higher education considerable leeway when dealing with
charges of academic dishonesty (Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz, 1978; University of Michigan v. Ewing, 1985). Each school creates its own formal response but, in general, the more extensive and complicated the process becomes, the more unlikely reporting will be and the more antagonistic and punitive the atmosphere (Pavela, 1994). However, as long as college officials operate in good faith and conduct academic misconduct investigations fairly and in accordance with prudent procedures, they run very little risk of being successfully sued. It is the wise administration that creates, disseminates, and uniformly enforces a code of student conduct that adheres to that principle and to the existing precedents (Weidemann v. SUNY, 1992).

Theoretical Framework for Experiment

Historically, the purpose of higher education in the United States has been tied to intellectual and spiritual growth. Colonial colleges trained young men for the ministry. Often the president of the institution was a father figure who taught upperclassmen the moral and ethical code by which they were supposed to live. As the student body expanded to include some of the less aristocratic and eventually females, society took comfort in the
practice of *in loco parentis*, whereby administrators and faculty nurtured and disciplined students as if they were their parents. In addition to intellectual growth, higher education was responsible for moral development.

A very different student body arrived on campuses after World War II and the creation of the G.I. Bill. These students were older, more worldly, and more representative of the American socioeconomic spectrum. They were also more resistant to being monitored by school officials and being bound by rules designed for adolescents leaving home for the first time.

This resistance, characteristic of an increasingly disillusioned society, culminated in the 1960's with the revolt of youth as they rejected the values their parents had espoused. No longer willing to be parented by the institution or to have choices made for them, students demanded a voice, pushed for freedom of choice in curriculum, dress codes, and living arrangements. Honor codes were held in disdain by these youth who resented being policed. Administrators, alarmed by the numbers and the vigor of students, backed off on a wide range of issues, including the teaching of ethics, in order to maintain the peace and to stay in business. Many of these
students were not on campus to prepare for the good jobs their parents had hoped they would find; they rejected materialism and the curricula designed to help them obtain it.

As citizens have become more dissatisfied with the rampant crime and corruption of authorities, they have placed some of the blame on an educational system characterized by a laissez-faire attitude toward discipline and moral development. The pendulum has begun to swing back toward more conservative values and lifestyles. Institutions of higher education are being called on to assume a more prominent role in the total development of students. The question is how best to do that.

The theories around which student development programs were originally built have come under attack. With the appearance of the nontraditional student on campus, some have questioned the relevance of theories developed for use with the traditional student. The complexity of society imposes itself on campus life, and student services personnel generally acknowledge that there is no one "truth" applicable to work with students whom most agree are "unpredictable" (Carpenter, 1994). A battle wages between the naturalistic and the positivistic armies in this field.
just as it does in other areas of educational research.

Carpenter (1994) points out that neither extreme is useful when dealing with people. Naturalists make a case for phenomenology, believing that because each person's reality is unique to that person, few if any generalizations are useful. The minute a concept is formulated, it would become suspect because of the continuously changing phenomenological field. The extreme positivists would "discover" a theory of development "both universal and constant across settings and time" (p. 33), and then coordinate and organize functions so as to optimize those constants. Obviously, neither approach is satisfactory.

Indeed, student affairs practitioners might be well advised to combine the best of the two approaches. Because some strategies do work and some patterns do make sense, professionals can generalize based on recurring experiences while acknowledging individual differences and unique situations. College personnel must work within reasonable guidelines, clear enough to provide structure but flexible enough to allow for individual differences. "In order to discover or create programs or other structures likely to meet the needs of a high percentage of
participants, all available tools should be used" (Carpenter, 1994, p. 35).

Relevant Theories

The theoretical perspective which underlies traditional student development approaches takes into consideration the psychosocial stages of development as presented by Erikson, the psychosocial theory of college student development as explained by Chickering, and the theory of moral development introduced by Kohlberg.

Erikson

Erikson's theory is built around eight stages of development, each of which involves some psychosocial crisis. That crisis must be resolved before successful movement into the next stage. Failure to resolve the crisis results in less than optimal personal growth. By the time the traditional student (aged 18-24) reaches college, he or she theoretically has dealt with four of these stages: trust versus mistrust, autonomy versus shame and doubt, initiative versus guilt, and industry versus inferiority.

The challenges of puberty and adolescence, which roughly span the ages of 12 to 20, are critical in terms of role identity versus role confusion. Three conditions necessary for development of a positive
identity are "relative freedom from anxiety and pressure, varied direct experience, and roles and meaningful achievement" (Erikson, 1968, p. 124). The early adulthood stage deals with intimacy versus isolation; in other words, the young adult, ready for intimacy, commits to and nurtures relationships or chooses not to connect.

The literature on college students consistently refers to their stressful lives. Since there may not be much that institutions can do to create that "relative freedom from anxiety and pressure," student service practitioners should perhaps focus on experiences which may nurture growth: a variety of hands-on experiences, policies and programs which help define the student’s role on campus, and opportunities for meaningful achievement. In the area of academic integrity such a program might include clarity of policy, opportunities to role play solutions to ethical dilemmas, and acknowledgement of those who positively influence the moral decisions of their peers.

*Chickering.*

Chickering (1969) defines vectors as stages having both direction and force, and he identifies seven vectors of student development. They include
the development of 1) competence, 2) autonomy, 3) purpose, and 4) integrity; 5) the ability to recognize and control emotions; 6) the establishment of a stable self-image; and 7) an appreciation of individual differences combined with an increasing maturity in relationships. Vectors one through three are considered the "roots" of student development; vector four is the basis for all future growth; and vectors five through seven represent a "branching out" into the real world. Vector four, integrity, includes objective evaluation of ethical dilemmas, an acceptance of one's own values and a willingness to bespeak them, and a congruence between one's beliefs and one's actions.

Chickering suggests that certain environmental conditions foster students' growth at colleges and universities. They are a consistent set of institutional objectives, the inverse relationship of institutional size to opportunities for students to get involved, an open exchange of information which promotes student interaction with academic and social issues, an atmosphere of mutual respect in residence halls, a sense of campus-wide community, and the impact of students on one another.
Kohlberg.

Kohlberg’s theory of moral development defines moral development in terms of movement through stages and defines moral education in terms of facilitating such movement. The stages one moves through are subcategories of these three levels of development:

1. Preconventional: Usually the moral development of a child, although some immature adults and adolescents remain in this stage; concerned with one’s own personal, concrete interests; rights of self.

2. Conventional: Usually entered into by adolescents, more fully developed in early adulthood, and the most dominant level of thinking of adults; "member-of-society" perspective;

3. Postconventional or Principled: Least common, arises in early adulthood (if at all), few adults attain this level; a "prior-to-society" approach; awareness of universal and societal principles as concepts even before agreements and judgements are made.

Challenges to Traditional Theory

As widely as the work of these three theorists has been quoted and as frequently as programs have been built upon those works, the theories are not universally accepted. Theories that imply that traditional students share common backgrounds, values, and opportunities no longer meet the needs and demands of the student, who is now realistically recognized as
a consumer. If higher education in this country is going to survive and, hopefully, flourish, it must take into account diversity of the student population.

Since the publication of *Education and Identity* (1969), Chickering has indicated that he would probably broaden his definition of "college students" to include the diversity of the current student body with respect to race, gender, and age. In addition, he would focus more on how the vectors "interact with one another -- the ways they seem to be part of a larger structure" (Thomas & Chickering, 1984, p. 396, in Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p.22).

Among the most frequent challenges to traditional student development theories are those that concern their applicability across racial and gender lines. An overview of those challenges is an important component of this discussion.

**Issues of race.**

Models have emerged that address the psychosocial development of other minority groups, but the preponderance of literature describes the African American experience. Helms (1990) identifies three "components" of racial identity: a personal identity, a reference group orientation, and an ascribed identity. The personal identity includes one's
attitudes and feelings about oneself; the reference group orientation reflects the extent to which one uses a particular group to define one's personal identity; and the ascribed identity is "the individual's deliberate affiliation or commitment to a particular racial group" (Helms, 1990, in Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p. 25). An individual's particular racial identity will be unique to him or her based on the "weightings the individual assigns to these three components" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p.25). The variations of balance/imbalance evolve into different models, or "racial identity 'resolutions'" (Helms, 1990, in Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p.25).

Within the possible resolutions, Helms categorizes two "theoretical strands." One such strand is useful primarily for counseling and other psychotherapeutic purposes, but, according to Pascarella and Terenzini, not of much use in studying African American college students. That focus is on classification of the individual by "characteristic racial beliefs, attitudes, feelings, and behaviors" (Helms, 1990, in Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p.25). These "types" have attracted little attention from researchers; furthermore, typifying or stereotyping students is not relevant to this study.
On the other hand, the second theoretical strand or set of models has been considered more seriously. These models are representative of what Helms calls the "Nigrescence or racial identity development [NRID] perspective" (Helms, 1990, in Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p. 25). They attempt to describe "the developmental process by which a person 'becomes Black' where Black is defined in terms of one's manner of thinking about and evaluating oneself and one's reference groups rather than in terms of skin color per se" (Helms in Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p. 25). Although Baldwin (1980), Banks (1981), Gay (1984) and others have developed models from the NRID perspective, Cross' model has been most widely cited by researchers.

Cross describes five stages through which individuals pass as they shape their own personal black identity. The first is Stage 1, "Preencounter" (or prediscovery)." In this stage the individual's view of the world is dictated by the Euro-American culture, and the focus is on being assimilated into "the dominant, white world." Stage 2, "Encounter," involves an experience that challenges the individual's previous understanding of "blacks' place in the world." Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) cite
the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., as an example. The experience "triggers a reinterpretation" of the views and beliefs formed in Stage 2.

Stage 3 is "Immersion-Emersion," which includes two sub-stages as the individual searches for a new definition of himself or herself as black. During the immersion phase the person turns inward and is so immersed in his or her blackness that only blackness has value; conversely, all blackness is inherently valuable. In the emersion phase, the individual moves from the "dead-end, either/or, racist, oversimplified aspects of the immersion experience...[and] begins to 'level off' and control his experiences" (Cross, 1971, p. 104). Four outcomes are possible in Stage 4, which is "Internalization." They are 1) continuation and rejection; 2) continuation and fixation in Stage 3; 3) internalization which brings peace and a sense of self but is limited to philosophizing and planning without commitment to those plans; and 4) progression to "what is actually Stage 5, 'Internalization-commitment'" (Cross, 1971, p. 105). This is representative of optimum growth because the individual now moves from planning alone to "participation in the reformation of the black community" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p. 25-26).
The shift is from being a "token" reformer to being a "relevant" one (p. 26), from being a philosopher to being an activist. Stage 5 is the most difficult stage to measure and, therefore, the most challenged.

**Issues of gender.**

Whereas Cross’ model addresses differences in the development of African-American identity, Carol Gilligan’s "Different Voice" model challenges the traditional theories of human and moral development for being male-oriented (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p. 33). Gilligan offers this explanation for why women, when evaluated for moral development, seem to develop more slowly than men: the work by Kohlberg, Erikson, and others is based on studies of men. The developmental sequences, purported to be universal, do not adequately describe the stages through which women pass. According to Gilligan, the discrepancies are attributable to the differing world views held by men and by women.

In essence, Kohlberg’s male-oriented approach focuses on the "subordination of the interpersonal to the societal definition of the good" (Gilligan, 1977, in Gilligan, 1982, p. 489). Women, on the other hand, as Gilligan’s research reveals, define themselves largely by their relationships with others. Their
judgment of morality is "insistently contextual" (Gilligan, 1977, in Gilligan, 1982, p. 482). The values cultivated in men are those of justice and autonomy; those instilled or, perhaps, inherent in women are care and connection. In other words, men are encouraged to operate independently and according to principles of justice, but women value interdependence, "care-giving and response" (Gilligan, 1986, p. 40). Women "have both judged themselves and been judged" by relationships; men's standards are rules (Gilligan, 1982, p. 70). When moral choice depends on context rather than on absolute principles, the process can be complex (Gilligan, 1982, p. 55).

A similarity between Gilligan's model and others is the movement through three levels, "from an egocentric through a societal to a universal perspective" (1977, in Gilligan, 1982, p. 48). These levels are called "Orientation to Individual Survival," "Goodness as Self-Sacrifice," and "The Morality of Nonviolence." The first level, as in most social development models, centers around the individual and her needs. Movement from that point is toward an awareness of others and a sense of "responsibility as a new basis for defining relations between self and others" (Pascarella & Terenzini,
1991, p. 34). At the second level, the maternal instinct so widely accepted as "the feminine voice" emerges. It becomes important to protect the weak and needy. Goodness is synonymous with caring for others, particularly those who cannot care for themselves. In trying to achieve a balance which would protect the vulnerable, a woman "seeks to resolve the conflict between selfishness and responsibility" toward others (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1995, p. 34). The third level, "the Morality of Nonviolence," is "an equilibrium ... between the expectations of conformity and caring in conventional notions of womanhood and [of] individual needs" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1995, p. 34). Women seek to balance their desire not to hurt others, hoping that "in morality lies a way of solving conflicts so that no one will be hurt" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 65). This moral principle, nonviolence, becomes the basis for decision-making and defines justice from the feminist perspective.

Pascarella and Terenzini summarize the differences between Kohlberg and Gilligan as "the differences between the morality of rights and the morality of responsibility, between concepts of autonomy and separation and concepts of connectedness"
and relationships" (1991, p. 34). Gilligan, however, does not distinguish between two separate and ill-fitting theories. She believes, as do many who subscribe to feminist thought, that these approaches represent two different, but not incompatible, world views -- that men and women reason in both the voice of justice and the voice of care. Although one voice may dominate, and although one gender may prefer and use one voice more often than the other, both are available for cultivation and use. Individuals and, sometimes, society tend to emphasize one voice and neglect the other, which leads to the "problems of dominance and subordination" (Gilligan, 1986, in Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p. 35). Women "have traditionally deferred to the judgment of men, although often while intimating a sensibility of their own which is at variance with that judgment" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 69). A critical juncture in an individual's growth may be confronting and resolving that conflict.

Kohlberg's response to Gilligan is that one theory is adequate and that the "two voices merely constitute different styles of moral reasoning" (1984, in Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p. 35). In any case, these several schools of thought present a challenge
to administrators and others who work with college students.

Integration of the Traditional and the Alternative

Despite what I consider valid challenges to traditional theories of student development, it may well be that provisions for diversity can be integrated into the foundation upon which Kibler’s approach to teaching integrity is constructed. Offering a wide range of growth opportunities within any academic and student service programs increases the possibility of successful outreach.

Before designing any program which will challenge and promote growth, student affairs professionals and other administrators must consider the varied developmental stages of those for whom the program is designed. It would seem logical that no one means of dealing with any undergraduate concern will fit all. If administrators ascribe, even with modifications, to the student development theoretical framework around which to build a comprehensive program to address academic dishonesty, Nuss (1981) suggests they consider the following assumptions:

1. College students do not mature and develop at the same rate and must be considered as individuals within the group.
2. Theoretical discussions are not adequate to stimulate moral development; students must be given opportunities to practice in a safe environment.

3. Students can only understand moral reasoning that is on the same level, on a lower level, or on one stage higher than their own.

4. The university community must foster a climate which encourages and supports appropriate development growth.

5. Some students may exhibit a higher level of moral development than faculty or staff.

6. The use of different approaches and programs can increase the likelihood of reaching students with different levels of maturity.

7. All attempts to teach moral behavior must take into account these four components: moral sensitivity (identification of situation), moral judgment (reasoning), moral motivation (prioritization), and moral behavior (planning and acting).

   (Based on Rest, 1965; Dalton, Healy, & Moore, 1985; cited in Kibler, 1993a).

This model indicates that because individuals mature at different rates, no one approach or program can be expected to reach all students. An environment where ethics are explained, discussed, modeled, valued, and promoted within a developmental framework fosters moral development (Kibler et al, 1988).
Current Approaches to Promoting Academic Honesty

Kibler's Framework

William Kibler of Texas A&M University has built a framework for promoting academic integrity grounded in student development theories (1993b). In concert with a panel of student judicial affairs officers and other educators, he has outlined the framework in such detail that "it can be used as a research-based checklist" (Kibler, 1993b, p. 14). Kibler's model includes three broad categories of interventions which are designed to promote an environment conducive to academic integrity. The categories of intervention are ethos promoting academic integrity, policies on academic integrity, and programs on academic integrity (Kibler, 1993b, p. 11).

1. Ethos reflects the character or values system of a particular institution. The message is that academic integrity is to be revered, honored, and upheld. All forms of communication, written and verbal, reaffirm this ethos, which is considered a priority of the administration.

2. The policy is written documentation defining the institution's stance and rules regarding dishonesty.
3. Programs include all forms of education, training, seminars, or orientations which expand upon the mere existence of a policy.

As illustrated in Figure 2.1, there is a natural overlap of the three categories of intervention if all activity of the institution is congruent with the model. For example, when the policy is written (2), it is included in new student orientations (3).

Kibler also specifies seven components, which are the means by which the interventions are implemented. The components Kibler identifies are communication, honor code, disciplinary policies, disciplinary process and programs, faculty assistance, training, and promotion of academic integrity.

Within each of these seven components Kibler offers specific strategies as well. An example is training instructors (a component) to discuss the university’s standards on academic conduct (an intervention) in the first meeting of every class (a strategy). The components of the interventions form links in a chain which protects the university’s ethical culture. Figure 2.2 illustrates this connection.

The targets or focus of all these interventions is faculty/staff, students, and the institutional
MEANS OF INTERVENTION

The broad categories of methods that an institution may use to address student academic dishonesty and promote an environment of academic integrity.

ETHOS PROMOTING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The ethos reflects the character or value system of a particular institution. An ethos promoting academic integrity conveys that academic integrity is something to revere, honor and uphold. This ethos is established by all forms of written and verbal communication, by evidence of practice, and by the extent to which academic integrity is a priority of the leadership of the institution.

POLICY ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Written documentation that addresses an institution's position and/or rules regarding academic dishonesty.

PROGRAM ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Education, training, activities, or programs that address academic dishonesty beyond the existence of a policy.

(Kibler, 1993)
Figure 2.1 MEANS OF INTERVENTION
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Each component is comprised of INTERVENTION STRATEGIES

(KIBLER, 1993)

Figure 2.2 COMPONENTS OF THE MEANS OF INTERVENTION
community which includes the other two groups and parents, visitors, and supporters.

Two components -- methods of communication and the use of an honor code -- will be discussed in depth later because they are integral to the present study. Briefly, the other five components are:

1. Training of anyone who teaches on prevention strategies, policies, sanctions, testing techniques, and classroom atmosphere which fosters honesty.

2. Assistance to faculty through proctoring, case consultation, gathering and presenting evidence.

3. Disciplinary policies which are clearly defined and disseminated, testing guidelines which are promoted, and a means for anonymous reporting.

4. Disciplinary processes and programs which include sanctions for dishonesty and are based on severity of offense, prior record, and student level of development.

Programs in the fourth component include education in ethics, morals, and values with opportunities to practice new behaviors; assessment of these programs, and counseling options for offenders.

5. Promotion of academic integrity by monitoring data, assessing effectiveness of programs, elective credit for volunteers who take seminars, involvement
of students and faculty in developing and implementing policies, and an institutional effort to reduce size of lecture sections.

Components on which Study Focuses

This study focuses on the honor code and on effective communication of this information by faculty to students.

Honor code.

An honor code may be called a code of conduct or a guide for student behavior. It is essential that it be in writing and be disseminated to all in the campus community (Kibler, 1995; Ford, 1995; McCabe & Trevino, 1993). It must define specific, prohibited behaviors and the consequences thereof, a method for reporting violations, and each individual’s responsibilities under the code.

Researchers interested in this field make a strong case for a uniform code, clearly defined for students, supported and implemented by both administrators and faculty, and uniformly enforced. Some programs require the signing of a pledge upon admission to the college or at registration; others, on every homework and exam paper; still others, at the beginning of each course. At Rice University,
"the following pledge is either required or implied" on all written work completed by students: "On my honor, I have neither given nor received any aid on this (examination, quiz or paper)" (On My Honor, 1994, p. 4). Some institutions require renewed commitment by faculty on a regular basis (Pavela & McCabe, 1993).

Communication of expectations.

Communication of expectations in the area of academic integrity is crucial (Chickering & Gamson, 1991). Every activity of the institution is an opportunity to reinforce the ethos promoting academic honesty. New student orientations, first class meetings, and teacher training sessions are ideal. The statement should be printed on everything the university publishes: admissions packets, handbooks, blue books, catalogs, schedules of classes, syllabi, and in the student media. The efforts made to reduce cheating should be publicized, and case statistics and results should be regularly released by the student press, with only general demographic information on offenders.

Sabloff and Yeager (1989, in Aaron, 1992) make the following recommendations. All literature directed toward students should be readable and more than a mere listing of rules. Standards should be
placed in separate sections, written in language students can comprehend, and accompanied by examples. Copies should be clean and large enough to be read easily. The philosophy and purpose of this policy as well as the rights and responsibilities of both students and faculty should be clearly and frequently stated.

A good example of an effective brochure is the one published by the University of Delaware in 1994. Adapted from a similar brochure produced by the Dean of Students Office at Louisiana State University, the publication outlines university policies, sanctions, and specific forms of academic dishonesty as well as proactive strategies both students and faculty can use to promote academic integrity. The unique format is a reproduction of the actual blue book used for all essay exams, and is an attractive excerpt from the longer Official Student Handbook.

Written communication alone does not invite interaction and participation, which is the learning approach that works best with the traditional student (Chickering & Gamson, 1991). An interactive format in which to practice new behaviors is an excellent way for individuals at this level of development to grow.
In addition, the positive use of peer influence is at work when peer judicial councils exist.

Kibler's framework, encompassing all these interventions, is not static or universal. Each community is unique and dynamic, and should preserve those qualities. When it comes to developing programs, one size does not fit all at the institutional level any more than it does at the individual student level. Some institutions may focus on Chickering's seven vectors or Erickson's stages of psychosocial development or Kohlberg's stages of moral development; others may find Chickering and Gamson's discussion of The Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education project attractive (1991); still others may work toward building the sense of community advocated in the report entitled Campus Life: In Search of Community issued by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990). Each, in its own way, encourages interactive learning, behavior rehearsal in a safe environment, and, ultimately, the individual's responsibility for his or her own actions. Finding the combination of interventions which work may require substantial investigation, time, and energy, but the returns are

This author subscribes to the design crafted by Kibler and associates, which is built on traditional theories of student development but which can and should incorporate modifications to account for diversity. The theoretical base of this study, however, targets two parts of Kibler’s framework, the written code of academic conduct and the communication thereof to students, particularly by faculty.

Interactive discussion, role playing, theoretical debate -- all must be preceded by communication of the institution’s policy on academic misconduct and on accompanying sanctions. The development of moral reasoning and of personal ethics is a time-consuming, ongoing process, as is all human growth. In the meantime students are on campus attending classes, taking exams, and doing class assignments; they need immediate exposure to basic information about standards, expectations, and sanctions. Capitalizing on those experiences which the majority of students share, such as classroom presentations and new student orientations, is a reasonable place to start.
Perceptions with which Students Enter LSU

The Office of Student Services at LSU conducted an Entering Student Survey in January and February 1995. For each statement the 246 students selected one response of the five given: Disagree Strongly, Disagree Somewhat, Neutral, Agree Somewhat, Agree Strongly. The perceptions of the 246 students on the three items most relevant to this study are summarized on Tables 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 by both frequency and percentage.

Table 2.1 LSU students are honest and practice integrity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Str</th>
<th>Dis SW</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A SW</th>
<th>A Str</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>123 *</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>32.11</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 LSU students cheat in their academic work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Str</th>
<th>Dis SW</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A SW</th>
<th>A Str</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>103 *</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>41.87</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 I anticipate occasionally cheating in my academic work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Str</th>
<th>Dis SW</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A SW</th>
<th>A Str</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>117 *</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>47.56</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cluster of responses categorized as "Neutral" for the first two statements indicates that incoming
students are open to the influence of the campus community. They do not seem willing to label their peers as dishonest or lacking in integrity. In fact, over 84% of the sample were neutral or agreed to some extent that LSU students are honest and practice integrity. When responding to the statement that LSU students cheat in their academic work, 41.87% were neutral while 27.24% disagreed somewhat and 20.73% agreed somewhat. In other words, only 10.16% of the 246 selected either extreme on this item.

While these new students appear not to be locked into a perception of their peers, they do seem to feel strongly about their own integrity -- or they want to appear to. Over 47% strongly disagreed with the statement that they anticipated occasionally cheating in their academic work, and 27.64% disagreed somewhat. That leaves, of course, 24.8% who were neutral or who might entertain the possibility of cheating. The literature on academic misconduct indicates that the campus environment may influence that decision.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Restatement of Hypotheses

Research indicates that the most powerful deterrent to cheating in college is an instructor who explains and enforces a policy consistent with and supported by the code of conduct of the institution (Kibler et al., 1988). Assuming that the traditional undergraduate student in a required course enters with a perception of cheating similar to that of his fellow students, the purpose of this study is to see:

1. If there is a relationship between the type of information students receive about cheating and students' perception of the seriousness of cheating.

2. If there is a relationship between the type of information students receive about cheating and students' perception of the frequency of cheating.

If students' perceptions of academic dishonesty can be influenced, the next step would be to explore whether their behaviors are then affected by those altered perceptions. It is in laying the foundation for that step that this study is of value.

Methodological Assumptions

For purposes of this study, the assumption is that traditional students, those aged 18-24 and entering higher education soon after completion of
secondary school, who are enrolled in undergraduate courses at Louisiana State University (LSU) are fairly representative of students at other large public universities in the United States with respect to:

1. Perceptions about what constitutes cheating.
2. Perceptions about the seriousness of cheating.
3. Perceived frequency of cheating behaviors.
4. Progression through the stages of moral, personal, and ethical development.

Research Design

The experiment is a single-factor multiple-treatment design with four treatments: 1) instructor, 2) video, 3) written code of student conduct, 4) no-treatment control. These treatments, or sources of information, represent the independent variables in this study. The dependent variables are the perception of the seriousness of cheating and the perceived frequency of cheating on a specific campus. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine whether the means of the three groups receiving the treatments differ significantly from one another and from the control group. Because a significant difference was found, the Tukey test, a non-parametric counterpart for multiple comparison of
population means, was performed to investigate specific differences between the sample groups. It is those results which are discussed.

The means of the responses to each item on the instrument, a self-report survey, were compared with the means of those same items for each of the three sample groups and the control group. In educational research some dependent variables such as perception may be difficult to measure. In this study, however, I exercised some control by limiting the options for subjects by using close-ended questions.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument is a self-report survey. The first page was modified with permission from Don McCabe of Rutgers University (1995). The Center for Academic Integrity, which is housed at College Park, Maryland, has used student and faculty versions at a variety of institutions. Part of this survey involves the students' perceived reasons for cheating, their perceptions of the frequency of cheating on our campus, and the ways in which the students themselves have cheated or have observed it in their classes. Since many colleges and universities have revised and utilized this instrument using their own methodology, the LSU study had to be evaluated separately for
validity. During an internship with the Dean of Students the spring of 1995, I conducted a pilot survey to do just that. The pilot study and the results will be discussed in the next section.

Section Two on page one of the actual survey used in this study contains questions used on the McCabe survey and were included so that they could be measured against the same items on the LSU pilot study.

Section One of the survey asks for background information. The ethnic/racial categories listed are those used by the Office of Budget and Planning at LSU in its reporting and are labeled *ethnic* although one might make a case for the term *racial*. Section Two on the first page addresses academic integrity in general at LSU. Subjects responded to items adapted from the survey used by the Center for Academic Integrity on a four-point Likert scale.

Page two, the largest segment of the survey, is an adaptation of the Perceptions of Cheating Scale (POCS) originally created by Roberts and Toomey (1993) to assess faculty and student perceptions of examination-related situations. They operated under the assumption that the more similar the perceptions of these two groups are, the more likely they are to work together to prevent cheating. Respondents were
asked to assign punishment on a scale from 1 to 7 based on how serious they considered the offense in each of the 30 scenarios to be. The researchers hypothesized that faculty would assign harsher consequences than would students; that is, in fact, what they found. Because faculty perceptions are not relevant in this study, only students will respond to the survey.

In the Roberts and Toomey study, the subjects were 252 students, 50% of whom were seniors; the 180 faculty represented only 26% of the total faculty. Roberts and Toomey did not have enough information to claim that faculty respondents were "systematically different than non-respondents," nor do they claim that the results are completely generalizable. Attempts will be made to increase that probability in this study.

The second page of the survey contains 22 specific behaviors which may or may not be considered cheating; this calls for students’ perceptions and opinions. For each of the 22 examples students were asked to formulate four responses. Two of the four directly relate to this study and will be discussed in detail. Those two are classification of behavior by seriousness and estimated frequency at LSU of each
behavior. The other two responses, while not related as directly to the hypotheses, were included because the information is useful in discussions of academic misconduct and because a graduate student's opportunity to survey such a large undergraduate sample is somewhat rare. Those responses are the frequency of the individual student's engagement in each behavior and the circumstances under which the individual might engage in that behavior.

In the first set of responses, the participants were asked to classify each of the 22 behaviors as 1) not cheating, 2) minor cheating offense, 3) serious cheating, and 4) very serious cheating. These are items 16-37 on page two.

Respondents were then asked how frequently, in their opinion, each of the 22 behaviors occurred on the LSU campus. The choices were 1) never, 2) seldom, 3) often, 4) very often. These items are numbered 82-103 on page two.

The two other categories of response, interesting but only tangentially relevant to this study, focus on the respondents' personal histories. The second column, numbers 38-59, asks how often the respondent has engaged in each of the 22 behaviors. The response choices are 1) never, 2) once, 3) a few times, 4)
several times. Items 60-81, column three, solicit a response to this question: If given the chance and knowing you would not get caught, would you engage in this behavior? The choices are 1) no, not under any circumstances, 2) only if I were in danger of failing the course, 3) if I needed a better grade to keep a scholarship, to stay eligible for athletics, or to improve changes for graduate school, and 4) if I think the instructor is unreasonable in his or her expectations or is not an effective teacher.

The items on the LSU survey which are numbered 30, 31, 33, 34, and 35 on page two correspond to Roberts and Toomey's items 6, 7, 20, 22, and 27, and number 32 is a variation of their item 15 adapted for LSU students.

A variation of items 5 and 8 on Livorsky and Tauber's "Cheating 'Quiz'" (1994) was incorporated into the LSU instrument. On the Livorsky and Tauber quiz, respondents read ten situations and answered "yes" if they considered the situation an example of cheating or "no" if they did not. The original behaviors were followed by the question "At this point, has he or she cheated?" That question was omitted for this study because it was not related to
the hypotheses, which concern frequency and seriousness of cheating.

The rest of the specific behaviors on page two are examples taken from the Academic Integrity Survey constructed by the Center for Academic Integrity at College Park, Maryland (1994). Not only did McCabe of Rutgers University grant permission to use the survey in this study; he suggested modifications and omissions based on the use of the survey at Rutgers and at other colleges and universities (D. McCabe, personal communication, March 1995). For example, because some attention has been directed at cheating among college athletes and members of Greek organizations, McCabe warned against arranging the activities section in a way which would appear to target those groups. Several items had not generated useful responses or would have made the LSU instrument too lengthy so they were dropped or reworded. One such question was about the student's current living arrangements; another concerned level of parents' education; and another, family income.

The Center for Academic Integrity has used student and faculty versions at a variety of institutions. Part of this survey involves the students' perceived reasons for cheating, their
perceptions of the frequency of cheating on our campus, and the ways in which the students themselves have cheated or have observed it in their classes. Since I revised this instrument and incorporated parts of others for my study, I needed to evaluate for validity and reliability. I did that by conducting a pilot study.

**Pilot Study**

During an internship with the Dean of Students the spring of 1995, I conducted a pilot survey on the topic of academic misconduct. Although I made an effort to have a representative sample, I cannot make that claim because I used volunteer instructors. The primary purpose of the pilot study, however, was to try out the instrument. Significant results follow (Sistrunk, 1995).

**Summary of Pilot Study: Spring 1995**

Surveys for both students and faculty were based on McCabe's instrument developed through the Center for Academic Integrity, College Park, Maryland. Although this was not a random sample, distribution of academic classification was fairly evenly distributed. Sixty-five percent of students had been at LSU one or two years, including that school year. Fifty-nine percent of those students surveyed plan to pursue
graduate work. Extra- and co-curricular activities most often participated in were intramural athletics and Greek organizations (23% each).

Twenty-three percent of faculty respondents had been at LSU more than 20 years. Thirty-eight percent of other faculty respondents had been at LSU between four and ten years. Fifty-two percent had never reported academic dishonesty to authorities; 60% of those did not feel they had adequate information to support suspicions. Of the 49% who had reported incidents, 38% were dissatisfied with the way the matter was handled.

In comparison and contrast of similar items on both student and faculty surveys, each student was asked how often he or she had engaged in a behavior, and each faculty member was asked how often the behavior had been encountered in the classroom. Choices given were 1) never, 2) once, 3) a few times, 3) several times, and 4) many times. The percentages listed below are the highest reported responses from 328 students and 27 faculty.

Seventy-five percent of students said they had never used crib notes on a test, and 74% of faculty had never observed that behavior in class. Fifty-five percent of students reported never having copied from
another student during a test without that person's knowledge, and 52% of the faculty reported having seen it done a few times. Sixty-four percent of students claimed never to have copied with the other student's knowledge.

As for copying material, almost word for word, from any source and turning it in as their own work, 81% of students said they had never done so; 44% of faculty, however, had discovered this form of plagiarism a few times. Seventy-five percent of the students claimed never to have fabricated or falsified a bibliography. Similarly, 67% of the instructors had never observed that particular offense.

While 80% of students reported never having turned in work done by another student, 37% of faculty said they had either never seen that or had seen it only a few times. Sixty-nine percent of the students said they had never received substantial, unpermitted help from someone else; 48% of the faculty responded that they had never encountered this behavior, and 30% had encountered it a few times. When asked about students' having collaborated on an assignment when individual work was asked for, 52% of them said they had never done so; 44% of the faculty also answered never, and 37% answered that they had seen such
behavior a few times. When asked about copying a few sentences without footnoting them in a paper, 55% of the students indicated they had never copied in this way, and 42% of the faculty had found that behavior a few times.

One of the two items given only to students involved writing a paper for another student; 87% responded that they never had. Eighty-two percent reported never having copied someone else’s program in a math/computer course rather than having done their own.

The next section offered responses ranking from Very Low and Low to High and Very High. Forty-nine percent of students ranked the severity of penalties for cheating at LSU high, whereas 56% of faculty ranked it low. The chances of getting caught cheating at LSU were low according to 57% of the students and to 59% of the faculty. Forty-four percent of the students surveyed rated students’ understanding of the Code of Student Conduct at LSU low and so did 48% of the faculty; 33% rated it very low. Forty-eight percent of the faculty rated the faculty’s understanding of LSU’s policy on academic conduct low and differed widely on their perception of faculty support of that policy. Forty-four percent ranked it
high, and 33% ranked it low. Forty-one percent of the
students surveyed described the faculty's explanation
of these policies to their classes as low, and 59% of
faculty admitted that the consistency of faculty in
explaining the policy to classes is low. The
faculty's enforcement of the policy was rated high by
49% of students whereas the consistency of enforcement
was rated low by 67% of the faculty respondents.

In conclusion, both groups were asked to rate the
effectiveness of LSU's policies in preventing
cheating. Whereas 52% of students assigned it a low
rating, an even greater percentage of faculty (74%)
rated it low.

Most frequent student responses.

When students were asked what they would do if a
friend asked for help during a test or exam, 45% said
they would ignore or turn down request. Thirty-one
percent responded that they would say nothing but
expose their paper so the friend could copy. In
contrast, 74% said they would ignore or turn down the
request if an anonymous classmate asked for help.

Fifty-one percent of students thought it was
unlikely that a typical LSU student would report an
observed incident of cheating; forty-seven percent
thought it was very unlikely the incident would be reported.

Students responded that their most important sources of information about campus rules are informal conversations with other students (32%), published sources (24%), and faculty discussion in the classroom (23%). Trial and error was the least important source.

Perhaps one of the most disparate statistics is that while 76% have witnessed cheating, only 2% thought it likely that a typical LSU student would report such an incident. On a related topic, 37% would help a friend cheat if asked and even 9% would help an anonymous classmate cheat. Not one respondent would report a friend who asked for help, and only one of the 328 students surveyed would report an anonymous classmate.

The data were consistent with the literature and with my expectations and suggested that the instrument had acceptable reliability and validity.

Internal and External Validity

Because this is a treatment\post-test design using random assignment of units or class sections, the usual threats to internal and external validity do not present a problem (Borg & Gall, 1989). Neither
history, maturation, becoming test-wise, attrition, instrumentation, statistical regression, nor any of the other internal threats apply. The sample is large enough to satisfy the demands of external validity such as population and ecological generalizability and should increase the probability of initially equivalent treatment groups. Sections of a required science course were chosen for survey distribution in an effort to survey sections representative of the larger LSU population. To correct for the challenge of differential selection, I excluded evening sections and those sections composed of science majors only.

Reliability

Roberts and Toombs (1993) tested the reliability of the Perception of Cheating Scale (POCS) using the samples of the 252 students and the 180 faculty. Coefficient alphas were .93 and .94 respectively. When the authors averaged item-total correlations for the two groups, those scores means were .57 and .63 respectively.

The reliability and the length of a test are related. This survey contains eight background questions with multiple choices and 103 other items related to academic integrity at LSU. The large number of items reduces the threat to reliability.
Validity

It is important to know the extent to which extraneous variables have been controlled in an experiment. One extraneous variable here is exposure to the Code of Student Conduct before the semester in which subjects were surveyed or in a course running concurrently. In an attempt to control for that variable, each student was asked to fill in the oval marked E if they had "ever been in a class at LSU in which the instructor gave a formal presentation on the university's expectations concerning academic honesty" other than the one they saw in that particular biology class. Two hundred forty-four respondents or 36.1% of the total sample had had that exposure at LSU.

The two behaviors on page two which were used to confirm face validity are represented in items 34 and 36. One is definitely an example of cheating: "Paying another student to take a test for you, write a paper for you, or to obtain old tests which the instructor does not want distributed." The other is not: "Preparing a cheat sheet before an exam, taking it with you, but, because you feel guilty, deciding not to use it." The rest of the examples call for some interpretation. The largest percentage of
students in each sample classified items 34 and 36 appropriately.

Sample

Sample Selection

Some of the literature on academic dishonesty indicates that the highest reported rates of cheating are at the sophomore level (Baird, 1989; Bowers, 1964, in Mathews, 1985). Possible reasons are that poorer students often leave after that point, that students have become acculturated to the mores on their particular campus, or that they get increasingly adept at deception.

Ideally the sample would have come from sections of a required course in the general curriculum. English courses were considered and discarded because in every freshman and sophomore class the instructor is required by department policy to discuss in detail plagiarism and related forms of cheating. Only students in their first semester at LSU would not have had that exposure; that would require identification of individuals rather than sections and would have complicated the process.

A large biology section taught by E. William Wischusen, coordinator of the department, had participated in the pilot study in the spring of 1995.
He allowed me to approach his faculty, all of whom were willing to participate.

Because sections could not be matched in each of the four treatment groups, evening sections were omitted because they attract more atypical students; likewise, sections composed primarily of science majors were omitted because those students seem, in general, more motivated and academically focused than the typical student in that course. The biology instructors serve as their academic advisors, and the course is a prerequisite for higher level science courses. Matching across the four treatment groups would have been important, but difficult, if these sections were to have been included.

In an attempt to obtain responses from the various categories of students within the university, the instrument has items to identify students within each section. At one point omission of foreign students and of students not between the ages of 18 and 24 was considered but was discarded. Students with those characteristics represented such a small percentage of the total sample that their participation did not taint the results.

There was no way to identify beforehand by class roster or computer records what might have been two
other important variables. These are Greek affiliation and participation in collegiate athletics. Since the evidence is inconclusive and since these characteristics appear to be evenly distributed in the four sample groups, I did not correct for them. However, the demographic and activity section on the McCabe instrument has items devoted to activities in which students are involved. These data were collected from the surveys so that their frequency could be noted.

Each of the sections contained approximately 250 students, giving an estimated sample of 250 subjects per group, an estimated total of 1000 subjects. After some initial dropping, adding, changing of sections, and absenteeism, a total of 674 students participated in the survey. Sample size is large enough to increase likelihood of the means and standard deviations' being representative of the population mean and standard deviation.

The Population from which the Sample was Taken

Louisiana State University conducts registration by a computerized system accessed by students through a phone line. When registration is done solely by computer and not through a phone system which allows students some power of selection, the chance of
randomization within sections is greater. The Office of Budget and Planning at LSU reported the numbers on Table 3.1 for the 19055 students who comprised the undergraduate population in the Spring 1996 semester classified by race and gender.

**Table 3.1 RACE AND GENDER DISTRIBUTION OF LSU POPULATION, SPRING 1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th># Males</th>
<th># Females</th>
<th>Percent of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Amer</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7537</td>
<td>7603</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographic data collected for the entire sample was similar to the total LSU population as reported in Spring 1996 except in terms of gender distribution. The totals for the race of the 674 students surveyed are given in numerals and by percentage on Table 3.2.

Whereas females comprised 50.6% of the university's population and males comprised 49.4%, women composed 64.6% of the sample and men, 35.4%. In an effort to explain the difference in gender
Table 3.2 RACE OF SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

distribution in the sample, I discussed the issue with Dr. Wischusen. Although sections for science majors, which were omitted from this study, tended to be predominantly male in the past, that is not true now. Furthermore, the data do not support the supposition that more female students might be drawn to sections taught by women. In this study three of the four sections were taught by women, and whereas the distribution of those three samples were 57.6% female and 42.4% male; 62.3% female and 57.7% male; and 71.6% female and 28.4% male, the section taught by the
male instructor was divided 65.1% female and 34.9% male.

The other characteristics requested on the survey were age, academic standing by hours earned, and the number of years at LSU.

Demographics and Background of Sample

The composite of all four sample groups includes 432 females and 237 males. The largest age group, those 18-24 years old, makes up 93.6% of the sample. Subjects reported their academic standing to be: 54.9% freshmen, 26.5% sophomores, 11.1% juniors, 7% seniors, and 0.4% graduate students. Because the underclassmen were the primary target and they comprised 81.4% of the overall sample, no adjustments were made. The fact that 85.7% described themselves as first or second year students at LSU reinforced the decision to include responses from all individuals who were surveyed.

Over half of the sample, 58.9%, plan to attend graduate school. The majors most cited were business (18.6%), education (17.2%), and "other" (21.4%). In rank order of their having been selected as activities the students were involved in at LSU were fraternities and sororities, intramural athletics, a religious group on campus, some unnamed special interest group,
and a service organization. Because many Greek organizations participate in intramural competition, it is not unusual for intramurals to run a close second to fraternities and sororities. Whereas 16.6% of this sample played intramural athletics, only 7.1% were involved in intercollegiate athletics.

Demographics and Background of the Four Groups

Control group (CON).

Of the 184 subjects in this group, 106 (57.6%) are female and 78 (42.4%) male. The largest age bracket is 18-24 or 94.6% of the sample. White students comprise 78.1%; Asian, 7.1%; African American, 6.0%; Hispanic, 5.5%; foreign, 2.2%; and other, 1.1%. There are no Native Americans in this section.

One hundred nineteen (64.7%) classified themselves as freshmen and 34 (18.5%) as sophomores. There were 16 juniors (8.7%), 13 seniors (7.1%), and 2 graduate students (1.1%). For 132 students (72.5%) this was their first year at LSU. Twenty-nine (15.9%) were in their second year, and six (3.3%) in their third year. Eleven (6.0%) were in their fourth year and four had been at LSU for more than five years.
When asked if they planned to pursue graduate work, 114 (62.6%) answered "yes," and 21 (11.5%) answered "no." Forty-seven (25.8%) were undecided.

The occupations students most planned to enter were business (21.4%), "other" (20.2%), education (13.9%), law (11.0%), and medicine (9.2%). The majority of pre-med students enroll in a "majors only" section; these sections are not included in this study.

When asked to mark all activities in which they have participated at LSU, students listed fraternity or sorority (27.0%), intramural athletics (18.9%), special interest groups not listed on survey (14.1%), a religious group on campus (11.4%), and a service organization (10.3%). Eighty-one (43.8%) had had prior introduction to Louisiana State University's Code of Student Conduct as it relates to academic conduct.

**Code of student conduct group (CODE).**

Ninety-four of these 151 students (62.3%) are female and 57 (37.7%), males. One hundred thirty-nine (92.7%) are between the ages of 18 and 24, seven (4.7%) between the ages of 25 and 30, two (1.3%) are 31 to 40, and two (1.3%), 41 and older. Again, whites comprise the largest ethnic group (79.7%). African
Americans comprise 9.2%; foreign students, 3.9%; Asians, 3.3%; and Hispanics, 2.0%. There is one Native American (.7%) and two unclassified (1.3%).

Academic classification is as follows: 89 freshmen (58.6%), 35 sophomores (23%), 18 juniors (11.8%), and ten seniors (6.6%). One hundred (66.2%) of the group were in their first year at LSU; 27 (17.9%), in their second year; and 14 (9.3%) in their third year. Six (4.0%) were in year four, and four in year five. Eighty (52.6%) planned to pursue graduate work, 26 (17.1%) did not, and 46 (30.3%) were undecided at the time of the survey.

The occupations listed in order of frequency were "other" (21.8%), education (21.1%), business (15.6%), medicine (10.2%), public or government service and engineering (8.2% each), arts\architecture (6.1%), law (4.8%), and science (4.1%).

Students in the CODE group most often participate in the following activities: fraternities or sororities (21.1%), a religious group on campus (14.5%), special interest groups not listed as an option (16.4%), and intramural sports (13.8%). This section has the largest percentage of intercollegiate athletes in the study (13.2%). Seventy students
(46.1%) indicated that they had seen or heard a presentation on academic honesty at LSU.

**Instructor group (PROF).**

This section is the smallest of the four, with 109 subjects. There are 71 females (65.1%) and 38 males (34.9%), 96.3% of whom were aged 18-24. The group consists of 87 (80.6%) whites; 11 (10.2%) African Americans; three Asians (2.8%); three (2.8%) Hispanics; two (1.9%) Native Americans; one (0.9%) foreign; and one (0.9%) unclassified. Fifty-seven (52.3%) classified themselves as freshmen, 34 (31.2%) as sophomores, 11 (10.1%) as juniors, and seven (6.4%) as seniors. There were no graduate students in this class. Sixty-three percent (68 students) were in their first year at LSU and 31.2% (34 students) were in their second year. No one had been on campus for more than five years.

When asked if they planned to pursue graduate work, 62 (57.4%) said they did, 11 (10.2%) said they did not, and 35 (35%) were undecided. The occupations chosen most frequently were "other" (24.3%), business (15.9%), education (15.0%), and law (14.0%). The activities most often marked were fraternity or sorority (26.6%), intramural athletics (18.3%), an unlisted special interest group (15.6%), a religious
group on campus (11.9%), and an academic honor society (11.0%). Forty-four (40.4%) indicated that they had had the LSU policy on academic conduct explained to them in some formal presentation or discussion.

**Video group (VIDEO).**

This sample is composed of 161 (71.6%) females and 64 (28.4%) males, making it the largest section. Two hundred seven (92%) are between 18-24 years old, nine (4.0%) are between 25-30, six (2.7%) between 31-40, and three (1.3%) are 41 or older. One hundred seventy (77.3%) students are white, 7.3% Asian, 8.6% African American, 2.7% Hispanic, 0.5% foreign, 3.2% unclassified. There is one Native American in this section (0.5%).

Academic classifications by percentage are as follows: 45.7% freshmen, 33.2% sophomores, 13.0% juniors, 7.6% seniors, and 0.4% graduate students. One hundred twenty-seven (56.4%) were in their first year at LSU, 62 (27.6%) in their second, 17 (7.6%) in their third, and 13 (5.8%) in their fourth. There were four (1.8%) who had been at LSU five years and two (0.9%) who had been here more than five years. Those who planned to do graduate work number 136 (60.7%), 30 (13/4%) did not, and 58 (25.9%) were undecided.
The occupation most frequently chosen was something other than those listed (20.5%). Second most often was business (19.6%) while the third was education (18.3%). The remaining were medicine (15.1%), law (8.2%), arts/architecture (6.4%), and public or government service (5.0%). Forty-nine (21.4%) indicated that they had heard a prior presentation on LSU’s expectations regarding academic conduct.

Students were also asked whether they planned to pursue graduate level work and in what activities they had participated at LSU. Although the responses may not relate directly to the hypotheses, they are of interest to the researcher.

Treatment

Standardization of treatment is described in this section.

The control (CON) group did not receive any information, written or oral, about the expectations of the instructor or of the university concerning academic honesty until after the outcome assessment was conducted.

The LSU Code of Student Conduct (CODE) group was given an excerpt from the Code of Student Conduct of LSU and told that the policy on academic misconduct
described on those two pages applies to this course. For standardization purposes, the instructor introduced me, I briefly explained to the students our purpose, and an assistant and I distributed the two pages. The instructor allowed 15 to 20 minutes for students to read the material and sign on the second page that they had read the Code. Their signatures did not indicate agreement with or a commitment to the policy. Students then passed forward the signed sheets. The instructor offered no amplification at that time.

The instructor in group three, [PROF], presented information in accordance with the policy instituted by the University. He agreed to use a highlighted copy of the Code, complete with examples, to increase standardization among Groups B, C, and D.

The fourth group, [VIDEO], saw a modified version of the videotape entitled Academic Integrity: The Bridge to Professional Ethics, which was created by the Center for Applied Ethics at Duke University. The "basic premise of this videotape and manual is that ethics are only relevant in a real context--with cases that are familiar to the audience" (Vesilind, 1995, p.2). As each section of the film ends, the manual encourages the instructor to stop the tape and lead a
discussion about the ethical principles involved. Because that would have consumed too much class time and because there would be such a lack of uniformity, the instructor allowed me to play the video with only a brief introductory comment. Everything the students needed to know about the scenarios and their applicability to classroom ethics was on the screen. The one addition that was made to the original video was a segment defining the distinction LSU makes between premeditated and unpremeditated instances of academic misconduct and the consequences of each. Watching the video took approximately 20 minutes. The videocassette player is mounted to the ceiling of the auditorium and the picture projected to a wall-size screen, easily seen from every seat in the room.

After all sections were exposed to the treatment, but before the first mass exam, all sections were administered the three part survey. This took 20 to 30 minutes. Students were not required to participate in the survey but no one refused. The time lapse between treatment and the survey was two weeks or less.

Scope and Limitations of Study

A longitudinal study with a random sample of the entire student body of Louisiana State University
would be ideal. With adjustments made for important variables, a pre-test/treatment/post-test format would provide valuable data. That was not, however, within the scope of this project. The expense, the time frame, and the imposition on faculty teaching time would have been substantial.

In this study, therefore, I concerned myself primarily with the undergraduate at Louisiana State University (LSU) who fits the traditional definition by falling within the 18-24 year old age group.

Although the development of disciplinary policies and the implementation of disciplinary programs are an integral component of a total plan to address academic dishonesty from a student development perspective, it is beyond the scope of this study to discuss in detail all methods of dissemination. One method of dissemination of information in this study was the instructor. It was not necessary, in this case, to factor in the variable of instructor proficiency at delivering the message. Only one instructor gave such a presentation, and he used a format and examples consistent with the video and the excerpt from the Code of Student Conduct. He did, as a matter of fact, present to the attentive class a succinct but thorough
introduction to LSU's policies and sanctions. This took less than ten minutes.

One last limitation was that the video, while excellent, was not specifically designed for my sample. Nevertheless, I chose to use it because there are few films available. A vignette of two male LSU students in a residence hall discussing the difference between premeditated and unpremeditated cheating was added; but the best conditions would occur if a film were developed for this particular purpose.

Limitations in Selecting Research Subjects

Had time allowed, I would have preferred to collect data as classes began in the Fall 1995 semester so I could have limited the subjects to incoming freshmen in an almost exclusively freshman course. Selecting a stratified random sample of the student body of Louisiana State University to survey and follow longitudinally was not feasible either for this study.

Gender ratio.

The male/female ratio in the sample is not representative of the total student body of Louisiana State University, but I chose not to correct for gender. The literature does not indicate that gender is a factor in predictability of cheating, and the
other data provided by such a large sample is valuable. Also, the other characteristics of the sample are reflective of demographic and activity histories at LSU.

Greek ratio.

Kathy Marcel, of the Office of Greek Affairs at Louisiana State University, reports that 15% of undergraduates at LSU are affiliated with fraternities and sororities. While 24.4% of the 675 students involved in this study claimed membership, that is not necessarily inconsistent; membership is more concentrated among first and second year students before academics and finances take their toll.

The decision not to administer the survey to a control group before any subjects were exposed to the treatments was made based on the assumption that the subjects, as a group, enter the course with similar perceptions of what constitutes cheating.

Limitations in Choosing the Research Design

The original plan was to use a pre-test/treatment/post-test format (R-O-X-O pattern, with R=random selection of sections, O=observation, X=treatment) as described by the Solomon four-group design (Borg & Gall, 1994). In the original plan, the instructors would have conducted the first day of
class this way: Students would have entered, roll would have been taken, a survey would have been distributed without comment from the instructor; it would have been collected, I would have left, and then the first day introduction to the course would have begun. In one section, the professor would not have discussed the issue of academic dishonesty; there seem to be some who do not or who do not do so until the first test. A second professor would have delivered his/her interpretation of policy as applicable in that course; and a third would have handed out the Louisiana State University Student Code of Conduct, admonishing students that they are responsible for the contents; and the fourth class would have seen a video. My intent was to return to the classes about two weeks later, but definitely before the first exam, administer the same two-part survey and compare results for each section with that section's pre-test; additionally, the means of each of the four groups would have been compared and contrasted with one another.

The R-O-X-O format presented several problems. One was the pattern of students to add, drop, and change sections daily during the first month of classes. As is the case when one uses volunteers and
experiences attrition, the researcher cannot assume such movement would be done on a random basis. Daily checks on class rosters on the University’s main frame would be necessary but very time-consuming.

In the end, a pre-test/treatment/post-test format was discarded because, in addition to these problems, it would borrow more teaching time than an outcome only format. The challenge, of course, is to make a case that the students in each group of four sections are similar in respect to important variables.

Limitations in Selecting the Instrument

A limitation of the instrument is the attractiveness of the questionnaires. In order to save space and, therefore, money on the printing and then the scoring of the instruments, an intricate design was laid out by the Measurement and Testing Center at LSU. I was concerned about its being confusing, but because survey participants seem to respond more positively to what they perceive to be short surveys, I was hesitant to discard it. I asked several student volunteers not in the classes to be surveyed to test it; they did not seem to find it confusing. Additionally, when asked about any difficulties during the testing itself, no students voiced confusion.
Furthermore, it may appear to some readers that the behaviors listed in items 16 through 103 are unintentionally arranged in an order based on values of this researcher, other researchers from whom they are borrowed, or Western civilization in general. It may appear also that values are assigned to the choices given. Although LSU does differentiate between premeditated and unpremeditated offenses and has more serious sanctions for the former, no claim is made that the four choices of classification (items 16-37) are interval data nor that they are quantifiable. That claim is not made for frequency options (items 82-103) either.

The sections of other instruments from which this survey is taken were not originally designed to elicit this kind of data. For example, the first part of the POCS was designed to identify respondents’ perceptions of behaviors which may or may not be cheating; the second part asked that the subject classify the behavior as intentional or unintentional, etc. Nonetheless, the questionnaire as modified does yield interesting and useful data. As described earlier, the video from Duke University was tailored to reflect Louisiana State University’s policy on academic misconduct.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

In this chapter I begin by giving an overview of survey results and then describe the survey results as they relate to each hypothesis.

Overview of Scoring and Analysis

The data were analyzed in four ways. First, a simple frequency count/percent for each of the 103 items for each of the four sample groups was calculated. Next, an analysis of variance was performed for the 674 observations in the data set. Because the test results indicated a significant statistical difference between some of the group means on some items, the Tukey's (HSD) Test was administered to find where the differences occur and to control for Type I experimentwise error rate. Finally, ANOVA results for individual item analysis were calculated. I used a 0.95 confidence level and a critical value of 3.642 to determine significant difference at the .05 level.

Seriousness of Cheating as the Dependent Variable

Items 16 through 37 require the respondent to classify specific examples of behavior as 1) not cheating, 2) minor cheating offense, 3) serious cheating, or 4) very serious cheating. When an ANOVA was performed on items 16 through 37 as a single
category, a significant difference was found. Table 4.1 reveals the difference that exists for seriousness of cheating.

**Table 4.1 ANOVA RESULTS FOR SERIOUSNESS OF CHEATING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>247.75</td>
<td>659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250.69</td>
<td>662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates statistical difference at .05 level.

The Tukey test revealed that the significant statistical difference is only between the VIDEO group and the LSU Code of Student Conduct group. The mean score for the VIDEO group (M=2.81, SD=.60) is higher than the mean score for the CODE group (M=2.63, SD=.72). This indicates that the video presentation is a more effective type of presentation than the mere reading of a code of conduct in influencing students' general perception of the seriousness of cheating behaviors. Table 4.2 shows the specific differences between the groups as revealed by the Tukey test.
Table 4.2  TUKEY RESULTS FOR SERIOUSNESS OF CHEATING BY TYPE OF INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of information</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (none)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct</td>
<td>2.63*</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Presentation</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>2.81*</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates statistical difference at .05 level.

Constructs of Seriousness of Cheating

In addition to this overall difference, there are statistical differences among three of the groups on 11 of the 22 individual scenarios. These differences may indicate a relationship between the type of information students received about cheating and the students' perception of the seriousness of cheating.

Two distinct patterns or constructs emerge among items for which there is a statistically significant difference between sample groups. The first pattern is the difference on eight items between the group which had received information from the instructor (PROF) and the group which read the LSU Code of Student Conduct (CODE). The second pattern is the
difference on six items between the control group (CON) and the group which read the code (CODE).

Influence of instructor.

An examination of the mean scores indicates that higher scores were found for students in the PROF group than for students in the CODE group. That is, students' perceptions about the seriousness of cheating were higher when they had been exposed to the instructor's presentation than when they read the LSU Code of Student Conduct individually and without discussion. The differences were on items 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, and 34.

Item 17 requires students to classify "Copying from another student during a test with his or her knowledge." The differences on item 17 are between PROF (M=3.146, SD=0.779) and CODE (M=2.697, SD=1.092), a difference of 0.449.

For all four groups, the most often selected response for item 17 was number three, which is a serious cheating offense. CON chose it 40.2% of the time; CODE, 32.2%; PROF, 43.1%; and VIDEO, 37.1%.

On item 18, "Using unpermitted crib notes (or cheat sheet) during a test," there is a difference of 0.30776 between PROF (M=3.366, SD=0.703) and CODE (M=3.059, SD=1.031).
The difference on item 21 between PROF (M=2.899, SD=0.952) and CODE (M=2.447, SD=1.155) is 0.4517. That behavior is "Cheating on a test in some way other than copying, using a cheat sheet, having advance knowledge of test content, or helping someone else cheat."

On item 22 there is again a difference between PROF (M=3.257, SD=0.947) and CODE (M=2.730, SD=1.190). That difference between the means is 0.5266. Item 22 is "Copying material, almost word for word, from any source and turning it in as your own work."

The difference on item 24, which is "Turning in work done by someone else as if it were your own," between the instructor's group (M=3.000, SD=0.827) and the group reading the code of conduct (M=2.566, SD=1.183) is 0.4342.

"Writing a paper for another student," item 28, exposed a difference between the means of PROF (2.945, SD=1.044) and of CODE (M=2.362, SD=1.269).

On item 29 the difference between the means is PROF (M=2.853, SD=0.998) and CODE (M=2.461, SD=1.201). The behavior is "In a math/computer or science course, copying someone's program or lab work rather than doing your own."
The difference on item 34 is between groups PROF (M=3.266, SD=1.051) and CODE (M=2.802, SD=1.277). "Paying another student to take a test for you, write a paper for you, or to obtain old tests which the instructor does not want distributed" is the behavior described.

Table 4.3 presents the items which represent the influence of the instructor, with mean scores and standard deviations for the two contrasting groups.

If these eight behaviors are categorized by type of offense, four of them involve one student's taking information from another student, three involve manipulation of circumstance to create personal advantage, and only one involves giving information to another. In other words, seven of the eight behaviors benefit only the student perpetrating the offense. However, the items which describe behaviors on the survey are not organized topically.

Lack of influence of code.

The second pattern or next largest grouping of differences was between the control group (CON) and the group which read the LSU Code of Student Conduct (CODE). An examination of the mean scores indicates that higher scores were found for students who had not been exposed to any formal presentation of LSU's
Table 4.3  INFLUENCE OF INSTRUCTOR AS CONSTRUCT IN SERIOUSNESS OF CHEATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>PROF</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Copying from another student during a test with his or her knowledge.</td>
<td>M=3.146</td>
<td>M=2.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.779</td>
<td>SD=1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Using unpermitted crib notes (or cheat sheet) during a test.</td>
<td>M=3.366</td>
<td>M=3.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.703</td>
<td>SD=1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cheating on a test in some way other than...</td>
<td>M=2.899</td>
<td>M=2.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.952</td>
<td>SD=1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Copying material, almost word for word, from any source and turning it in as your own.</td>
<td>M=3.257</td>
<td>M=2.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.947</td>
<td>SD=1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Turning in work done by someone else as if it were your own.</td>
<td>M=3.000</td>
<td>M=2.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.827</td>
<td>SD=1.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Writing a paper for another student.</td>
<td>M=2.945</td>
<td>M=2.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=1.044</td>
<td>SD=1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. In a math/computer or science course, copying someone's program or lab work...</td>
<td>M=2.853</td>
<td>M=2.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.998</td>
<td>SD=1.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Paying another student to take a test for you, write a paper for you, or to obtain old tests which the instructor does not want distributed.</td>
<td>M=3.266</td>
<td>M=2.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=1.051</td>
<td>SD=1.276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

expectations concerning academic honesty than for those who had been given a copy of the code to read silently and without explanation. That indicates that students' perceptions about the seriousness of cheating were higher if they had been given no
information at all than if they had merely been asked to read the code. The differences were on six items: 16, 17, 22, 24, 28, and 34.

Item 16 asks the respondent to classify the behavior "Copying from another student during a test or exam without his or her knowing" as 1) not cheating, 2) minor cheating offense, 3) serious cheating, 4) very serious cheating. For this item, the difference between the means of CON (M=2.935, SD=0.859) and CODE (M=2.632, SD=1.001) is 0.3032. With such a large sample, the difference is significant, both practically and statistically.

Item 17 addresses the following behavior: "Copying from another student during a test with his or her knowledge." The mean for the control group is 3.049, the standard deviation 0.857. The mean for the code of conduct group is 2.697, and the standard deviation 1.092. The difference between the two means is 0.3516.

The difference between the means of CON (M=3.071, SD=1.046) and CODE (M=2.730, SD=1.190) on item 22 is 0.3380. The behavior is "Copying material, almost word for word, from any source and turning it in as your own work."
Item 24 deals with "Turning in work done by someone else as if it were your own." The CON group (M=2.918, SD=1.121) rated this behavior as more serious than did the CODE group (M=2.566, SD=1.183).

"Writing a paper for another student," item 28, was rated as a more serious offense by the control group (CON: M=2.832, SD=1.223) than by the group which read the code of conduct (CODE: M=2.362, SD=1.269). The difference between the means is 0.4697.

The final behavior on which the groups differed is number 34, "Paying another student to take a test for you, write a paper for you, or to obtain old tests which the instructor does not want distributed." The difference between the means (CON: M=3.152, SD=1.178; CODE: M=2.802, SD=1.277) is 0.3495.

Table 4.4 shows the differences between the control group and the code of conduct group.

No statistically significant difference appeared between the PROF and CON groups; however, in all cases where the PROF and CON groups scored the same items as more serious offenses than the CODE group did, the group informed by the instructor scored them higher than the control group did. The means for matching items were higher for the PROF group than for
Table 4.4 LACK OF INFLUENCE OF THE CODE AS CONSTRUCT IN SERIOUSNESS OF CHEATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Copying from another student during a test or exam without his or her knowledge.</td>
<td>M=2.935</td>
<td>M=2.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.859</td>
<td>SD=1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Copying from another student during a test with his or her knowledge.</td>
<td>M=3.049</td>
<td>M=2.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.857</td>
<td>SD=1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Copying material, almost word for word, from any source and turning it in as your own.</td>
<td>M=3.071</td>
<td>M=2.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=1.046</td>
<td>SD=1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Turning in work done by someone else as if it were your own.</td>
<td>M=2.918</td>
<td>M=2.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=1.121</td>
<td>SD=1.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Writing a paper for another student.</td>
<td>M=2.832</td>
<td>M=2.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=1.223</td>
<td>SD=1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Paying another student to take a test for you, write a paper for you, or to obtain old tests which the instructor does not want distributed.</td>
<td>M=3.152</td>
<td>M=2.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=1.178</td>
<td>SD=1.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the CON group although both were higher than for the CODE group.

Frequency of Cheating as the Dependent Variable

Items 82 through 103 ask respondents to estimate how frequently they think each of the behaviors occurs at LSU. Responses offered are 1) never, 2) seldom, 3) often, and 4) very often. When an ANOVA and a Tukey's test were performed on those items as a set or
category, no two groups in the sample were significantly different at the .05 level. The sample groups did differ significantly, however, on seven of the 22 individual descriptions of behavior.

Construct of the Frequency of Cheating

All ten of the differences noted on items 82-103 were between the PROF group and the others. Seven of the ten differences were between the PROF and VIDEO groups, creating the only consistent pattern.

Influence of instructor.

An examination of the mean scores reveals that in all cases the group which had received information from the instructor scored higher than the group which saw the video with student actors. The higher the means, the more frequently students perceived the behaviors as occurring. The items on which significant statistical differences were found are 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, and 98.

Groups PROF (M=2.807, SD=0.855) and VIDEO (M=2.406, SD=1.176) differ by 0.4012 on item 90, "Turning in work done by someone else as if it were your own."

The means of PROF (M=2.862, SD=0.967) and VIDEO (M=2.406, SD=1.176) differ by 0.3689 on item 91, which
is "Receiving substantial, unpermitted help on an assignment outside class."

On item 92 the difference between PROF (M=3.119, SD=0.949) and VIDEO (M=2.568, SD=1.288) is 0.5516. The behavior is "Working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work."

The means of groups PROF and VIDEO differ by 0.4585 on item 93, "Copying a few sentences of material without footnoting them in a paper." The means and standard deviations are, respectively, PROF (M=2.908, SD=0.950) and VIDEO (M=2.449, SD=1.285).

On item 94 the difference between PROF (M=2.734, SD=0.968) and VIDEO (M=2.266, SD=1.217) is 0.4676. "Writing a paper for another student" is the example of cheating.

A difference of 0.4270 appears between PROF (M=2.798, SD=0.911) and VIDEO (M=2.371, SD=1.217) on item 95, which is "In a math/computer or science course, copying someone’s program or lab work rather than doing your own."

The final item in Section Two, which includes pages one and two of the survey, on which there is a statistical difference is 98; the groups which differ by 0.4340 are PROF (M=2.761, SD=.017) and VIDEO (M=2.328, SD=1.250). "Making elaborate plans to sit
next to a particular student in order to copy answers and glancing from time to time at the other student's answer sheet" is the behavior. Table 4.5 shows the differences between the group which had the instructor presentation and the group which saw the video.

**General Construct Relating to Hypotheses**

The only item in the section referring to general academic integrity at LSU for which a significant statistical difference is indicated is item four. The item is:

When students are brought to the attention of faculty for cheating, the faculty member can choose one of the three courses of action listed below. Select the one you think faculty members at LSU most often choose.

The choices are 1) no disciplinary action is taken, 2) disciplinary action is taken by the course instructor, 3) the case is passed on to some other LSU authority for disciplinary action.

The difference between the means is between the control group and the group seeing the video (0.17451), the CODE and VIDEO groups (0.18252), and the PROF and VIDEO groups (0.20756). The control group (63.0%) most frequently chose response number two ("Disciplinary action is taken by the course
Table 4.5 INFLUENCE OF INSTRUCTOR AS CONSTRUCT IN FREQUENCY OF CHEATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>PROF</th>
<th>VIDEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90. Turning in work done by someone else as if it were your own.</td>
<td>M=2.807</td>
<td>M=2.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.855</td>
<td>SD=1.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Receiving substantial, unpermitted help on an assignment outside class.</td>
<td>M=2.862</td>
<td>M=2.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.967</td>
<td>SD=1.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work.</td>
<td>M=3.119</td>
<td>M=2.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.949</td>
<td>SD=1.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Copying a few sentences of material without footnoting then in a paper.</td>
<td>M=2.908</td>
<td>M=2.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.095</td>
<td>SD=1.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Writing a paper for another student.</td>
<td>M=2.734</td>
<td>M=2.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.097</td>
<td>SD=1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. In a math/computer course, copying someone's program or lab work rather than doing your own.</td>
<td>M=2.798</td>
<td>M=2.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.911</td>
<td>SD=1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Making elaborate plans to sit next to a particular student in order to copy answers and glancing from time to time at the other student's answer sheet.</td>
<td>M=2.761</td>
<td>M=2.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.017</td>
<td>SD=1.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

instructor") as did the group which read the LSU Code of Student Conduct (59.9%). The other two groups also selected response two most often -- PROF (62.4%) and VIDEO (61.1%). The highest percentage of students in
each group perceives that when students are brought to the attention of faculty for cheating, the course instructor takes the disciplinary action rather than ignoring the incident or referring it to the appropriate LSU authorities.

**Most Frequently Chosen Classifications of Behavior**

All four groups classified the 22 behaviors on items 16 through 37 as to degrees of seriousness. The examples discussed in this section are those for which all four groups most frequently selected the same classification.

Two items were included on the survey to test face validity of the instrument. One is an example of cheating and one is not. Item 36 is "Preparing a cheat sheet before an exam, taking it with you, but, because you feel guilty, deciding not to use it." Each group described this example as "not cheating." That is, in fact, the only behavior on the survey that is clearly not considered academic misconduct as defined by LSU in the LSU Code of Student Conduct.

One of the behaviors most frequently considered a very serious example of academic misconduct by all four groups is item 34. Item 34 is "Paying another student to take a test for you, write a paper for you, or to obtain old tests which the instructor does not
want distributed." It is the second behavior included to test face validity of the instrument, in this case as a definite example of cheating.

Item 32, "Deliberately missing class in order to retake an exam (ex: lying about medical or other extenuating circumstances to get an extended deadline or to retake an exam)" is an example of academic misconduct. Interestingly, the only section which did not consider item 32 cheating was the group which received the instructor's briefing.

The students shared similar perceptions of items 25, 26, 27, and 33, and classified them as minor cheating offenses. The first two behaviors are sometimes confused with collaboration or cooperative learning. Item 27 deals with improper footnoting, and item 33 involves seeing other students' tests on an instructor's desk and looking at them.

Item 19 is "Using unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given." The only group which did not define item 19 as a minor offense was the control group, which placed this behavior in the "very serious cheating" category.

Summary

The data which indicate that the instructor is more effective than other means of disseminating
information about seriousness of cheating are consistent with the literature. The connection between the instructor's influence in this area and the higher reports of cheating by the group which received that type of information seem logical. Since few, if any, studies have been done to evaluate the effectiveness of video presentations, there is no clear indication that the apparent ineffectiveness of the video in this study is either anticipated or unexpected. The lack of influence of the LSU Code of Student Conduct in this study contributes to the division of researchers on this topic.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

This experiment was designed to see if there is an indication that a careful, thorough explanation of institutional policy and consequences for violating it might affect students' perception of dishonest behavior and, perhaps eventually, affect their cheating behavior. Does any one means of dissemination of policy seem more effective in influencing perceptions than another? Does it appear that using several methods of getting the message to students might accommodate their varying levels of ethical, intellectual, or personal development? If the answer to these questions is yes, that is a good argument for each institution to conduct its own investigations as to which method of dissemination of information works best with its unique student body. If, on the other hand, students' perceptions are fixed and not influenced by any intervention on the part of the university, that is a separate issue to study.

Summary of Data

Analysis of the data in this study indicates that an instructor's presentation of university expectations concerning academic conduct truly is the most effective means of influencing students'
perceptions of the seriousness and frequency of cheating. In contrast to that influence, the code of conduct, when distributed without discussion, appears to have even less impact on student perceptions than an institution's failure to address academic misconduct at all. Also ineffective in this study was the video representation of standards for academic behavior. On item by item analysis the code had less influence than no treatment at all; therefore, the statistical difference between the video and the code regarding seriousness of cheating as a category has little practical significance.

Interpretation of Data

Seriousness of Cheating

Influence of instructor.

The instructor who presented the information contained in the LSU Code of Student Conduct made a clear, succinct statement which students apparently considered noteworthy. The change in student perceptions regarding cheating may be attributable to two factors.

The first factor which may affect students' perceptions of cheating is the role of the instructor as a sanctioned agent of the university. As such, he or she lends both credibility and authority to the
standards which the institution has put into writing. Having learned that faculty members are jealous of their teaching time, students consider important those issues which instructors address during class time. Secondly, students may perceive that the instructor who discusses academic misconduct is more likely to monitor such behaviors. Informal interviews conducted with undergraduate students during the course of this study bore a common theme. Students in general have a lower opinion of those who get caught cheating than of those who cheat. It may or may not be wrong to cheat, but it is stupid to get caught. The risk of apprehension seems to be a greater deterrent than the issue of morality. That perceived risk may affect the perception of seriousness of those behaviors.

There does not seem to be a direct relationship between the number of years a student has been at LSU and the number of students who indicated that they had been exposed to the policy governing academic conduct at LSU. It appears that the courses one takes and the instructors who teach them are more likely to influence that exposure. A variable difficult to measure is the approach individual instructors take in addressing academic misconduct. The instructor in this study made a comment which struck me as a
realistic approach to the discussion: Whether or not you think the policy is fair or right, it is, nonetheless, the policy by which the university judges academic behavior. This honesty may have contributed to the class’ sustained attentiveness to and retention of the information.

Lack of influence of code.

In this study the control group, which received no information in class about LSU’s standards of academic conduct, classified cheating behaviors as more serious than the group which had read the LSU Code of Student Conduct. Proponents of the honor code might find that difficult to accept; however, proponents of honor codes base their support on what may be a faulty assumption. That assumption is that a carefully crafted document conveys to students the university’s expectations, information for which they are then responsible. Students, once exposed to those expectations, supposedly recognize the value the institution places on academic integrity and can no longer use ignorance of the policy as an excuse to misbehave. Some institutions require the signing of a pledge; others do not. Nonetheless, theoretically, students will assume responsibility for their actions in this area.
Typical of the instructors with whom I spoke, one LSU instructor said that she deals with cheating if and when it happens. She places the responsibility for knowing policy and adhering to it on the student. The most common position is that college students are young adults and, as such, they are responsible for their own actions. They should, in turn, accept consequences for those actions. What young people should do, however, is not necessarily what they have been prepared to do.

Webster’s Dictionary (1993) defines adolescence as "that period of life during which the child changes into the adult." Western culture has extended the period of adolescence past the traditional teen years. The contemporary college student aged 18-24 is usually still financially dependent to a large degree on his or her parents. It is not unusual for grades to be mailed to those who pay the bills, a sort of report card system carried over from elementary and secondary school tradition. Mail addressed "to the parents of ..." arrives regularly at the homes of college students, offering parents information about toll-free "phone home" long distance plans, safe apartment complexes, student discounts for health and auto insurance on parents’ policies, summer study programs
abroad, and goodie baskets that can be delivered during finals to show parental support. The ties that bind young people to their families may nurture emotional security, but they may also create prolonged dependence and delayed independence. The assumption that these students are adults, fully prepared to assume responsibility for their lives may be faulty.

In addition to the lack of maturity of the traditional student, two other possible explanations for the lack of influence of the code in this study exist. One is that the distribution of a document without discussion of it indicates its relative unimportance. The tons of junk mail distributed in this society has immunized many to the power of the informally distributed word. Disregarding flyers, brochures, and handouts is a habit too easily acquired. Distribution of the written code, whether in class or in the college catalog, may be seen as an activity designed to meet the minimum requirement of informing students of university policy and may not be perceived as a worthwhile endeavor.

Another possible interpretation of the higher means scored by the control group when classifying cheating behaviors is that those who have no formal indoctrination are inclined to err on the side of
caution when unsure of the degree to which LSU categorizes a behavior as unacceptable. It would be unwise, however, to assume that classifying behaviors as serious on a survey reflects the students' personal beliefs and translates directly into action.

**Frequency of Cheating**

*Influence of instructor.*

Increased knowledge about behaviors the university classifies as cheating may result in heightened awareness of the frequency of those behaviors. One cannot infer, however, that recognition of a behavior is agreement to its meaning.

*Lack of influence of video.*

I was somewhat surprised that the video of student actors did not influence the audience significantly. Because this generation is media-oriented, I expected a more positive response to the "lights, camera, action" presentation. Perhaps these students are saturated from a lifetime of advertisements. A further expectation was that seeing their peers involved in disseminating information would exert a subtle pressure on students to consider the message important. It does make sense, however, that members of one's peer group on film do not have near the influence that peers with whom one associates.
do. It would be interesting to know if the film developed at Duke University featuring Duke students is more effective on that particular campus. Maybe if recognizable leaders of the LSU student body, such as athletes and members of student government, had been featured, the film would have had more impact. No such video exists at this time.

To be fair, one must note that the producers of the video have created an instructor's manual designed to promote discussion. Because it would have required considerable involvement by the instructor and substantial class time, the instructor's manual was not included in this study.

Conclusions Regarding Hypotheses

The data in this study support the literature which indicates that the most effective type of information is the instructor presentation. It does not appear that either the distribution of the code of conduct nor the video presentation made a significant change in students' perceptions of the seriousness or frequency of cheating for the sample groups.

Implications

For Theory

This study does not support the aspect of Kibler's framework which implies that all seven
components are of equal value in promoting an ethos of academic integrity on campus. Because the components in Kibler's illustration are equidistant from the circles representing the means of intervention, one has the impression that the components are equally important in the program (see Figure 2.2). Several of the components involve faculty, of course, but the data from this experiment indicate that communication of expectations by the instructor is the single most effective means of influencing students' perceptions. Kibler's framework is helpful and thorough; however, the insertion of a graphic that emphasizes faculty participation would be more reflective of faculty significance. Perhaps a chain connecting the components to one another would portray the instructor's essential role in everything from formulation of policy to communication of expectations in the classrooms to consistent initiation of the disciplinary process. That chain might be labeled Faculty.

The question of why students respond to an instructor's warnings warrants theoretical consideration. Reasons might include respect for the instructor's position or fear of faculty members' power over the grade book or the student's growing
desire to behave ethically. On this point, a re-
examination of student development theory might be
useful. The level of the student’s moral and
psychosocial growth certainly weights the reasons
students choose to behave within university
guidelines.

An additional area of theoretical interest is the
role that contemporary morality plays in students’
choice not to report classmates who cheat. When the
674 students in the sample were asked what they would
do if a friend asked for help during a test or exam,
43% said they would ignore or turn down the request.
Twenty-nine percent said they would say nothing but
would expose their papers. On the other hand, 71.7%
said they would ignore or turn down the request from
an anonymous classmate. Perhaps the current moral
code emphasizes loyalty to friends over loyalty to an
institution’s honor code. The fact that 94.9% of
these students considered it unlikely or very unlikely
that an LSU student would report an incident of
cheating he or she observed supports this supposition.
Whatever the reasons, even when students do not report
one another, they do respond to an instructor’s
presentation on acceptable academic conduct.
Even at an institution which can implement the 7 component plan, it is apparent that the instructor is still the key to successful intervention. That is good news for the institution unable, due to finances or personnel, to create the comprehensive program Kibler suggests. Because it is both effective and inexpensive, institutions can utilize the power of faculty to promote an atmosphere of academic integrity in the classroom and in the broader academic community.

For Practice

In higher education.

This study supports the literature which emphasizes the importance of the role of faculty in promoting high academic standards at colleges and universities. Gehring et al (1986) explain that "apparent faculty indifference to academic dishonesty communicates to students that the values of integrity and honesty are not sufficiently important to justify any serious effort to enforce them" (p. 76). A campus climate that appears to be tolerant of cheating may actually encourage those who never cheated before to do so. When blatant cases are ignored, honest students are outraged, and the policy weakened. The support of faculty members, therefore, is essential;
they are representatives of the university, extensions of the institution's commitment and philosophy, role models. The plan to encourage academic integrity, then, seems obvious: Formulate a code of conduct that defines and refines the expectations of the institution. Require, or at least strongly encourage, faculty to include discussion of the policy in the classroom. Train instructors to follow appropriate, standardized guidelines for reporting suspected academic misconduct. Enforce the policy consistently and equitably. Obvious? Perhaps. However, that which may be obvious is not always simple. A brief return to the role of higher education in this country is in order.

If, as Bok (1983) suggests, one very important goal of education is to equip the individual to make informed decisions and then to assume responsibility for the consequences of those decisions, a comprehensive program designed to promote ethical growth is valuable. The institution which does not perceive as part of its mission the provision of opportunities for psychosocial growth in addition to intellectual growth may find distribution of university policy without discussion adequate. In that case, students would be required to assume full
responsibility for knowing and adhering to this or any policy. If, on the other hand, the institution perceives for itself a broader mission, the creation of opportunities to explore ethical issues is consistent with that mission.

In Applying the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education (1991), Chickering and Gamson summarize seven principles for improving the quality of the learning experience. The guidelines include encouraging student-faculty contact both in and out of the classroom; promoting cooperation among students rather than competition; initiating active learning as opposed to rote memory and recitation; providing prompt feedback; allotting adequate time on task; and communicating high but realistic expectations "for the poorly prepared or motivated as well as for the bright and well motivated" (1991, p. 20). Those expectations surely include the conduct of academic pursuits in an ethical manner, the communication of which is the heart of this study. That sixth concept, communication of expectations, leads naturally to the seventh principle which recognizes individual learning styles and abilities. In that respect, an attempt to use, among other methods, the video presentation to complement
the instructor's presentation of the written code of conduct would not be incongruous.

In an ideal teaching situation, then, faculty and students engage in active learning sessions -- whatever the topic. Students "... must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences, apply it to their daily lives. They must make what they learn part of themselves" (Chickering & Gamson, 1991, p. 66). It is no longer enough for the administration to construct policy and disseminate it. The value of involving faculty and students in the entire process from formulating policy on academic misconduct to defining sanctions and creating, nurturing, and sustaining an ethos where academic integrity is revered should be apparent. When joint student/faculty committees draft policy, and joint judicial councils enforce it, the academic community sees a unified front. Kibler's framework, with all the components, is an excellent approach to consider.

Those familiar with strategic and tactical planning on a campus know that a comprehensive program to address any campus concern is neither created nor implemented overnight. Although an issue may be urgent, an appropriate response may not be immediate.
Campus communities need a plan to address cheating and promote academic integrity which is both effective and feasible.

At Louisiana State University.

To recommend that LSU formulate a comprehensive, multi-faceted program such as Kibler's would be unrealistic at this point. Such a program would require resources this university just does not have; other projects, more visible and perhaps more urgent, take priority. Underpaid faculty and staff are often understandably reluctant to assume additional duties not directly related to primary responsibilities. Considerable expenditure in dollars and in use of personnel are involved in conducting student/faculty seminars outside of class, offering training sessions for instructors on monitoring and reporting procedures, and producing materials (and possibly a video) tailored to a particular university. In addition, reducing class size and providing proctors for exams presents a fiscal and logistical challenge. An already overworked counseling staff might resist taking on the mandatory counseling of cheating offenders, and, as it is, orientation leaders express concern over the large number of issues they try to
address in sessions for freshmen and transfer students.

At this point there are no official ongoing programs at LSU through which students discuss academic dishonesty and the sanctions against it with one another. Nor does the practice of the faculty's discussing standards for academic conduct in class appear to be widespread at LSU. Perhaps the time and energy required in addition to the regular teaching responsibilities constitute an infringement on time, an inconvenience for which I had hoped to find an alternative. Had the dissemination of the LSU Code of Student Conduct had a significant influence on students' perceptions, that would have been a simple, time efficient method of getting the message out. Based on this study, that is apparently not the case. Another alternative, one which would have taken some class time but no involvement by the instructor, was the video. Since it was not effective in this case, neither the code nor the video without opportunity for discussion is a reasonable alternative to the instructor presentation. The most cost effective plan is to involve the faculty. One brief presentation, reinforced by a statement on the course syllabus, could be implemented immediately, providing department
heads serve as advocates for the implementation of such an approach. If faculty are informed that this method is the most effective tool an institution has to address a growing problem, many will elect to participate.

Two departments which I found to be addressing the issue at LSU are the Department of English and the Department of Biology. Instructors in freshman English composition classes are required to discuss plagiarism in detail. Other forms of cheating, however, such as on exams, are not addressed because they are not relevant to those courses.

The biology department addresses cheating directly by restricting opportunities to cheat through precautions taken at exam time. Students from the large lecture sections report to assigned smaller classrooms for testing where they must show picture ID. This practice takes advance logistical planning, additional resources, and enthusiastic cooperation from instructors -- all of which one can readily observe. Graduate assistants serve as proctors, and all exams are given at the same time on the same evening. Teaching large sections of Biology 1001 and 1002 reduces the demand for additional faculty but increases the need for these preventive measures.
Perhaps the allocation of staff and funds are balanced by the complementary aspects of the program. In other words, large sections allow for fewer faculty to instruct more students but the uniform exam system with proctors creates occasional inconvenience.

Without question, faculty are the most instrumental persons on campus in the prevention of academic dishonesty. They are in the best position to communicate and enforce standards and expectations. "If faculty are isolated from the institution's efforts to prevent academic dishonesty, those efforts are likely to be ineffective" (Report to the Lewis & Clark College Community, Executive Summary of Results, Academic Integrity Task Force, March 1995). Therefore, I recommend a three phase approach to meet LSU's needs within LSU's budget.

First, in an orientation session conducted jointly by an LSU Ambassador, who is a trained student leader, and a faculty or staff representative, school representatives should emphasize that academic integrity is consistent with the university's mission and in the best interest of those who seek a quality education. The university has access to several thousand new students through Spring Testing, freshman advising sessions, and transfer orientations. The
Dean of Students, who is responsible for processing cases of academic misconduct, refers to academic integrity in his remarks to these groups; however, students do not hear from their peers on this subject. LSU Ambassadors, as peers, could provide valuable input. The LSU Code of Student Conduct is a carefully crafted document; the 1992 version was amended by a committee comprised of faculty, staff, and student representatives. A brief statement of introduction and explanation should suffice.

Secondly, the LSU administration should strongly encourage departmental policy that requires faculty to address the issue briefly before the first exam or graded assignment. Also, the university should supply proctors when appropriate to reduce opportunistic cheating. Graduate assistants could supplement faculty. Administrative staff would assist in exchange for comp time, if necessary.

The third step is vital if the university is to have any credibility in the area of academic standards, but it is probably the most difficult to institute. Instructors must be willing to share some of their authority over the classroom with the Dean of Students, through whose office cases of cheating are
supposed to be handled. Consistent referrals and uniform, equitable consequences contribute to the ethos that Kibler describes in his framework. McCabe and Trevino "... have provided convincing evidence that cheating is greatest among students who believe their peers are cheating and where the climate of peer disapproval is low" (1993, in McCabe & Bowers, 1996, p. 289-90). Louisiana State University has a system in place which includes a peer review council, one form of positive peer pressure. The system will not work, however, unless the faculty initiates it. The 70 cases of suspected cheating which were referred to LSU authorities in 1994-1995 represent a mere .00367 percent of the student population, an absurdly low figure compared to students' self-reported offenses on any campus; between 9% and 70% of college students admit some cheating behavior (Davis et al, 1992; McCabe & Bowers, 1996). Instructors appear to be negligent at either monitoring or reporting suspected incidents of academic misconduct.

Pondy (1978) says it well: "... the effectiveness of a leader lies in his [or her] ability to make activity meaningful for those in his role set-not to change behavior but to give others a sense of understanding what they are doing and especially to
articulate it so they can communicate about the meaning of behavior ... If in addition the leader can put it into words, then the meaning of what the group is doing becomes a social fact... This dual capacity ...to make sense of things and to put them into language meaningful to large numbers of people gives the person who has it enormous leverage" (in Pfeffer, 1981, p. 188). That leverage is in the hands of the classroom instructor.

For Related Research

Because this was not a longitudinal study, one cannot assume a relationship between changed perceptions and subsequent changed behavior. "Bem (1972) and others have argued that attitudes and beliefs frequently follow action, with the behaviors being used as a way of determining what the individual's perceptions must be. Of course, the use of behavior to infer beliefs and attitudes is more likely to the extent that the behavior was taken voluntarily and publicly" (Salancik, 1977, in Pfeffer, 1981, p. 169). It might be valuable to track a group of students who are exposed to opportunities to examine ethical standards during their undergraduate experience. The first step would be to construct a carefully crafted code of student conduct, preferably
a result of both student and faculty input. LSU's is an excellent model. The next step would be to implement campus-wide training for instructors and graduate assistants promoting consistent reporting of suspected cheating offenses to the proper authorities. One would then survey first-time, entering freshmen as to perceptions of the seriousness of cheating, then monitor that group, tracking reported suspected offenses. A second survey of the group further into their college experience would follow for comparison of perceptions. The final step would be the comparison of the number of reported cases of suspected academic misconduct during this time period. Of course, the validity of that particular data would be dependent on the extent to which faculty adhere to the guideline of disseminating information, monitoring student behavior in their courses, and following institutional guidelines for reporting suspected offenses.

If funds were available, it might still be worthwhile to develop a film featuring student leaders on a particular campus and to test its effectiveness in influencing student perceptions. Duke University received grant funding for the video used in this study.
Summary

"In the final analysis, the most important question to ask concerning academic dishonesty may be how an institution can create an environment where academic dishonesty is socially unacceptable, that is, where institutional expectations are clearly understood and where students perceive that their peers are adhering to these expectations" (McCabe & Trevino, 1993). Without question, the single most critical factor in undergraduate education is the classroom instructor. While he or she may be an expert in one particular discipline, his or her influence extends beyond that area of expertise. The instructor may not be able to dictate behavior outside the realm of his or her classroom but in that one corner of the world, the instructor can require conformity to specific standards. To set standards for academic behavior and to enforce that standard uniformly is the faculty member's significant and essential contribution to the creation of a positive ethical atmosphere on any campus.
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APPENDIX

A: CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT
B: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY SURVEY
3.6. Misconduct

"Misconduct" is any action by a student which endangers or threatens to endanger the health or safety of the University community or the educational mission of the University. The term "academic misconduct" refers to what is commonly known as "cheating." Full definitions of these terms are given in section 5.1. of this Code.

5. MISCONDUCT

5.1. Academic Misconduct

a. General

Academic misconduct represents a most serious and reprehensible type of student misconduct; thus, the University must make a genuine effort to prevent its occurrence. The University must also develop policies and procedures that assure students of due process protection when academic misconduct is alleged and that provide meaningful and consistent sanctions for students found guilty of academic misconduct.

Equal treatment guaranteed to students by the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution requires that the same University policies, procedures, and practices be used and also requires imposing of "like sanctions for like violations" on all student misconduct. This obligation of the University can be fulfilled only if each instructor reports all suspected academic misconduct to the Dean of Students in accordance with the provisions of this Code. Consistent with this obligation, section 6.4. of this Code states, "...no University disciplinary sanction shall be imposed upon a student except in accordance with the provisions of this Code..." Thus, it is contrary to University policy for an instructor to assign a disciplinary grade, such as an "F" or zero on an assignment, test, examination, or course as a sanction for admitted or suspected academic misconduct in lieu of formally charging the student with academic misconduct under the provisions of this Code.
b. Types of Academic Misconduct

Although all academic misconduct is reprehensible, premeditated acts of academic misconduct represent a greater threat to the integrity of the University than do unpremeditated acts of academic misconduct. The following definitions of and distinctions between unpremeditated and premeditated misconduct are established.

c. Unpremeditated

Unpremeditated academic misconduct is an act of academic misconduct taken without advance contemplation, prior determination or planning, or full understanding that the act is considered academic misconduct, i.e. on the spur-of-the-moment, seizing the opportunity to cheat, collaboration to a greater degree than is permitted in a particular situation, and careless or incomplete documentation of sources.

1. Copying from another student's test paper;
2. Allowing another student to copy from a test paper;
3. Using the course textbook or other materials such as a notebook normally brought to a class meeting but not authorized for use during a test by the person giving the test. Having such forbidden material open and in sight of the student will be considered prima facie evidence of use;
4. To attempt to commit, or to be an accessory to the commission of an offense listed above;
5. Failing to thoroughly follow instructions related to the preparation and presentation of work submitted for credit in a manner that results in submitting as one's the work of another or misleading the faculty member as to the condition under which the work was prepared, i.e. work with another on a project that was to be done individually, insufficient documentation of sources, or using material prepared outside of class on an in-class assignment.
6. Other acts of unpremeditated misconduct.

d. Premeditated

Premeditated academic misconduct is an act of academic misconduct which grows out of advance contemplation or meditation, prior deliberation or planning which may, but need not, include the preparation of a written plan or notes. Although prior thought and planning
is a requisite to premeditation, this prior thought and planning need not exist for any particular period of time before it is carried into effect. i.e., this prior thought and planning can occur while the student is taking a test or examination. For purposes of filing formal charges, each of the following offenses will normally be considered a premeditated offense.

1. Collaborating during a test with any other person by giving or receiving information without authority;
2. Using specially prepared materials, e.g., notes, formula lists, or notes written on student's clothing or body, during a test. Bringing such forbidden material to a test will be considered prima facie evidence of use or attempted use;
3. Stealing, buying, or otherwise obtaining, all or part of an unadministered test, including answers to an unadministered test;
4. Seeing or giving away all or part of an unadministered test or information about an unadministered test, including answers to an unadministered test;
5. Bribing any other person to obtain an unadministered test or information about an unadministered test;
6. Substituting for another student, or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself, to take a test;
7. Submitting as one's own, in fulfillment of academic requirements any work (such as, but not limited to, a theme, report, term paper, essay, computer software, other written work, painting, drawing, sculpture, or other scholastic art work) prepared totally or in part by another;
8. Any selling, giving, or otherwise supplying to another student for use in fulfilling academic requirements any theme, report, term paper, essay, computer software, other written work, painting, drawing, sculpture, or other scholastic art work;
9. Breaking in and/or entering a building or office for purpose of changing a grade in a gradebook, on a test paper, or on other work for which a grade is given;
10. Changing, altering, or being an accessory to changing and/or altering a grade in a gradebook, on a test paper, or on other work for which a grade is given, on a "drop slip," or on official academic record of the University which relates to grades;
11. Proposing and/or entering into an arrangement with an instructor to receive a grade of "F" or any other
reduced grade in a course, on a test, or any other assigned work in lieu of being charged with academic misconduct under the Code of Student Conduct.

12. Plagiarism: plagiarism is defined as the unacknowledged inclusion, in work submitted for credit, of someone else's words, ideas, or data. When a student submits work for credit that includes the words, ideas, or data of others, the source of this information must be acknowledged through complete, accurate, and specific footnote references, and, if verbatim statements are included, through quotation marks as well. Failure to identify any source, published or unpublished, copyrighted, from which information, terms, phrases, or concepts have been taken, constitutes plagiarism. Students should also take special note that failure to acknowledge study aids such as Cliffs Notes, encyclopedias, or other common reference books, also constitutes plagiarism. Only universally available facts, e.g., the date of Abraham Lincoln's death or Washington's birthdate, are excluded from such documentation. By placing his or her name on work submitted for credit, the student certifies the originality of all work not otherwise identified by appropriate acknowledgements;

13. Other acts of premeditated academic misconduct;

14. To attempt to commit, or to be an accessory to, the commission of an offense listed above.

8. DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS

8.2. Academic Misconduct by Undergraduate Students

a. Assigning a Grade for Academic Misconduct

A student found guilty of unpremeditated academic misconduct will not receive credit for the work involved, and may be dropped from the course in which the misconduct has occurred and assigned a permanent grade of "F" for the course. A student, found guilty of premeditated academic misconduct will be dropped from the course in which the academic misconduct has occurred and a permanent grade of "F" must be assigned in the course.

b. Unpremeditated Academic Misconduct

1. For the first offense:
   a. The minimum sanction for the first
offense is probation to the Committee on Student Conduct for a period of at least one year and loss of credit for the work involved.

b. The intermediate sanction for the first offense is probation to the Committee on Student Conduct for the remainder of the student's stay at LSU under the same status (undergraduate or graduate) which prevails at the time of the offense; removal from the course in which the academic misconduct has occurred, and a letter grade of "F" in the course.

c. The maximum sanction for the first offense is separation from the University for one or more semesters.

I have read the University's policy statement on academic misconduct and understand that I am subject to its enforcement.

______________________________

(name) (date)
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY SURVEY

Student

The demographic information requested in this survey is strictly confidential and will not be used to identify you. It is an effort to insure that the sample of students participating in the survey represents the diverse population at LSU. PLEASE USE A #2 PENCIL.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male
2. Age: ☐ 18-24 ☐ 25-30 ☐ 31-40 ☐ 41 and older
3. How would you describe your ethnic background: ☐ Asian ☐ African American ☐ Hispanic ☐ Native American (Indian) ☐ White ☐ Foreign ☐ Other
4. What is your present academic standing? ☐ Freshman ☐ Sophomore ☐ Junior ☐ Senior
5. Graduate student
6. How many years have you been at LSU (including this year)? ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ more than 5
7. Do you plan to pursue graduate work? ☐ yes ☐ no ☐ undecided
8. What kind of occupation do you plan to enter?
   ☐ Law ☐ Medicine ☐ Public/Government Service ☐ Other
9. What is your present academic standing? ☐ Freshman ☐ Sophomore ☐ Junior ☐ Senior
10. How likely is it that a typical LSU student would report an incident of cheating? ☐ Very unlikely ☐ Unlikely ☐ Likely ☐ Very likely
11. When students are brought to the attention of faculty for cheating, the faculty member can choose one of the three courses of action listed below. Select the one you think faculty members at LSU most often choose. Cohen disciplinary action is taken. ☐ Disciplinary action is taken by the course instructor. ☐ The case is passed on to some other LSU authority for disciplinary action.
12. How would you rate: ☐ Very Low ☐ Low ☐ High ☐ Very High
   The severity of penalties for cheating at LSU?
   Chances of getting caught cheating at LSU?
   Students' understanding of the Code of Student Conduct at LSU (which outlines policies toward academic dishonesty)?
   The faculty's explanation of LSU's policies on academic dishonesty to their classes?
   The faculty's enforcement of these policies?
   The effectiveness of these policies in preventing cheating?
13. Students learn about campus rules in different ways. Which of the following were important sources of information about campus rules for you? Rank them in order of importance to you, using one to indicate the most important source and five for the least important. MOST
   Published sources (student handbook, school newspaper, college bulletin) INFORMATIVE
   Informal conversations with other students
   Faculty discussion in the classroom
   Orientation program for freshmen or new students
   Trial and error
15. We would like to ask you some questions about specific types of cheating. Please remember that this survey is completely anonymous and there is no way anyone can connect you with any of your answers. Use the following classifications as a basis for your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you classify this behavior?</th>
<th>Have you engaged in this behavior?</th>
<th>If given the chance you would engage in this behavior?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= Not cheating.</td>
<td>1= Never</td>
<td>1= No, not under any circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2= Minor cheating offense.</td>
<td>2= Once</td>
<td>2= Only if I were in danger of failing the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3= Serious cheating.</td>
<td>3= A few times</td>
<td>3= If I needed a better grade to keep a scholarship, to stay eligible for scholarships, or to improve chances for graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4= Very serious cheating.</td>
<td>4= Several times</td>
<td>4= If I think the instructor is unreasonable in his expectations or is not an effective teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often do you think the following occur at LSU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you think the following occur at LSU?</th>
<th>Classify Emigration in would cases now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2= Seldom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3= Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4= Very often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classify Emigration in would cases now</th>
<th>Engaged in Behavior</th>
<th>Would Engage</th>
<th>Occurs how often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copying from another student during a test or exam without his or her knowing it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying from another student during a test with his or her knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using unpermitted crib notes (or cheat sheets) during a test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using unfair methods to learn what was on a test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping someone else cheat on a test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating on a test in some way other than copying, using a cheat sheet, having advance knowledge of test content, or helping someone else cheat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying material, almost word for word, from any source.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning in work done by someone else as if it were your own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving substantial, unpermitted help on an assignment or test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying a few sentences of material without Source noting them in a paper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing a paper for another student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a math/computer or science course, copying someone's program or lab work rather than doing your own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting an instructor's office on legitimate business prior to a test and, while the instructor steps out, accidentally seeing a copy of a test and carrying it down to a few lines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a copy of a test from the room so that someone else can read it even though the instructor has asked all students to turn tests in as they leave class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying or taking another class in order to retake an exam (ex: lying about medical or other extenuating circumstances to get an extended deadline or to retake an exam).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going up to an instructor's desk to ask a question during an exam and noticing answer sheets face up on the instructor's desk and seeing other students' answers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying another student to take a test for you, write a paper for you, or to obtain old tests which the instructor does not want distributed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picking up a dropped answer sheet during an exam and, while handing it back, noting several answers and, when rereading your own work, changing some answers based on what you saw.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a cheat sheet before an exam, taking it with you, but, because you feel guilty, deciding not to use it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making elaborate plans to sit next to a particular student in order to copy answers and glancing from time to time at the other student's answer sheet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your help!
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